

A
COUNTERBLAST TO THE ORGAN;

OR,

THE LAWFULNESS OF USING INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN WORSHIP DURING
THE PRESENT DISPENSATION

DISCUSSED AND DENIED.

BY

JAMES HARPER,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
XENIA, OHIO.

PRICE 25 CENTS.

New York:

MAGILL & DE LA MARE, BOOK AND JOB PRINTERS,
76 CORTLANDT STREET.

1881.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

PART FIRST—DECLARATIVE, OR THE STATE OF THE CONTROVERSY.

CHAPTER.	PAGE.
I.—Theories as to the relation of Instrumental Music to the worship of God in the New Testament Church.....	4
II.—Pleas urged for the Preceptive Theory.....	5
III.—Pleas urged for the Permissive, or Optional Theory.....	7

PART SECOND—THE COMPETING THEORIES CONSIDERED.

I.—Inquiry touching the law of worship.	8
II.—Considerations in support of the Radical doctrine as to the law of worship.....	10
III.—Further Confirmation of the Radical view as to the law of worship	13
IV.—The Preceptive theory as to the use of instrumental music—Examination of the Æsthetic or Rationalistic plea for said theory.....	16
V.—The Preceptive theory—Further consideration of the Æsthetic Argument.....	20
VI.—The Preceptive theory—The arguments drawn from ancient appointment and alleged non-repeal considered.....	24
VII.—The Preceptive theory—Further proof that instrumental music was ceremonial.....	27
VIII.—The Preceptive theory—Instrumental music in worship peculiarly associated with the temple.....	30
IX.—The Preceptive theory—Inquiry as to the use of instrumental music in the Synagogue.....	32
X.—The Preceptive theory—Inquiry in relation to Synagogue worship continued.....	34
XI.—The Preceptive theory—Argument against it from the method of worship in the Synagogue.....	37
XII.—The Preceptive theory—What was symbolized by the instrumental music of the temple—Patristic evidence.....	39

XIII.—The Preceptive theory—Argument against it from the specification of particular instruments.	45
XIV.—The Preceptive theory—Argument against it from the silence of the New Testament.	49
XV.—The Preceptive theory—Argument against it from the silence of the New Testament—Meaning of Psallo.	53
XVI.—The Preceptive theory—New Testament evidence—Meaning of Psallo.	57
XVII.—The Preceptive theory—New Testament evidence—Consideration of Psallo concluded.	58
XVIII.—The Preceptive theory—The argument for it drawn from directions in the Psalms to use instruments considered.	61
XIX.—The Preceptive theory—The argument in its favor founded on certain Old Testament predictions considered.	64
XX.—The Optional or Permissive theory—The pleas in its behalf founded on alleged church authority and on the fact of divine appointment and alleged non-repeal considered—Some quibbles noticed.	68
XXI.—The Optional theory—The argument in its favor drawn from supposed parallel cases considered.	70
XXII.—The Optional theory—The "Circumstance" plea considered.	73
XXIII.—The Optional theory—The "Tuning fork" plea considered.	77
XXIV.—The Prohibitory theory—Recapitulation of Arguments—Argument for it from the absence of New Testament sanction of musical instruments in worship.	79
XXV.—The Prohibitory theory—Argument in its favor drawn from the silence of the New Testament—The cavil drawn from infant baptism noticed.	82
XXVI.—The Prohibitory theory—New Testament evidence in its favor.	84
XXVII.—The Prohibitory theory—Historical evidence in its behalf.	86
XXVIII.—The Prohibitory theory—Value of the historical fact that in the Early Church instruments of music were not used in worship.	89
XXIX.—The Prohibitory theory—Evidence in its favor derivable from modern church history.	92
XXX.—The Prohibitory theory—Evidence in its behalf from modern church history.	93
PART THIRD—ECCLIASTICO-POLITICAL ASPECTS OF THE QUESTION.	

INTRODUCTION.

The doctrine, government and worship of the Church are so closely connected, that whatever affects the integrity and purity of any one of them, tends to produce a corresponding modification of the others. It may be a fanciful notion, but I have often thought that the sentiment just expressed is suggested by the words, "And it shall be one tabernacle," which, in substance, occur more than once in the instructions which God gave to Moses in reference to the framing of the tabernacle.

All the parts of that peculiar structure were, according to the divine pattern and prescription, carefully adjusted to one another, and adapted to the promotion of the ends contemplated. The outer and the inner arrangements, the casket and the gem, sustained to one another an exact and admirable correspondence.

Moral truth is not, as some seem to suppose, an aggregation of isolated, disconnected principles, but a glorious organism from which nothing can be abstracted, and to which nothing heterogeneous can be added, without detriment to the beauty and power of the whole. That tender, mutual sympathy which the Apostle graphically describes as characteristic of the various members of the human frame, may, in a figure, be affirmed of the different parts of the system of moral and religious truth, "And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it."

Yet many who profess to be strenuous in maintaining in their fulness and simplicity, unmixed with human philosophy and speculation, what are called "the doctrines" of the bible, that is, truths pertaining to the being and character of God, the nature and state of man, and the way of salvation, are anxious to explain that, for forms of worship and of church polity, they feel little, if any, concern! And this indifference is, in many quarters, reckoned a mark of exemption from besotting prejudice, a token of generous liberality of mind, a manifest fruit of Christian charity!

So prevalent and fashionable is the sentiment in question, that no one who desires to stand well in the estimation of the Christian public in general, will betray any glow of zeal in impugning, or in advocating almost any particular form of worship, or of ecclesiastical government. Pope's oft-quoted couplet,

"For points of faith let senseless bigots fight;
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right,"

if not accepted in its full significance, seems to be very generally deemed appropriate in reference to the outward forms of religion at least.

And yet the statements now made require, when we reflect, some modification; for, at the present time, there is an extensive spread of the ritualistic spirit,

which reveals itself in an unwarrantable multiplication of outward forms of worship, and in reliance upon them for the victory over hostile influences. It would be more nearly correct to say, that the indifference which, it has been alleged, prevails, relates rather to the divine authority of any particular mode of worship and church government. Extremes meet: and the sentiment, that it matters little in what way we worship God, is radically not very remote from the sentiment of the ritualist, who studies to enlarge and embellish the simple ritual of the New Testament. In either case alike, there is a disregard of the prescription of God, while in one, this disregard assumes the aspect of a disregard, or at least underestimate of all forms; in the other, of a disparagement of the precise forms enjoined by God.

That those who would adhere to divine appointments in the matter of worship must encounter the two streams of sentiment now indicated, and encounter them with substantially the same front, is too obvious to demand extended proof. No one acquainted with the facts will presume to deny that, in a large degree, the ritualistic spirit has made advances in some prominent Protestant denominations. But side by side with this fact, is another not less apparent or significant, that in churches, heretofore noted for the severe simplicity of their religious services, there have arisen a love of pomp and theatrical display, a craving for a florid worship, and a disposition to sneer at all conscientious scruples in the department of worship, as sheer bigotry or hypocrisy. It is nearly always assumed that he who is concerned about what some would derisively call "the mint, the anise and the cummin," is living in neglect of the weightier matters of the law. Churches, both in the United Kingdom and in America, which, in view of their traditions and professed principles, might have been deemed proof against such an innovation as the introduction of instrumental music into the service of praise, are beginning to be deeply agitated on the subject, while predictions are confidently made that the most tenacious of them will soon succumb to the growing demand for the artistic and ornamental in worship. That sagacious observer and statesman, Mr. Gladstone, has expressed his impression on this point in the following terms:—"The present movement in favor of ritual is not confined to ritualists, neither is it confined even to churchmen. It has been, when all things are considered, quite as remarkable among Nonconformists and Presbyterians; not because they have as much of it, but because they formerly had none, and because their system appeared to have been devised and adjusted in order to prevent its introduction, and to fix upon it even in 'limine,' the aspect of a flagrant departure from first principles. Crosses on the outside of chapels, organs within them, rich pointed architecture, that flagrant piece of symbolism, the steeple, windows filled with subjects in stained glass, elaborate chanting, the use of the Lord's prayer, which is no more than the thin end of the wedge that is to introduce fixed forms, and the partial movements in favor of such forms already developed, are among the signs which, taken altogether, form a group of phenomena, evidently referable to some cause far more deep and wide-working than mere servile imitation, or the fashion of the day. In the case of the organ, be it recollected, that many who

form part of the *crème de la crème* (cream of the cream) of Protestantism, have now begun to use that which the Pope does not hear in his own chapel, or his sublime Basilica, and which the entire Eastern Church has ever shrunk from employing in its services."

It is quite common now-a-days to hear the heroic qualities of the Puritans extolled, and that in quarters where their cherished principles are rejected and derided. The age which builds the tombs of martyrs is not always a martyr age. To admire is not to imitate. To laud is not to emulate. In the very home which Puritan courage and principle prepared for posterity, it is reckoned rather a mark of advancement in thought to sneer at the views which the Puritans held on matters of doctrine and worship. A mild illustration of this fact is found in the curt and contemptuous reference made to the opponents of instrumental music in worship, by Dr. W. M. Taylor, of New York, in one of his lectures, delivered some years since, to the students of Yale Theological Seminary. "Those," said he, "who object to the use of an organ, might as well object to the use of a tuning-fork or a note-book in worship."

If Dr. Taylor, whose Scottish birth and education might have taught him to rate a little more highly the sense of those he sneers at, should ever read Cotton Mather's History of New England, he will discover that the taunt he uttered fell on the graves of the sainted leaders of New England thought in bygone days, as well as on the heads of those, who, though not, it may be, descendants of the Puritans according to the flesh, are in a nobler sense, even by mental ties and religious consanguinity, their offspring and heirs.

The Church with which the writer is connected, the United Presbyterian Church of North America, though enjoying the distinction of maintaining not a few unpopular truths, has not escaped the contagion of the times; for it now appears that a question which many supposed was definitely and finally settled in the negative, that namely, as to the use of instrumental music in worship, must be re-opened and subjected to another sifting. This circumstance is the immediate occasion prompting to the preparation of the following argument, as a contribution to the defense of a cause which I deem scriptural and important.

It may be premised that the discussion is shaped with reference chiefly to the state of matters forming the immediate incentive to engage in it, that is, it contemplates mainly the attitude of those who admit, that for all parts of our worship, we must have the appointment of God. At the same time, some care has been taken to handle the question for the benefit of a wider circle, and to meet in some measure the requirements arising from divergence of views touching the law which should control the worship and order of the Church of Christ.

Studying to give, in as concise a way as is consistent with the object in view, a comprehensive survey of the vexed question before me, I will pursue the following line of thought and investigation, namely: First, Submit a statement of the various opinions entertained as to the relation of instrumental music to worship in the New Testament Church, and give a synopsis of the pleas urged on the pro-instrumental side; Second, Consider the claims respectively of the competing

opinions or theories; Third, Survey the question in its relation to ecclesiastical polity or order, or in other words, inquire whether the use of musical instruments in worship should be left an open question in the Church, or should be debarred and condemned in explicit terms.

PART FIRST.

Declarative; or, the State of the Controversy.

CHAPTER I.

THEORIES AS TO THE RELATION OF INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC TO THE WORSHIP OF GOD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH.

The importance of ascertaining and indicating at the outset of our inquiry, the actual or supposable competing views touching the question in hand must be apparent. So far as I know, the theories in respect to the use of instrumental music in the worship of the present dispensation, are reducible to three, which, for sake in part of alliteration, may be called, The Preceptive or Prescriptive, The Permissive and The Prohibitory theory.

The Preceptive theory is to the effect that the use of instruments of music in worship is still obligatory, such use having been commanded by God. The Permissive theory is, that the use of musical instruments in worship is neither forbidden, nor enjoined absolutely, but is allowable, and in certain circumstances may be rather advisable or commendable.

The Prohibitory theory, is that the use of instrumental music in worship, so far as the present dispensation is concerned, is destitute of divine sanction, and is unlawful.

According to the first view, instrumental music in New Testament worship is commanded; according to the second view, conceded, and in certain circumstances commended; according to the third view, condemned.

If the first and second of these views can be proved untenable, the third shall have been established, because it is the only alternative left after their rejection, unless it be the alternative of nescience, or confessed inability to decide for any of the theories. The line of argument which shall set aside its rivals, will tend to the confirmation of the third theory. If we can show that God has not made the use of instruments in worship obligatory upon us; if, besides, it can be shown that he does not commend, or in any way sanction this use, it will follow that to use them now for such a purpose is unlawful. For, all concerned in this controversy will admit, that no mode of worship is allowable which God has not in some way sanctioned, whether directly or indirectly. Even Romanists do not claim a liberty to introduce ceremonies which God has not warranted the Church to devise and adopt. If it can be proved that God has neither enjoined instrumental music, nor pronounced its use optional in New Testament

worship, nor furnished the Church with a general commission to enact modes of worship not clearly prohibited in his word, the conclusion drawn must be that instrumental music should no longer form a feature of the service of song. It is our conviction that God has done none of the things specified in the previous sentence, and therefore we hold to the conclusion just indicated.

CHAPTER II.

PLEAS URGED FOR THE PRECEPTIVE THEORY.

Desiring to deal fairly with the views opposed, and to make clear to all who may read this discussion, what the points are to which it will be necessary to reply, I will set down at the outset all the arguments of any consequence which have been urged, or which I can think of, in behalf of the use of instrumental music in divine worship; and accordingly I present first an outline of the argument which may be framed in behalf of the preceptive theory already defined:

I. The *Æsthetic*, Rationalistic, or presumptive plea.

The purport of this plea is that, as all our powers are to be devoted to the service of God, it is to be presumed that our faculty and taste for music will have full scope allowed them in the worship of God. It may be noted that some would be disposed to regard our possession of a musical power and susceptibility as a sufficient indication of our duty in this matter. Others, however, less daring, adduce the fact that God has endowed us with a musical faculty, as presumptive evidence that he would make provision for the employment of this faculty in the fullest measure in the exercises of worship, and hence, as a reason why we should anticipate that, in making regulations touching his worship, God would not overlook the faculty bestowed upon us, in virtue of which we are competent to enjoy and produce music, instrumental as well as vocal.

There are sundry elements involved in this plea which, for sake of clearness, may be separated and presented in detail. They are such as these:—

- (1.) The entire powers of our being should be consecrated to the service and glory of God.
- (2.) Musical susceptibility and power are characteristics of our race, revealing themselves in some degree among all men, though not equally in all.
- (3.) The musical element of our nature prompts not only to vocal, but also to instrumental music, and men everywhere acknowledge practically the power of the latter as well as of the former.
- (4.) It is unreasonable to suppose that God who gave us a nature which finds enjoyment and seeks expression in music, instrumental as well as vocal, would forbid the employment of either kind in his worship. On that supposition, how could we call upon all that is within us to bless his holy name, as we are commanded to do? The principles of all true art are from God. Ought not art, then, in its varied forms to be made tributary to religion? Instead of being suspected and looked upon askance, ought not *æsthetics* to be cultivated and honored in the department of worship? In order that vocal music even, may, to the greatest ad-

vantage, be produced in divine worship, the aid of instruments is requisite; the vocal song being thereby guided, sustained and enhanced. The manifest predilection shown in refined communities for an instrumental accompaniment of vocal song, seems to indicate that the principles of good taste dictate such a combination. But the principles of good taste originate with him who gave us our being, and therefore it may be presumed that the application of them in his worship will have his sanction.

II. The Scriptural plea, or combination of pleas.

Under this head, the following considerations are wont to be adduced by the advocates of instrumental music in worship:—

- (1.) God did prescribe the use of musical instruments in his worship once.
- (2.) There is nowhere in the bible any formal or express repeal of this Old Testament regulation, and if so, it must still be in force.
- (3.) There are certain prophetic intimations in the Old Testament, to the effect that, in New Testament worship musical instruments should be used, and that with divine approval. For instance, in Ps. 66 : 4, it is said: "All the earth shall worship thee, they shall sing to thy name," where the word rendered "sing," it is claimed, includes in it a reference to the use of instruments. Again, it is said in Ps. 87 : 7, "As well the singers as the players on instruments shall be there;" the allusion being, it is presumed, to the New Testament Church.
- (4.) There are also in the Old Testament, exhortations and commands addressed to men at large, to praise God with instruments, as, for instance, in Ps. 68 : 32; 98 : 3, 4; Is. 12 : 5, in all of which a verb is used which, it is maintained, suggests an instrumental accompaniment, and still more expressly in Ps. 149 and 150.

(5.) The impossibility of showing what instrumental music typified, is also urged as a reason for the belief that it was not typical or transient, but intended to be a permanent element in the worship of God.

(6.) It is contended that in the New Testament, so far from finding a repeal of the old law prescribing the use of instrumental music in worship, we find countenance given to the notion that the law touching such music is still in force. Two classes of passages are cited in support of this view, namely, certain texts in which the verb, "Psallo," occurs, which, it is alleged, means to sing with an instrumental accompaniment. These texts are 1 Cor. 14 : 15: "I will sing (Psallo) with the spirit, and I will sing (Psallo) with the understanding also;" Rom. 15 : 9: "For this cause I will confess to thee among the Gentiles, and sing (Psallo) unto thy name;" Eph. 5 : 19: "Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing and making melody (Psallontes) in your heart to the Lord;" Jas. 5 : 13: "Is any merry let him sing psalms (Psalleto)."

The other class of passages consists of texts in which the saints, either in glory, or in the New Testament dispensation, are represented as celebrating the praises of God with certain specified musical instruments. These texts are all found in the Book of Revelation, and are as follows: Rev. 5 : 8, 9; 14 : 2; 15 : 2, 3.

The substance of the arguments for the preceptive theory has now been laid before the reader, with as much clearness as a desire to be brief would admit, and with as much candor as I can command. Every enthusiast for instruments may not be disposed to rest on every argument now presented, and all are not agreed as to the relative value of the arguments which they do employ, but I have massed together the aggregate of the pleas used to support the view that the use of instruments of music in worship is now obligatory.

CHAPTER III

PLEAS FOR THE PERMISSIVE, OR OPTIONAL THEORY STATED.

We address ourselves now to a statement of the arguments which are, or might be, used to sustain the permissive theory as to the employment of instruments in New Testament worship. This theory, it will be remembered, is that God neither requires nor forbids us to use instrumental music in his worship, but that he permits us to do so; that it is lawful to worship him now, as of old, with instruments, and may be very expedient so to do, but in certain circumstances may be inexpedient.

The pleas advanced in support of this view are as follows:

I. The line of argument adopted to establish the preceptive theory. Remarkable as it may appear, this is the method of proof chiefly used by those who do not wish to prove the use of instrumental music in worship obligatory, but only optional. Some, however, claim that instrumental music in worship antedated the time of Moses, and, like the Sabbath, survived the Mosaic ceremonies with which it was for a time associated.

II. It is urged that certain appointments made by God, even in the more rigid dispensation of the Old Testament, were left in a large degree to the discretion or option of his people to be observed or not. This is put forward for the purpose of repelling the very natural objection, that the argument for the preceptive theory cannot avail in behalf of the permissive doctrine. It is tacitly assumed, rather than formally maintained, that in some way what seems to have been once commanded and obligatory in the musical department, is now optional, taking rank in this respect with the ancient regulations in regard to freewill offerings.

III. It is furthermore argued by some that the command to sing, carries necessarily with it the license at least, to use all the appropriate means for the performance of that exercise, and that, as musical instruments are very useful as aids in the production of vocal music, no distinct appointment of them is needed, their utility being adequate evidence of their legitimacy. In connection with this line of argument, it is customary to allege that the use of instruments of music in worship, rests on the same authority as the use of a pitch-pipe or a note-book, and that those who allow the latter appliances to be used in connection with worship should not scruple to admit the former.

IV. It is asserted that the Church is vested with authority to decree rites, not expressly forbidden in Scripture, and must, therefore, at least, have the right to

declare lawful certain forms not prescribed in Scripture. Not all who plead for license as to the use of instrumental music, would use this argument, but many of them do, and they are all under a strong temptation to resort to it, as is shown by the fact that those among them, who by profession are strict Presbyterians, are found using arrows long supposed to belong only to the quiver of prelacy.

The foregoing are the main pleas employed by those who favor the theory of permission. It is not my purpose to furnish at this stage, a sketch of the arguments by which the prohibitory view may be supported. These will in the sequel be exhibited, partly in the refutation of the rival theories, and partly in a direct form.

PART SECOND.

The Competing Theories Considered.

CHAPTER I.

INQUIRY TOUCHING THE LAW OF WORSHIP.

Having presented the different theories as to the relation of instrumental music to worship in the present dispensation, and furnished a sketch of the main arguments available in behalf of the imperative and optional theories, it is now in place to scrutinize those arguments, and show our reasons for rejecting the theories in support of which they are advanced, and accepting the theory of prohibition.

As there exist, however, different views in reference to the fundamental law of worship; as this diversity of views contributes to the shaping of the conclusions reached in regard to the legitimacy of the instrumental service, and as this divergence of opinion must be continually recurring and confronting us as we proceed in the discussion, I will devote a few pages at this stage of our investigation to the consideration of this question. What is the fundamental principle or law for the regulation of worship? As to the law which should regulate the mode of worship, there are at least four distinguishable views, which are as follows:

I. The Romish. This is to the effect that the Church, which now means virtually the Pope, has authority to prescribe modes of worship, subject only to this limitation, that none be enjoined which is forbidden in either the Scriptures, or the patristic traditions in the custody of the Church. Forms and ceremonies decreed in this spirit are held to be binding upon the conscience.

II. The Anglican. The tenor of this view, is that the Church, guided by the general principle, "Let all things be done decently and in order," may decree rites and ceremonies additional, though not contrary to the express or plainly implied enactments of Scripture, and that forms so decreed are authoritative over the conscience. The only appreciable difference between this and the Romish view, is that this recognizes the Scriptures alone as the limiting standard, whereas by the Romanist, the traditions of the Church are put on a level with the Scriptures,

as a standard of faith and practice; while, besides, he regards certain apocryphal writings as included in the Scriptures.

III. The Lutheran, or Compromise view. The substance of this view is that the Church may adopt certain rites and forms of worship which have not been appointed in the word of God, provided that no one who is conscientiously opposed to them shall be forced to compliance, or be subjected to censure for his non-conformity. This position was taken by some of the earlier Puritans in England, who were not disposed to protest seriously against some ornamental additions to the Scriptural forms of worship, but were averse to compulsion in the matter, and disinclined to say that they felt bound in conscience to compliance. In course of time the Puritans reached clearer views and firmer footing; the doctrine about to be announced having gained acceptance with them.

IV. The Westminster, or Radical view. The essence of this doctrine is that no form of worship is admissible without divine appointment, and that every form so appointed, is carefully to be observed according to prescription.

I have called this the "Westminster" view, because it is the law of worship recognized expressly in the formularies drawn up by the famous "Assembly of Divines" convened at Westminster Abbey, London, in the seventeenth century.

The doctrine in question, however, was not broached first by that Assembly. It was the doctrine of Calvin, of most of the Reformed Churches of the Continent, and of the Church of Scotland, and had been acted upon by them before the sitting of the Westminster Assembly.

That the Westminster Confession and Catechisms teach the view just stated needs, perhaps, to be proved, inasmuch as many who profess adherence to them, and are recognized as authoritative expounders of them, appear to write and act as if no such principle had been enunciated in those documents. Some attention, will, therefore, be bestowed upon this point.

In Chapter I, Section 6, of the Confession of Faith, occur these words:—"The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory and man's salvation, faith and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture; unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the spirit or traditions of men."

Again, in Chapter XXI, Section 1, the following declaration is made:—"But the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by himself, and so limited by his own revealed will, that he may not be worshipped according to the imaginations or devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representation, or any other way not prescribed in the holy Scripture."

Turning to the Larger Catechism, the same doctrine we find expressed in the answers to questions 108 and 109. In answer to the former question, which is, "What duties are required in the second commandment?" it is said, "The duties required in the second commandment, are the receiving, observing and keeping pure and entire all such religious worship and ordinances as God has instituted in his word." To question 109, which is, "What are the sins forbidden in the

second commandment?" the reply is given, "The sins forbidden in the second commandment are all devising, counselling, commanding, using, and any wise approving any religious worship not instituted by God himself; * * * * * all superstitious devices, corrupting the worship of God, adding to it or taking from it, whether invented or taken up by ourselves, or received by tradition from others, though under the title of antiquity, custom, devotion, good intent, or any other pretense whatsoever; simony, sacrilege; all neglect, contempt, hindering and opposing the worship and ordinances which God hath appointed."

The Shorter Catechism gives forth a similar sound; for in answer to question 50, "What is required in the second commandment?" it is said, "The second commandment requireth the receiving, observing, and keeping pure and entire all such religious worship and ordinances as God hath appointed in his word;" while to question 51, "What is forbidden in the second commandment?" the answer rendered, is, "The second commandment forbiddeth the worshipping of God by images, or any other way not appointed in his word."

These statements are so precise and clear that to mistake their meaning would seem well nigh impossible, and that meaning is that every part and form of lawful worship is appointed by God, and that whatever lacks this appointment is forbidden.

CHAPTER II.

CONSIDERATIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE RADICAL DOCTRINE AS TO THE LAW OF WORSHIP.

The Radical view of the law of worship may be successfully vindicated, both directly from the word of God, and indirectly from the consequences which logically flow from any of the rival views.

We start with this general principle, that in Old Testament times, the lawful mode of worshipping God was instituted by himself. It was not left to the ingenuity of men to devise ceremonies of religion, but the mode of worship was prescribed, and that even in minute details by God himself. Into the vexed question about the origin of sacrifice it may be prudent not to enter; but this may be said, that several considerations, among which one is the analogy of God's procedure in later times in regard to his worship, justify the belief that the rite of sacrifice originated in a divine appointment.

In the preparation of the tabernacle and its furniture, how frequently was Moses charged to make them according to the pattern shown to him in the Mount! In the Mosaic arrangements, the vestments of the priests, the various kinds of offerings, the ceremonies to be observed in offering, and the sacred seasons, were all particularly prescribed by God himself. Nor was deviation from the appointed ritual admissible in that economy, unless in cases in which the same supreme authority who had instituted the ordinances, was pleased to relax them. In every case of lawful deviation we may not find an express statement to the effect that God himself had authorized the departure, but elsewhere in similar cases this is made abundantly clear. Changes not thus sanctioned were reckoned illicit. In

other words, the authority of God was counted necessary to warrant any alterations in the instituted forms of worship. In illustration of this, and in proof of it, I might refer to the law for the observance of the Passover. It was commanded by God that this ordinance should be observed on the fourteenth day of the first month. But it was found that some of the people were, by reason of ceremonial defilement, disqualified for a legal participation of the Passover at the prescribed time; whereupon those concerned appealed to Moses for some relaxation of the law in their case. There were two ways in which the relief sought might have been granted, namely, either by waiving the requirement, that the partakers of the Passover should be ceremonially clean, and allowing them to join in the feast, defiled as they were by the touch of a dead body, or by permitting them to observe the ordinance after they had purified themselves, although at a later than the regular time. High in position as Moses was, he did not feel at liberty to afford to those men relief in either way, until he had consulted God and obtained divine direction. "Stand still," said he, "and I will hear what the Lord will command concerning you." Numb. 9 : 8.

Now let it be noted, that in enjoining the observance of the Passover, God had not expressly forbidden the Israelites to keep it in any other month than the first. He had simply said, "In the fourteenth day of the first month, ye shall keep it." But Moses understood, and God administered to him no rebuke for such understanding, that the positive prescription amounted to a prohibition of any change in the law, till he who had ordained, should signify that a change might be made. And coming down to a later time, we find it mentioned as one of the sins of Jeroboam, that he presumed to appoint a feast for his people on the fifteenth day of the eighth month, in imitation, it would seem, of the feast of tabernacles, which God had commanded the Israelites to observe on the fifteenth day of the seventh month. Mark how the sacred writer emphasizes the presumption of Jeroboam, (1 Kings, 12 : 33):—"So he offered on the altar which he had made in Bethel, the fifteenth day of the eighth month, even in the month which he had devised of his own heart; and ordained a feast unto the children of Israel." If any of his people were bold enough to remonstrate with him on the adoption of the eighth, in room of the seventh month, Jeroboam may have replied in the strain of his modern imitators, that God had not forbidden the observance in the eighth month, and therefore that the change was allowable, the substance of the ordinance being still the same. But the inspired writer stigmatizes him for devising "of his own heart" another time for the feast than had originally been prescribed.

In like manner we have in the family of Aaron, and that also during his lifetime, a memorable proof that a positive appointment by God in a matter of worship, amounts to a prohibition of any departure from it. Nadab and Abihu, as we learn from Leviticus, 10 : 1, 2, were smitten dead for presuming to offer strange fire before the Lord, which he had not commanded. In this passage, our excellent English version is not as free from ambiguity as the original. The clause, "Which the Lord commanded them not," which stands in our version, might be deemed elliptical and as equivalent to this, "Which the Lord commanded them

not to do," that is, which he forbade them to do. But in the Hebrew, the adverb translated, "not," is placed before the verb rendered, "commanded;" so that the exact translation is, "Which the Lord did not command them," that is, to do which, he had given them no direction.

Those young men may have erred in different respects, but the point in their conduct which the spirit of God has seen fit to single out for explicit condemnation, is their presumption in taking fire, which the Lord had not commanded, where-with to burn incense before him. We know from Lev. 16 : 12, and Numb. 16 : 46, that it was enjoined by God, that the fire for the burning of incense was to be taken from the altar of burnt offering, and it can hardly be doubted, that the same law was in force at the time when Nadab and Abihu were cut off. There is certainly no evidence that God had forbidden expressly the use of any other fire for the end in question. In some way he, no doubt, had signified his mind that fire from the altar should be employed in this service, and in not conforming to this indication, the sons of Aaron sinned. They offered "strange" fire, an expression which is explained in the subjoined clause, to mean fire which the Lord had not commanded. What had not been prescribed was "strange" and unlawful. To merit the epithet, "strange," it did not need to be fire expressly forbidden, but simply fire not appointed for the end in view.

Should any one take the ground that God had not yet signified with what fire incense should be burned, our argument would be in no degree weakened, for on that supposition, it would appear that those young men sinned in venturing to use fire at all, without a divine command or warrant. On the supposition that no direction had been given, they could not be charged with violating any express law. The only way in which, on this assumption, they can have erred, was in their acting in the matter at all without a direction.

But if, as I suppose, a certain mode of procedure in the offering of incense had been indicated by God, the sons of Aaron were guilty because they used any other kind of fire than that which had been appointed. The appointment of one kind was held to be a prohibition of every other not appointed.

Those young men may have been among the advanced thinkers of their day, the patrons of progress who chafed under the rigor of law, and fancied that a dash of liberalism would greatly improve the arrangements of the tabernacle; but the penalty of their presumption was instant death. A beacon was thus set up which sends its lurid light athwart the centuries, as a warning against all tampering with divine ordinances in the way of subtracting, supplementing, or supplanting by mere human authority. Beyond reasonable doubt, the spirit of Old Testament legislation in reference to worship is adverse to the principle that men may acceptably worship God in a way not prescribed by himself. This view is embodied in the words of Moses, speaking as the representative of God, Deut. 4 : 2, "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you." The same principle is inculcated in Deut. 12 : 32, "What thing soever I command you, observe to do it; thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it."

An evasion of the force of our argument has been attempted. The particularity, it is alleged, with which God laid down the rites and ceremonies of the ancient worship, was owing to the fact that the services prescribed were typical or symbolical; important doctrines in regard to the way of salvation being wrapped up and set forth in them; whereas, it is contended, that in the worship of the New Dispensation, there is not a like necessity for express directions, and for literal adherence to prescribed forms. This line of reasoning has been pursued by at least one professed adherent to the Westminster formularies.

In exposure of this evasion it may be observed, that certain parts of the worship of the Israelites were no more typical or ceremonial than ours is; that the law forbidding modifications of the divine ritual applied equally to all parts of the worship of the Israelites, as appears from the texts last quoted, Deut. 4 : 2; 12 : 32; that the evasion under criticism rests on a very precarious assumption, namely, that the didactic is more important than the directly devotional element of worship. But the second commandment, which relates to the mode of worship, makes no special reference to the doctrines of grace, while it stringently forbids the worshipping of God in certain ways specified and suggested. Nor is there a single hint given in that precept, or elsewhere in the Old Testament, to the effect that while the Israelites must adhere closely to prescription in all the typical services enjoined, they might in other departments of worship, as for instance in prayer, take greater liberty and introduce devices of their own. The comprehensive charge embodied in texts already cited, covers no less the permanent, than the typical and transient forms of worship.

CHAPTER III.

FURTHER CONFIRMATION OF THE RADICAL VIEW AS TO THE LAW OF WORSHIP.

It is very extensively asserted that the rigorous law of worship which manifestly pervaded the Mosaic dispensation is relaxed in the New Testament, so as to permit devices of men to be introduced into worship, provided these do not conflict with any express command of God. In a certain sense we might admit this principle, for it is our belief that there is an express mandate God never repealed, but much confirmed in the New Testament, forbidding us to worship him in any way not appointed in his word; but in the sense attached to the words by those who put forward this view, I reject it utterly. That sense is, that we may adopt rites and forms in worship which God has not appointed, provided only that he has not in definite terms forbidden them. For instance, he has nowhere specifically forbidden the use of the sign of the cross in baptism, and, therefore, according to this principle, this sign, if deemed for edification, may be lawfully used in the baptismal service. And all those intimations found in the New Testament of the burdensome character of the ancient ritual, and of the liberty which marks the present dispensation, are supposed to be proofs of the abolition of the restriction which it has been shown was laid upon the worshippers of the former dispensation. Several strictures may be made on this notion, some of which I proceed to offer.

I. We have neither occasion or disposition to deny that the worship of the New Testament is comparatively simple, and gloriously free from the minute exactions and prescriptions which formed so visible a feature of the worship of the legal economy.

II. Yet the Old Testament yoke of bondage did not consist in the restriction of the Israelites to forms of divine appointment, but in the multiplicity and somewhat perplexing and galling nature of those divinely appointed forms. To be limited in our worship to the use of certain forms, so far from being necessarily a yoke, may be the truest freedom. Law and liberty are not incompatible. On the contrary, so far as mere creatures are concerned, there is no true liberty apart from law, and surely God can make laws for his creatures which shall be the very reverse of intolerable impositions.

The principle is to be spurned that it is a form of thralldom to be restricted in our worship of God to methods prescribed by himself. Nay, to a conscientious worshipper, it is a great relief to be so limited; for, in some respects, liberty is more trying than law. It is not law, but the quality of the law which can make a slave. To assume, as is so constantly done, that limitation in worship to divinely appointed modes, must be a yoke of a galling sort, is unwarranted by either Scripture or reason. For in some way God is to be worshipped, and who can be bold enough to question his ability to prescribe forms of worship that are more suitable to his dignity and our condition than any we could devise ourselves, or venture to maintain that to be restricted in worship to the prescriptions of Jehovah, is in itself a grievance?

III. The greater freedom of the present dispensation, so far as worship is concerned, lies not in the abrogation of the fundamental principle that God must be worshipped according to his own prescription, for that, we hold, is still in force, but in the abolition of many cumbersome forms and minute regulations, which for a time had a use, and the prescription instead of a simpler and less carnal ritual.

IV. So far, however, as God has signified the way in which he would now be worshipped, we are as truly bound to adhere to this as were the Israelites to observe with care the enactments of the Mosaic economy. The ritual is simpler, it is true, but it is not, therefore, less binding. Authority to add to it or take from it we have not, any more than had the Israelites in respect to the forms of their worship. The Apostolic Church was required to observe the ordinances as these were given by the Head of the Church. The Apostle Paul lays down the order for the observance of the Lord's Supper, as it was meant to be observed in the precise form indicated. In relation, also, to Church government, there was a fixed plan to be pursued in all the Churches. Paul concludes a warning against certain innovations in Church order, with the suggestive remark; "We have no such custom, neither the Churches of God" (1 Cor. 11:16); no countenance being given to the notion that each Church might make its own customs.

All this, besides, is but the carrying out into practical detail the mind of Christ himself, who upbraided the Scribes and Pharisees in these terms, Matt. 15:9,

"But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." See also his utterances as recorded in Mark 7:7-13. His sayings as reported in the passages indicated, are of signal importance in their bearing upon the point under discussion, and therefore a few remarks on them may be in place here.

(1.) It must be noted that the occasion of the reproof administered by our Lord, was an inquiry by the Scribes and Pharisees as to the reasons why his disciples did not follow the tradition of the elders, in respect to the washing of hands before eating.

(2.) The custom, the neglect of which was counted censurable by the querists, was one which seemed very much in keeping with the dispensation then in force; for in it various ablutions, intended not so much to remove physical impurity, as to symbolize moral cleansing, and effect the removal of ceremonial pollution, had a place. Those who pled for some additions to the washings prescribed in the law, could plausibly argue that the proposed measures were not meant to supersede the legal ordinances, but rather to complete, protect and commend them, being of the same general import with them. They could urge that God had nowhere expressly forbidden the new expedients, and that, in a careless age, they might be of signal utility for preserving in the minds of men, a habitual sense of the authority of God, and of the difference between the clean and the unclean.

(3.) The reply of Christ to the inquirers, suggests at least two ideas, namely, First, That the admission of human devices in the worship of God is apt to result in the setting aside of the positive enactments of God, for our Lord says, "Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition," and, moreover, "Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition." This is well illustrated in the diminution of reverence for the Sabbath, which seems to attend the recognition of Christmas and Saints' days; Second, That in matters of worship the commandments or devices of men are inadmissible, being virtually treason against the Great King. This seems to be implied in the words, "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Here there is a sharp contrast made between the directions of men and those of God; regard for the former being represented as incompatible with due regard for the latter. So far as our worship is founded on mere human commands or counsels, it is a vain worship.

One zealous advocate of instrumental music, who moreover, professes loyalty to the Westminster standards, has ventured to make the suggestion that while it may not be lawful to teach "doctrines," as distinguished from practical duties, on mere human authority, it may be lawful to teach certain modes of worship on mere human authority. Such a suggestion betrays sheer ignorance both of English and of Greek. The Greek word rendered "doctrines" denotes teachings of whatever kind, whether in relation to principles of theology, or of morals or to modes of worship, and the word "doctrine" in its old Latin sense, had precisely the same meaning, although it has come to be used in a semi-technical sense, as denoting a principle, rather than a precept.

An argument of no small weight in favor of the Radical doctrine as to the law of worship, can be drawn from the consequences which legitimately flow from the practical application of the rival views. Once admit the principle which runs through those views, that we may on any pretense whatever, neglect or modify the prescriptions of God relative to his worship, and it is difficult to tell the issues to which, in course of time, that principle will conduct. The incense, mysterious bowings and genuflexions, the use of crosses and crucifixes, the sacred vestments, the lighting of candles in daylight, and numerous other symbolic additions, which Rome has made to the simple worship sanctioned in the New Testament, may easily be brought into the Church through the little aperture which the principle alluded to affords. But having devoted so much time already to the question as to the law of worship, I must now dismiss the subject.

CHAPTER IV.

THE PRECEPTIVE THEORY AS TO THE USE OF INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC—EXAMINATION OF THE AESTHETIC OR RATIONALISTIC PLEA FOR SAID THEORY.

As already stated, the use of instrumental music in divine worship is contended for by some on the ground, that, as we are not only permitted, but also bound to employ in the praise of God all the powers of our being, and as we are possessed of the musical faculty, it ought to be used to the utmost in praising God. And as we have a taste and aptitude for instrumental music, it is thought to be but a fair inference from the general principle aforementioned, that we should use such music, as well as vocal, in expressing homage to God. The effect, moreover, it is argued, of a skilful blending of the two kinds of music, is favorable to the spirit of devotion; a circumstance, it is urged, not to be lightly estimated in determining the question in hand.

In answer to this line of argument, it may be said, that in the statement of the general principle, that all our powers should be employed in the praise of God, there is an ambiguity from which, chiefly, the reasoning under consideration derives its plausibility. The ambiguity lies in the word, praise, which may be used in either a wide or a restricted sense. In its wider sense it denotes any way in which we may do honor to one, or declare our appreciation of his excellence. In its narrower sense, it signifies the formal, specific service of song in the way of worship or adoration. Now the principle that all our powers are to be employed in the praise of God is true, if the word, praise, is taken in the first sense indicated; untrue, if taken in the second. We are under obligation to consecrate all our resources of mind and body to the glory of God; but it does not follow that everything done by us to this end must be accounted a part of formal, express worship. The sculptor is to use his chisel, just as he is to eat and drink, to the glory of God, but I am not aware that statues and graven images are among the legitimate appliances of worship, or that the making of them is a service of definite and formal praise. If we buy, or sell, or till the ground, we are to do so to the glory of God; but buying and selling and tillage, are not parts of the formal wor-

ship of God. In formal praise, the direct as well as the ultimate object before the mind should be to glorify God. In all other exercises, even that of prayer, while the ultimate aim should be to glorify God, the direct, or immediate aim may be to promote our own advantage, or that of others.

Now, the aesthetic argument under notice derives any plausibility which pertains to it, chiefly from confounding the two meanings of the word, praise. In other words it is a sophism resting upon the ambiguity of this term. I am at liberty, and even under obligation to devote all my powers to the service and the honor of God; but it does not, therefore, appear that I either must, or may, worship him by any exertion of my faculties and use of my acquirements. In the matter of worship generally, and of praise in particular, our energies must be exercised, not at will, but according to the directions of God. The Second commandment forbids expressly the making of images, or likenesses in any way, as aids to devotion, or appliances of worship, and so lays a restriction, beyond doubt, on the use of our powers in the matter of worship.

It may be said, however, that in the former dispensation, God prescribed the use of the musical faculty in his worship, in respect both to voice and instruments; whereas he allowed no use of the faculty for painting or sculpture in his worship; and from this it may be inferred that music sustains a different relation to worship, from that sustained by the plastic, or the pictorial art.

To this it may be replied that the Second commandment, while specifying, by way of illustration, not of exhaustive enumeration, certain respects in which the exercise of human ingenuity and energy is to be prohibited in worship, embodies the general principle that in the worship of God, everything must be ordered by himself; non-appointment being tantamount to prohibition. This being assumed as correct, it follows that, unless in so far as it has been appointed by himself, music is unlawful in the worship of God. The fact that man has a musical faculty, does not prove that provision for the exercise of it in the department of worship shall be made, any more than the fact that he possesses a faculty for making statues and pictures, proves that provision shall be made for the use of these in that department. It may be that music is a less sensuous and more ethereal art than either sculpture or painting, and that the use of it is less likely to exert a materializing influence on our religion; yet in the sphere of worship, even music requires to be held within limits, for, constituted as we now are, it would seem that we are always in danger of losing the spiritual in the material.

I am persuaded that the general principle holds good in respect to men, as they are now in the world, that the fullest bodily, or sensuous enjoyment, is incompatible with the fullest spiritual enjoyment, or, in other words, that the more the senses are occupied and gratified, the less are the higher reflective powers of the soul engaged. In what proportion these two departments of activity and enjoyment must stand to each other, so that they shall be mutually helpful and enhancing, is a problem we can hardly solve, and still less express in any clear and definite formula. God, however, can solve what we cannot, and it behooves us to listen submissively to his solution, instead of being carried away with the current

clamor about the necessity of carrying aesthetics and culture into our worship. We cannot tell what uses God may yet have for the æsthetical element of our nature. Germs now within us, and which, perhaps, in our present sinful state need to be held in check, or, at least, cautiously drawn out, may, in another state of being, be safely and advantageously developed. The child at school cannot wisely be allowed to use its energies, and cultivate even its natural tastes at "its own sweet will." There may be need for temporary restraint, coercion and direction, in order that in the end the fruitage may be the richer. So may it be with us. In the present life, it may be of the utmost moment that in the sphere of worship, some of our tastes and powers should be held in entire or partial abeyance, in order that in the life to come, these restricted faculties may revel in the luxury of liberty. It may be that in another state of existence, the childish and infantile of our nature may be harmoniously blended with the sober and the mature. The element of our nature to which the Old Testament pomp of ritual was adapted, and which is comparatively overlooked in our New Testament forms, may in the future world be recognized and amply honored in perfect consistency with the highest spirituality.

If the theory is correct, that the intensification of sensuous enjoyment promotes proportionally spiritual apprehension and growth, is it not a wonder that the Apostles did not lay more stress than they seem to have done on the expedient of "praise meetings," on the effort to preach the gospel by singing it, or even on the careful cultivation of the art of singing? If, as we are now so vociferously told, fine music is of such vast importance for the promotion of piety in the Church, and for the conquest of the world, it is very remarkable that the New Testament contains so few hints on the whole subject. It does not appear that when the Apostle Paul went to Ephesus, or Philippi, or Corinth, he set himself to the task of organizing a well-trained choir, not to say orchestra, as if he deemed such an arrangement one of the most valuable, if not absolutely indispensable, appliances of evangelization. Nor do we find in all the New Testament, a single specific direction to cultivate music, even vocal music, as an art of signal value in the sphere of religion. The duty of employing music (I do not say instrumental) is clearly laid down; but not a single hint given as to the artistic execution of the service of song, unless it be the general injunction, "Let all things be done decently and in order." Ought not this consideration to abate greatly the present demand for fine music in worship, and the disposition to rely on music as a passport through which the gospel may gain access to the hearts of men? When we turn from the New Testament to the modern Church, we find ourselves, so far as the matter of music is concerned, in a widely different atmosphere. Not one direction is given by the Apostles, indicating the great importance of securing in public worship the finest singing, even when they write to churches situated in the great centres of Grecian refinement, where music and the kindred arts were enthusiastically cultivated; whereas a large measure of the time of modern Christians is taken up in the cultivation of the art of music for church use, while grave ecclesiastical assemblies and councils can hardly meet and part, without discussing and setting forth the

vast importance of music for the success of the church. Nay, such is the rage for music now, that men, professing to follow the model of the apostolic church, do not scruple to break the peace of churches, and to risk the rending of them asunder from zeal for the use of musical instruments. Who is so blind as not to perceive that in regard to this matter of music, the church of to-day is in startling contrast with the church as organized and regulated by the Apostles?

I am aware that in writing thus, I am likely to incur the charge of barbarism, or at least of being hopelessly destitute of good taste. But whatever might be the truth of that charge, nothing now advanced, justifies it. I have no objection to good music in the worship of God. I prefer it, and believe that professing Christians should seek to conduct the musical part of worship, in accordance with the general principles of good taste, provided always that the chief regard be had to the directions of Scripture and the spiritual aspect of the service. But whenever the church begins to lay great stress on the quality of her music, she has entered on the gulf stream of ritualism, and differs palpably in her tone from the church as moulded by the Apostles. Nay, more, she differs in the particular alluded to, from the church even of the Old Testament; for, although in the Old Testament church, specific arrangements were made in the time of David, for the use of music in the worship of God, you will search the Old Testament Scriptures in vain for any express directions enjoining a highly artistic execution of the music, even by the trained choir of the temple. But do we not read in Ps. 33 : 2, "Play skilfully with a loud noise?" Yes, we so read in our version, and the words do not fail to be quoted in season and out of season, in enforcement of the importance of having artistic music in church. It may be observed, however, that it is quoted so often, partly for the reason that there is no other text that can be quoted, from the whole range of the Scriptures that seems so clearly to inculcate the duty of making the music of worship tasteful, if not elaborate. Granting that this sentence bears the meaning put upon it by those who are so fond of quoting it, we must still express surprise, if exquisite music is really so important a proof and help of devotion, that there should hardly be a text in the bible except this to tell us so. Of course one text clearly inculcating any matter is as good as a thousand; and yet we cannot help feeling that what is taught expressly in but one text, or even in a few texts, is not as important as that which is made prominent in many texts. Moreover, it is very questionable whether, or not, the words in the case before us fairly represent the Hebrew original. Admitting for the present the propriety of the rendering "play," I would state that the literal translation of the sentence is, "Make good to play with a loud noise," which means not so much to play with exquisite art, as to play with such energy as to express an exultant state of mind. It is heart, rather than art, in playing that is here inculcated.

However it may be with us in another life, I believe that in the present life, the sensuous element in worship needs to be subdued in character. There may be a species of mock devotion produced and fostered by appeals to the æsthetic department of our nature; but genuine devotion, it is our belief, will be more promoted when sensuous gratification is sought and afforded in only a very restricted degree.

Were it otherwise, the silence of the Apostles in regard to the subject of musical culture as a means of grace, and an expedient for spreading the gospel, would be unaccountable. The great law formulated by Sir William Hamilton, that perception and feeling are to each other in an inverse ratio, admits of an application to the case in hand. God knows, as we do not, in what proportion the sensuous element is to have place in the exercises of worship, and it is wise for us to seek counsel in this matter at the lively oracles, rather than at the lips of the devotees of art.

CHAPTER V.

THE PRECEPTIVE THEORY—FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF THE AESTHETIC ARGUMENT.

The questions may be asked, "Does not Christianity tend to the harmonious development and exaltation of all the original powers of our being? And must it not, therefore, tend to the cultivation and gratification of artistic tastes?" I readily grant that the true tendency of Christianity, is toward the development and elevation of our common humanity, both in respect to the body and to the soul; and that as there is in us an aesthetic faculty, Christianity must have a favorable bearing upon it. Without Christianity, certain departments of our nature may have a vigorous development, even a development outstripping that exhibited under Christian influences. The Pagan Greeks, for instance, have never been excelled, perhaps never equalled, in certain arts, especially sculpture; but this excellence was accompanied with deficiency in other departments of our complex being, particularly in that of morals. It is a suggestive fact, that the first striking advances in the ornamental, and even the useful arts, were made in the line of Cain's posterity; but those leaders in the department of art, fell far behind in the vastly more important matter of morals. No false religion promotes a symmetrical culture or development, of all the susceptibilities and faculties of our nature. It pertains to Christianity to do this. It promotes holiness, and holiness is wholeness, or the harmonious completeness of a moral agent.

But to infer from all this that provision must be made in the sphere of worship, for the exercise and development of all our powers is unwarrantable. While the true religion, by conducing to the general development of our nature, may lead ultimately to generous culture and great perfection in art, it by no means follows that scope for this culture and display will be afforded in the modes of worship which God appoints. The house of worship is not a physical gymnasium. Why should it be an academy of arts? The worship of God does not afford much field for the exercise and exhibition of man's skill in the mechanical arts, say in the construction of a steam engine, and is there any reason why the fine arts, as they are called, any more than the mechanical arts, should find scope for their exercise in the fullest degree in the worship of God? It is quite certain that within the sphere of worship God has restricted art in certain particulars. To see that he has done so, we have only to read the Second commandment, which bears on the face of it a prohibition of the making of images and likenesses for religious ends. Is the religion of the bible, therefore, hostile to art, because it lays this embargo on

the exercise of it in at least one direction? Now, may it not be that in the musical department, restrictions have been set by God, and that in profound wisdom? May it not be that the use of musical instruments, once sanctioned by him, is now interdicted, just as the use of many other things agreeable to the senses, once allowed, is now forbidden? Nay, even those who contend most for art in worship, will hardly take the ground, that even vocal praise shall be of the most involved and elaborate sort. Is it not felt that the music of the sanctuary should be simple, not complex, plain, not florid? Thus in worship there is, according to the judgment of even enthusiasts for art, restriction imposed. May not this prepare for admitting that God may have seen it wise to exclude from New Testament worship instrumental music altogether? It does not prove that he has; but it may suffice to show that there would be nothing in it contrary to analogy if he should.

The questions, however, will be urged, "Did not God assign a place to instrumental music in the ritual of the Old Testament Church? And, if so, can it be supposed that such music is unfavorable to spirituality?" I answer that the appointments of God are wisely adapted to the ends in view, and the circumstances in which they are made. But this implies that a change of circumstances may necessitate a corresponding change of measures. Toys may serve not only to entertain, but also in some respects to educate little children; but when a certain stage of development is reached, the process of education may be better conducted without the expedient of toys. When that stage is reached, the childish things are to be put away; for, so far from being helps, they would now be hindrances. Now in the training of our race, God seems to have pursued a plan analogous to that which finds place in the training of children. Weighty truths were presented pictorially in the way of symbols and types. The bodily senses were addressed in a more palpable and material way than is the case in the New Testament dispensation. Faith was produced and fostered not so exclusively by hearing as it is now, but also by other senses, in a large degree. The gospel facts were presented in spectacular form to the eyes of ancient worshippers, especially in the sacrificial service. It is true, before the time of Moses, the symbolism employed in religion was simple and scanty, compared with that involved in the elaborate ritual of the Levitical economy, and it may be thought that the method of education pursued with children, was in this case invented; the toys being multiplied as the age of maturity was approached. But even in this respect the analogy does not fail, for is it not found that while a very little child may be entertained and benefited by a very few toys, the more advanced child demands a greater variety? At the time when the Levitical system was established, the nations of the earth had become well compacted and organized, and the forms of their respective religions had become, or were becoming, elaborated. Possibly, as a counteractive measure in part, God, in the arrangements which he made for his chosen people, provided a ritual of an imposing and complicated sort, adapted to exhibit and enforce the truth respecting salvation, and to do this in a form so sensuous as might well have neutralized the influence of Pagan rites prevalent in adjoining lands. To

the Israelites he gave forms of worship fitted to instruct them, to break their stubborn wills, and to gratify the strong taste for the outward and sensuous, so sedulously consulted in the idolatrous practices of surrounding nations. Account for it, however, as we may, it is a fact that in the Old Dispensation, the worship partook of a show and sensuousness which hardly any, not even Romanists, will say would be warrantable now. That mode of worship, no doubt, was, in the main, more conducive to the various ends which God meant to accomplish by it, than would have been a simpler mode; but the circumstances being changed, the simpler mode may be that which wisdom demands. Hence, although instrumental music may have served an important purpose in the comparatively sensuous and symbolic worship prescribed to the Israelites, it does not follow that it is either requisite or desirable, in the New Dispensation, in which symbolism has but little place.

That the analogy which I have been tracing between the mode of training a child and that of training the church, is not a mere fancy, is apparent from the language of Paul in Gal. 4: 1-3, in which the church of the Old Testament is represented as a child under age, and as being held in bondage under the rudiments or elements of the world, called, also, in v. 9, "weak and beggarly elements;" while the church of the New Testament is described as enjoying in comparison the dignified position of a son who has attained his majority. Those "beggarly elements" were, for a time, valuable means for the education and protection of the church, and if instrumental music was one of these, as I believe it was, it, no doubt, was in some way fitted to subserve, in the circumstances the interests of religion. But a change of circumstances having come with the atoning death of the Saviour, this music, like other "beggarly" rudiments, might be dispensed with to advantage. The rite of sacrifice was at one time of signal use as a type of Christ and his work of atonement, and, left to ourselves, we might conceive that it could still be carefully employed to give a vivid symbolic representation of the great facts of redemption; yet we may feel quite sure, from the arrangements God has made, that it would not be advantageous in the present dispensation. The abolition of sacrifice is represented as a boon, not a loss, to the New Testament Church. And as bloody sacrifices, once of much religious utility, have been wisely abolished, may it not be so in relation to instrumental music? I am not proving, be it observed, that this music, as an element of worship, has been abolished; but only that it would be nothing wonderful if it had, for though once useful, it might now be deleterious.

The cavil may be raised, that there are many people now as puerile in their conceptions and tastes, as were the Israelites in the time of Moses, and the age of the Levitical ceremonies, and, besides, that there are now those who are children in years, for whom a sensuous system of worship is as desirable and requisite as it was for the Israelites. Ought not, then, instrumental music be as useful for worship now, as it ever was, so far as the classes specified are concerned?

I do not deny the facts on which this cavil rests, but I deny the inference drawn from them. It is conceded that there are the young, the imaginative and

the ignorant now, as in past times; but it cannot be supposed by any one who credits the bible, that under the new economy, God has provided for their case in the same way in which he did for the Israelites in their minority. If the argument is good for any thing, it would prove that a ritual, different it may be from that of the Levites, but equalling it in sensuousness and pomp, must have been authorized by God for the New Testament age. But can any one with the New Testament in his hands, reasonably suppose this to be true? Popery, indeed, has acted on the principle that Christianity is to be expressed and extended by sensuous splendor and ceremonial pomp, but Popery is not Christianity. There can be nothing more clearly proved from the bible than this, that the forms of worship established in the church by the Apostles were simple, plain and devoid of show, and thus in striking contrast with the pomp and ceremony of the previous dispensation. Why God has adopted this plan of procedure, we may not be able to tell, but that he has adopted it is amply manifest from the New Testament.

Thus, then, an answer to the cavil under notice is provided, and it is this, that however it may be accounted for, the imposing method of worship prescribed to the Israelites has not been authorized in the New Testament church, notwithstanding the fact that many in it and around it are children in years, and many children in understanding, if not in years. And if in face of the fact that there are many still who might be attracted by showy forms of worship, God has certainly established simple forms instead, may it not be, may it not rather probable, that among the sensuous forms eliminated from his worship is that of instrumental music?

In handling the æsthetic argument for instruments I have not discussed the question whether or not instrumental music is really helpful to congregational singing. There are competent judges who hold that in the interest of vocal music, a restraint ought to be laid on the use of instruments. It is commonly conceded that the human voice is the most excellent of all instruments of music. Is it possible that this most excellent of instruments is incapable without an accompaniment of producing the finest effects? Besides, it will hardly be denied, that the main musical element in divine worship is the vocal. Even as a matter of taste, would it not be preferable that the voice exerted in singing should be heard unmingled with the comparatively inferior tones of an inanimate instrument? Is it not a fact that the music of an organ, which is commonly reckoned by eminence the ecclesiastical instrument, serves the purpose of concealing or masking the false tones of the singers? The consequence of its use, often is that a faulty style of singing is indulged, and thus that the singing of a congregation, so far from being improved, is really injured. It is questionable whether any congregation that sings as a congregation, makes better music with an organ than without it. True, it may be found that congregations using organs, or other instruments, sing well, and even eclipse in this respect congregations that use no instruments; but this does not prove that the instruments make the difference. Other causes may be at work. The congregation using the organ may be composed in a large measure of wealthy people who bestow large attention on vocal culture, and thus

may outstrip in singing a poorer congregation that uses no organ; but the use of the organ does not make the difference. In a large number of congregations where instruments are used, the congregation does not sing. Only a few, perhaps only the members of the choir sing, and the performance may be very enchanting, but it is not what the Scriptures call for, congregational singing. It is well known that in the Greek church, instrumental music in worship is not allowed, and yet it is asserted by competent authority that the singing in some of the churches of St. Petersburg is unequalled in the world. Important is the testimony borne by one who presumably is well fitted to judge, the precentor, or leader of the singing in Regent Square Church, London:—"The organ," says he, "is not necessary to the harmony in modern psalmody; it is musically wrong as a leader of praise; it does not prevent flattening; it does not correct errors—it simply drowns them; it is more a fashion than anything else; it is not to be preferred to other instruments, none of which are desirable in public worship."

The considerations which have been presented may serve to show that the æsthetical argument for the use of instrumental music in worship is destitute of force. And yet feeble as it appears when closely looked at, not a few are influenced by it to such a degree, that they assume at once that no arguments can be valid, which would seem to prove that God has laid an interdiction on the employment of our musical powers in the production of instrumental music in his worship. The removal of this preconception and prejudice at the very threshold of our discussion will facilitate future progress.

CHAPTER VI.

THE PRECEPTIVE THEORY—THE ARGUMENTS DRAWN FROM ANCIENT APPOINTMENT AND ALLEGED NON-REPEAL CONSIDERED.

Having disposed of the plea which has been styled, "The æsthetical plea," in favor of the theory that musical instruments ought to be employed now in worship, I now advance to the refutation of various arguments more directly founded on Scripture, which are put forward on the same side.

FIRST. It is urged that as God did in ancient times prescribe the use of instrumental music in his worship, there can be nothing intrinsically sinful in such use.

In answer to this argument it may be said:

(1.) The fact alleged that God appointed during Old Testament times the use of musical instruments in his worship is admitted.

(2.) The inference that there is nothing intrinsically sinful in such use is also conceded to be valid.

(3.) These concessions, however, do not warrant the conclusion that it is imperative, or even lawful, to employ instrumental music in worship now. There are many things not in themselves sinful which God never appointed, nay, which he forbade to be used in worship whether, under the Old Testament economy or the New, and there are many things which he appointed to be observed in exercises

of worship under the former dispensation which are no longer lawful. The fact that a thing is not in itself wrong, is no proof that it may be used in worship. Before concluding that instrumental music is lawful in worship now, because it was once so used by divine appointment, we must determine the question whether or not the appointment which he made was meant to apply to our time and circumstances. The mere appointment proves nothing more than this, that instrumental music is not in itself sinful, and that it would be a duty to use such music now in worship, if the divine prescription was meant to extend to New Testament times. That it was, however, so meant, I deny.

SECOND. It is further urged in support of the Preceptive theory that the appointment to use instruments of music in praising has never been repealed, and that, therefore, it must still be in force.

This is probably the argument which weighs most with those who, adhering to the Scriptures as the sole rule of faith, contend for the use of musical instruments in worship; and, therefore, proportionate attention must be bestowed upon it. That it is not as powerful, as it is plausible, the following considerations, it is hoped, will show.

1. There are various ways in which the repeal of a statute may be effected, or indicated. The enactment may contain a clause of self-limitation, declaring that at a certain date, or in certain specified circumstances it shall be null and void. There may be an express repeal of the statute by competent authority. The statute may be part and parcel of a system of law which, on sufficient grounds, is known to be no longer in force; or it may be ignored in subsequent legislation in which the recognition of it might have been expected had it been meant to continue authoritative.

Now, while the opponents of instrumental music in worship do not claim that the law prescribing it is to be deemed defunct by self-limitation, or by express repeal, they may justly claim that the appointment in question has ceased to bind, inasmuch as it formed part of a general system of worship now annulled, and, besides, was not sanctioned either by precept, or authoritative example in the setting up of the new system of worship by which the former system was superseded. If every ordinance of the Old Testament must be still in force, unless it can be shown to have passed away by self-limitation, or express repeal, then the observance of the Seventh day Sabbath, the use of incense, the employment of lighted lamps as religious symbols, are still binding.

2. There are satisfactory grounds for the belief that the use of instrumental music in worship was enjoined as a part simply of the transient ceremonial system of the Israelites. Those grounds will now be presented in detail.

(1.) Such music is in keeping with the sensuousness and carnality of the ceremonial system.

In ascribing sensuousness and carnality to the ceremonial system, I would not be understood to stigmatize it as sinful, or as conducive to sin, but merely to indicate that it was characterized by rites peculiarly adapted to strike the senses. The gospel was under the Old economy, in a far greater degree than under

the New, exhibited and enforced by means of outward rites or "sensible signs." Symbols and types appealing to the senses abounded in the worship of the ancients, whereas in the New Testament church there are, it is our belief, but two symbolic ordinances, and these exceedingly simple, namely, baptism and the Lord's Supper. It was altogether in consonance with the sensuous character of Old Testament worship, especially in its fully developed stage that instrumental music should be a feature of it. Musical instruments accorded with the externality and pomp which marked the temple service peculiarly, and with which the simple forms of New Testament worship are in such signal contrast. In the sacraments of the New Testament there are employed material elements distinct from our bodies and external to them, but this is a feature absent from all the other ordinances of New Testament worship, unless instrumental music be reckoned among those ordinances. For the observance of the sacraments, we have clear, explicit authority in the New Testament, else we might have deemed them incompatible with the general spirit and tenor of the present dispensation; but no one will be bold enough to say that for the use of instrumental music in New Testament worship, we have equally clear authority. Yet the more sensuous, and therefore, the more allied to the prevailing spirit of Old Testament worship any observance is, the more does it need positive sanction before being accepted as an ordinance of New Testament worship.

But it is contended, on the other side, that the human voice is essentially as outward, and sensuous and carnal as an instrument of music; that the vocal organs are as external to the soul as a harp, or an organ. This is a favorite way of attempting to neutralize the argument against instrumental music founded on its sensuous character. But not thus can our argument be successfully parried; for who can venture the assertion that it is as directly natural to a man to use an instrument as to use his voice in praising God? There is a sense, indeed, in which the vocal organs are as external to the soul as are ordinary musical instruments, and in which the use of the former in worship no more proves the real spirituality of the service than does the use of the latter; but then there is a bond between the voice and the soul of him who uses it, which does not subsist between the soul and an instrument of music. The vocal organs are, what no mere instrument is, a part of the man, being bound up in the personality of which the soul is the centre. In all ages and circumstances men have used their voices in the worship of God. To pray, not mentally merely, but vocally, is a spontaneous impulse of all suppliants, and although the service of song does not appear to have existed as a part of stated worship before the time of David, yet it is so nearly related to prayer as to share in this characteristic of spontaneity and natural impulse. For the production of vocal music God has directly furnished the appropriate apparatus. For the production of instrumental music, mechanical contrivance must be superadded to all the natural endowments of man. Ingenuity in construction must be exerted in greater or less degree, before instrumental music can be obtained. While it must be admitted that there are principles in the human mind which enable and prompt men to use appliances for the production of instrumental music, it must not be

overlooked that for the production of vocal music, God has furnished man directly with all the requisite organs. Hence it may truthfully be said that while vocal music is natural, instrumental music is artificial, and that the latter is more external and sensuous than the former. Accordingly, we maintain that, in its own nature, the music of instruments is more allied to a dispensation of outward rites and ceremonies, than to one in which these are comparatively few and unimposing. Confirmatory of this view is the fact that even in Old Testament times, the vocal element of praise was held superior to the instrumental element; for, while there could be suitable praise rendered to God without the aid of instruments, as is apparent from the method of procedure at the observance of the Passover, and the institution of the Supper by Christ; there could be no rational praise rendered audibly to God without the voice, and the utterance of sentiments in words. In no age and by no denomination has it been held that appropriate formal praise could be rendered to God by the use of musical instruments apart from the use of the human voice, while many have held, and many now hold, that praise may and should be rendered with the voice alone. But this fact indicates that, in the consciousness of the Church, the voice is felt to be the chief instrument of praise, and that the music of instruments is comparatively external and unimportant in its character.

CHAPTER VII.

THE PRECEPTIVE THEORY—FURTHER PROOF THAT INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC WAS CEREMONIAL.

(2.) Another ground for regarding the use of instrumental music in worship as a part of the temporary ceremonial system is the peculiarly close relation which the instrumental service bore to the ritual routine of the tabernacle and the temple.

So far as we have evidence, instrumental music as a part of worship was confined to the tabernacle, and its successor, the temple, and was produced by none, ordinarily, but the members of the tribe of Levi, the peculiarly typical tribe. It may be urged in opposition to this statement that the first instance in which we read of the use of instruments in a religious spirit, is in the record contained in Ex. 15 : 20, 21, of the conduct of Miriam and other Israelitish women after the passage of the Red Sea.

In this case no mention, it must be admitted, is made of sacrifice; but on the other hand it is not clear that the instrumental exercise described was meant to be a part of formal worship. It was not till the close of the majestic song by Moses and the men of Israel, which was unmingled with any instrumental music, that Miriam and the other women went forth in triumphal fashion "with timbrels and with dances." The song of the men, it is expressly said in v. 1, was addressed to the Lord, and each one of them employed the words, "I will sing unto the Lord." On the other hand, the song of the women, while doubtless pervaded by a deep spirit of religious fervor, was not addressed directly to the Lord, but formed a response to the sublime ode which had been sung by the men and an echo of it;

for it is said (v. 21): "And Miriam answered them, Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously," etc. The words translated "them" and "sing ye," are masculine, a fact which shows that Miriam addressed neither the Lord, nor the women who were in her train, but the host of men whose deep-toned notes had just died away. This, then, is not an instance of the use of instrumental music in worship proper, and, therefore, militates not against the assertion that a strikingly close relation subsisted between sacrifice and instrumental music.

At a later date, when the Mosaic economy was established, it deserves notice that while no provision was made for the service of song in the worship of the tabernacle, there were two trumpets made by divine direction for the use of the priests, and of them alone, as we learn from Numb. 10: 1-10. It may here be noted, that in Hebrew Scriptures there are four words rendered equally "trumpet" in our version, namely, the words, "chatzotzerah," "shophar," "yovel," and "takoa;" but as each of the last two occurs but once in the Old Testament and, besides, do not concern us in our present discussion, our attention will be restricted to the first two. Of these the first is commonly believed to mean a straight, the second, a crooked trumpet. In connection with the worship of God, the former, that is the chatzotzerah, might be used by none but the priests. It does not appear that before the time of David, these priestly trumpets were employed in producing music proper; but rather for the purpose of making proclamations and lending an air of importance to certain solemnities. Specifically this direction was given touching the use of the two silver trumpets (Numb. 10: 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 the sacrifices of your peace offerings."

Afterwards, when David was raised up to order the musical service of the sanctuary, many priests were appointed to use trumpets similar to the two original silver trumpets, and to use them in some sense as a part of the service of song. As much as this appears to be taught in 2 Chron. 5: 11-13, where we are informed that 120 priests joined with the Levites in the exercise of praise; the singing and the trumpeting being in harmony, or blending together into one volume of musical tones. Thus we have the signal trumpets of the early tabernacle developed into the music trumpets of the temple, and in the two original silver trumpets we discern the germ of the entire instrumental part of the temple music. Hence, it seems hardly doubtful that the instrumental element of this music was closely connected with the priestly order, and with sacrifice the central ordinance of the ceremonial system.

It is true, the same period which witnessed the development spoken of, saw also the appointment of others than priests to make music in the temple, but the others appointed were Levites belonging to the priestly tribe and coadjutors of the priests.

It is also true that even in the temple service, the trumpets were still reserved for the use of the priests, while other instruments were assigned to the ordinary Levites; but this does not indicate that in the trumpets there was anything more

ceremonial than in the harp or the psaltery. The trumpets being adapted to the function of directing or commanding, appeared peculiarly appropriate to the priests as officially superior to their brethren of the Levitical tribe.

Now, it is apparent that the trumpet music was peculiarly associated with the office of the priests, who were typical functionaries, and it seems a reasonable conclusion that it partook of the typical, or at least symbolical character of those services assigned to the priests. Indeed, ardent advocates of the use of instrumental music in worship, concede that the trumpet music at least was symbolical and ceremonial, a feature of the transient Old Testament worship. To any who admit this, there are three remarks which may be made. First, If the music of the trumpet was ceremonial, then that sort of music at least has been abolished as a lawful element of worship, the ceremonial law having been abrogated. Hence, the enthusiasts for instruments, now ought to be careful to exclude this element of full orchestral music when they render praise to God. Second, The question seems to call for a reply, "What was there in the sound of a trumpet more than in the sound of a cymbal or harp, allying the former to the ceremonial system, if the latter also was not so allied?" Third, If the use of trumpets can be explained as symbolical, surely the use of other instruments can be so explained. Should it be said that the limitation of the trumpets to the priests, while ordinary Levites were to use other instruments, proves that there was something special in the trumpets to account for this distinction, I would grant it; but would add that the special thing in question was not anything peculiarly ceremonial, but the adaptation of the trumpet to give direction and express authority.

The considerations already offered to prove the identification of instrumental music with the peculiar ceremonial rites of the Mosaic economy, particularly that of sacrifice, receive confirmation from the account given of the revival which occurred in the time of Hezekiah, and of the restoration by that King of the imposing worship of the temple. With reference to those matters the following record is made in 2 Chron. 29: 25-28: "And he set the Levites in the house of the Lord with cymbals, 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 Hezekiah commanded to offer the burnt offering upon the altar. 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."

To all that has been said, it will doubtless be objected that the line of argument pursued would prove that vocal music pertained to the ceremonial system, and with it has been abolished.

My answer to this cavil is that, according to remarks already made, vocal music and the use of words in connection with it, do not partake of the same sensuous character as instrumental music, and, therefore, less readily might be supposed to

before to a transient, ceremonial system, like that of the Jews. Moreover, for the use of vocal music and of the psalms in the praise of God, we have express authority in the New Testament, while for the use of instruments we find, according to our judgment, no such authority. The objection would have been more plausible, had the New Testament been as silent in relation to singing and the use of the psalms in worship, as it is in relation to the use of instruments. Had it been the mind of God that the more sensuous element of the service of praise should be perpetrated beyond the Old Testament times, there surely would have been some notice taken of it in the New Testament; for that element, because of its sensuous character and manifest congruity with the ceremonial arrangements, was less likely than singing to be regarded as deserving of perpetuation in the new and more spiritual economy.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE PRECEPTIVE THEORY—ADDITIONAL PROOF THAT INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC WAS CEREMONIAL—INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN WORSHIP PECULIARLY ASSOCIATED WITH THE TEMPLE.

(3.) A third consideration favoring the view that instrumental music pertained only to the ceremonial rites is, that it does not seem to have been used in the ancient worship, apart from the tabernacle or temple.

This argument and the preceding one are very closely related, yet there are matters which can be more naturally presented by making the distinction now adopted.

The evidence that musical instruments were appointed by God to be used in the tabernacle and temple ritual, at least from the time of David, is abundantly strong, but very scanty is the evidence which can be adduced to show that apart from the central seat of Levitical ceremonies, the use of instruments in worship existed among the Israelites. The truth of the latter part of the statement just made, will appear upon a review of the items of evidence commonly brought forward.

For instance, we are reminded that instrumental music was practiced by certain prophets in the time of Samuel, for in 1 Samuel, 10 : 5, "After that thou shalt come to the hill of God, where is the garrison of the Philistines: and it shall come to pass, when thou art come thither to the city, that thou shalt meet a company of prophets coming down from the high place with a psaltery, and a tabret and a pipe, and a harp before them, and they shall prophesy."

Here, it may be observed, that there is no intimation made that the instruments named were used in the worship of God; that the prophets are not represented as using them, but as having them borne before them by others; that there seems to have been a mysterious connection between music and the extraordinary illapses of the spirit; and that if it could be shown that on the occasion in question the instruments were used in worship, it might still be answered that the worship was most probably connected with sacrifice, for the company is described as coming down from a high place, and in those days of confusion, high places were

resorted to for the observance of sacrificial rites, as is indicated in 1 Samuel, 9 : 12, 13.

It is further urged that a hint as to the common use of musical instruments in worship by the Jews, is found in Ps. 137 : 1, 2, where the captives in Babylon, are represented as saying, "By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down, yea, we wept, when we remembered Zion. We hanged our harps upon the willows in the midst thereof."

In answer to this item of evidence it may suffice to say that the fact of possessing musical instruments is no proof that the owner uses them in the worship of God; that in the case under notice the instruments were suspended upon the willows as being unused by the owners and for the time useless to them; that the statement touching the hanging of the harps on the willows is very probably not meant to express a literal fact, but to convey in a figurative way an idea of the cheerless and sad condition of the exiles, the sound of the harp having ceased from among them; and that the demand made by their conquerors was not for a performance on any instrument, but for the singing of a song of Zion, for the word translated "sing" carries in it no allusion to instrumental music, but unquestionably refers to vocal song. Moreover, it is to be borne in mind that among the exiles were many priests, together with other Levites, who may have carried with them into exile the instruments on which they had been wont to perform. Now, however, that sacrifice had ceased for a time and the temple had been demolished, the sound of the concomitant instruments was hushed.

Again, it is frequently asserted that the use of the harp in Old Testament times in the worship of God, apart from the temple, and by such as were not Levites, is clearly indicated in certain expressions which occur in the Book of Psalms. The chief, if not the only passages which contain such expressions, are these: Ps. 43 : 4, "Then will I go unto the altar of God, unto God, my exceeding joy: yea, upon the harp will I praise thee, O God, my God;" Ps. 57 : 8, "Awake up, my glory; awake psaltery and harp;" Ps. 81 : 2, "Take a psalm, and bring hither the timbrel, the pleasant harp with the psaltery;" Ps. 108 : 2, "Awake psaltery and harp."

There are different ways in which the texts quoted can be explained in consistency with the view that instrumental music in worship was used only at the tabernacle or temple, or, at least, in connection with sacrifice.

For instance, the language of these texts necessarily means no more than to declare, in terms drawn from the services observed at the seat of national worship, the earnestness of the writer in rendering honor to God. It virtually proclaims his purpose to devote himself, with all his energies, to the celebration of the praises of God, without implying that he would actually use in worship the instruments specified. Parallel utterances may be found abundantly in the writings of modern poets, who have no intention to finger a harp or lyre.

Besides, David sometimes speaks of doing that which could be fully done by him only through others. Thus, in Ps. 66 : 15, he says, "I will offer unto thee burnt sacrifices of fatlings, with the incense of rams; I will offer bullocks with

goats," where the word rendered "offer" means "to make go up," that is, lay upon the altar, an act which could be lawfully performed only by a priest. Hence David might fitly speak of rendering praise with instruments, although not himself handling the instruments named.

Moreover, David, who seems to have been the author of at least Psalms 43, 57 and 108, might do some things in connection with the worship of God not ordinarily allowable to any but members of the tribe of Levi. His position as the second lawgiver, and that particularly in the department of the service of song, might carry with it a license not generally enjoyed. In fact, David seems at times to have sustained somewhat the same relation as the Levites to the worship of God. While none but the high priest might wear the richly embroidered ephod, the ordinary priests were wont to wear a linen ephod, and none but they, or such as shared in a somewhat priestly character, might wear such a vestment (1 Samuel, 22: 18), yet on the occasion of the removal of the ark to Jerusalem (1 Chron. 15: 27) it is significantly mentioned that not only were the Levites who bore the ark, and those who conducted the service of song, invested with fine linen robes, but also that David was so attired, and that, in addition, he wore a linen ephod. Hence, the fact that David used instruments of music in praising God would not prove that such a mode of worship was lawful in the case of ordinary Israelites.

Now, in any of the ways suggested, the expressions on which I have been commenting may be understood, and, so understood, they will avail nought against our position.

CHAPTER IX

THE PRECEPTIVE THEORY EXAMINED—INQUIRY AS TO THE USE OF INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN THE SYNAGOGUE.

The question whether or not instrumental music formed any part of the services of the ancient synagogue demands some notice at this point.

In entering upon this branch of inquiry, it may be advisable to clear away some obstructions reared in our path by adroit disputants.

For instance, it is demanded of us that we prove the divine institution of the synagogue system of the Jews. This demand, too, comes not from Episcopalians merely, who have an interest in showing that religious rites and institutions may be lawfully originated by men acting on their own impulse, but even from persons who profess to believe the propositions contained in the Westminster standards. But so far as our present object is concerned, it matters little how this question may be determined. What concerns us in our present argument is not the question touching the origin of the synagogue, so much as the question relative to the forms of worship observed in it. The point which I desire to establish is this, that so far as we have any light shed on the modes of worship which subsisted in the ancient synagogue, the opinion that instrumental music was employed in it is discountenanced. Were it, indeed, necessary to discuss, as some would have us do, the origin of the synagogue, I should not hesitate to maintain that it was of

divine institution, although, as in the case of sacrifice, the original appointment of it has not been recorded. In the Mosaic arrangements room for it was left and even a suggestion of it given, as appears from Lev. 23: 3: "Six days shall work be done, but the seventh day is a sabbath of rest, a holy convocation."

Before the close of the Old Testament canon, and, therefore, while prophets were still granted to the church for its guidance, synagogues were in existence, for in Ps. 74: 8, it is said, "They have burned up all the synagogues in the land." This translation has, it is true, been disputed, but, I think, unjustly. The very lamentation just quoted, uttered, as it was, by an inspired writer, is an implied sanction of such establishments. Our Lord, moreover, seems, out of conscience, to have attended regularly the services of the synagogue, Luke 4: 16. If these facts do not prove the divine institution, they certainly prove the divine sanction of the synagogue. As already said, however, it is not requisite for our present aim to show that the synagogue system was divinely instituted. Whatever may have been the origin of that system, if it can be shown that there is no ground for the opinion that instrumental music was admitted into the synagogue, the ordinary worshipping place of the Jews, whereas it was so marked a feature of the temple worship, strong presumptive evidence will have been given that such music pertained exclusively to the ceremonial ritual, of which the temple was the chief seat.

Now, I fully admit that we have no very clear light shed on the methods of worship pursued in the synagogue during the Old Testament era, and in determining whether or not instrumental music was a feature of the synagogue worship in that age, our judgment must be formed under the guidance chiefly of these three facts, namely: the absence of any positive or probable evidence that instrumental music was used in the synagogue before the close of the Old Testament era; the well-known tenacity of the Jews in adhering to the customs handed down to them; and the extreme improbability that since the beginning of our era, till at least very recent times, any instrumental music has been employed in the synagogue service.

I am not aware that any evidence of a direct kind, or that any indirect evidence worthy of serious consideration, can be produced to prove that in the Old Testament age, instrumental music was included in the synagogue worship. So far as the Scriptures are concerned, there is an utter absence of any ground for the belief that the music of instruments was ever heard in the synagogue. Nor is there any other source of evidence known to me from which the conclusion can be fairly drawn that in the ancient synagogue musical instruments had a place.

Coming to the New Testament age, we find not only no evidence that in it, unless in very recent times, the synagogue service has embraced instrumental music, but much to prove the contrary.

It is well known that the Jews of our own day are agitated by the question of instrumental music. A new party, rationalistic and infidel in its spirit, embracing many of the wealthy, has risen among them, which clamors as loudly as any of our Gentiles can for the employment of instrumental music in worship; but these

agitators, the ritualists in one respect at least, as well as infidels of modern Judaism, are confessedly innovators, none of them, so far as I know, presuming to plead for their pet project, on the ground that the synagogue in by-gone centuries embraced in its services instrumental music. Some of them contend for instruments on purely aesthetic grounds, while others of them seek to strengthen their demand by an appeal to the facts, that by divine prescription musical instruments were employed in the services of the temple, and that in the psalms the use of such instruments is countenanced and commanded. I am not aware, however, that the attempt is made to prove that in the ancient synagogue, whether before or after the beginning of our era, instruments of music were used in worship. The stream of tradition on this point seems to be too strong for even the boldest innovators to breast it.

CHAPTER X.

THE PRECEPTIVE THEORY EXAMINED—INQUIRY IN RELATION TO SYNAGOGUE WORSHIP CONTINUED.

James Piccioto, a Jew, in his "Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History," published in London, in 1873, gives an account of the beginning of the movement, sometimes called the "Reform" movement among the Jews, one feature of which is the introduction of instrumental music into the services of the synagogue.

From this work we learn that the first proposal to enliven the dullness of the synagogue ritual with instrumental music, was made in London in 1836, in the form of a memorial to the authorities of the synagogue. This memorial proceeded from certain wealthy Jews, who having "waxed fat, kicked" against the ancient customs, and were fain to copy the fashions of the day. Of the drift of this document, Piccioto gives a summary account, part of which is here subjoined:—"The memorialists stated in that document that they had observed with regret the existence of considerable confusion during great part of the service; that the irregular singing of the schoolboys and others, tended to destroy all harmony and to impair the solemn effect of the beautiful Jewish hymns; while a constant repetition of some of the prayers, seemed to them to be the cause of the relaxation of attention and seriousness vitally requisite to the maintenance of a spirit of reverence and fervor. Without presuming to offer any specific plan, the memorialists ventured to make a few suggestions. The singing and recitation of prayers should be confined to the reader and to a certain number of trained boys; and the introduction of an organ or other instrument, they thought, would insure harmony, order and solemnity during the whole service. In view of the constant allusions to instrumental music in the Psalms, it was not conceived that there could be anything inherent in the Jewish faith to prevent its adoption. They respectfully but earnestly solicited an inquiry to be set on foot."

In 1836, as we learn from the same authority, a counter-petition, more numerously signed than the former, was presented to the elders. Touching the memorialists in this case, our author says:—"These members expressed an eager desire to see great order, solemnity and harmony established in the religious services, but

conscientiously and firmly differed from the other requisitionists as to alterations which would set aside, or change, those observances which for ages have been held sacred; they firmly believed, that if the principle of alteration in Jewish religious institutions was once admitted, it would split the Jewish nation into innumerable sects."

Failing to secure their ends, the advocates of change at length expressed the wish and purpose to be organized into a separate society, or congregation, in resolving upon which organization, however, they did not clearly state the reasons why they desired it; the main reason mentioned, being the plea of convenience in a local respect. Says Picciotto, who does not seem to be a special friend of conservatism, "It will be remarked that not a word is here said respecting instrumental music in synagogues, or the abolition of the second days of festivals, the two points most objectionable to those who call themselves strict Jews. Resolutions in conformity with the above declarations were adopted at that meeting, when it was decided that the new place of worship should be named "The West London Synagogue of British Jews."

The writer goes on to tell that the promoters of this enterprise were excommunicated for their conduct in the matter; but that, in the course of time, the sentence was revoked, the revolutionists thus gaining their point.

It is obvious, however, that those men, among whom, or in sympathy with whom were some scholars, as, for instance, Raphall, distinguished for their acquaintance with Jewish history and lore, did not dare to allege, though the plea would have been a potent one, that in the ancient synagogue, whether before or after the time of Christ, instrumental music was allowed. Even yet, in spite of the ritualistic tendency of the age, by which Jews as well as Gentiles are affected, and notwithstanding the power which the increasing wealth of the Jews has to induce them to ape the prevailing fashions, the "reformers," so called, have had but very indifferent success in their effort to have the organ established in the synagogue. In a few places they have carried their point at the expense of the disturbance, and, in some cases, disruption of congregations, but they are still in the minority, and, from the traditional Jewish point of view, are under the ban of heterodoxy.

It is, I am aware, alleged by Dr. Burney, in his "History of Music," published in London, in the year 1789, that in his time there was an organ in the synagogue of Prague. I am not in a position to contradict this statement, but I am in a position to prove that any statements made by this author favorable to the cause of instrumental music in worship are to be received with caution; for I have found him guilty in one very marked instance of misrepresenting, wilfully or unconsciously, documentary evidence, the purport of which he professed to give. But even if it could be indubitably proved that in one place, or in several places, instrumental music was used in synagogue worship in the last century, how far would this be from proving that such music was generally allowed in the synagogue, and that it had been so from the time of Christ!

Maimonides, a famous Jewish author, born at Cordova, in Spain, in A. D.

1135, has left behind him a treatise containing a full description and explanation of the synagogue services in his time, and in this account, while he represents the chanting of psalms as a part of the service, he does not give a single hint as to the use of any instrumental music in worship.

Of all the authors who have handled the subject of the synagogue, none, not even our modern explorers, such as Jost, has been more thorough and scrupulously exact than Vitringa. Grotius, Selden, Spenser, Lightfoot, Thorndyke, Hammond and Buxtorf had preceded him as workers in the great mine of rabbinical literature, and his elaborate work was composed with all the aid derivable from the deep researches of those illustrious men. I have examined with considerable care his treatise, entitled "De Synagoga Vetere," and have failed to discover in it the least insinuation that instrumental music was ever used in the worship of the synagogue. In a chapter devoted to an enumeration and description of the utensils which pertained either to the sacred worship or the decoration of the synagogue, particularly since the time of Christ, Vitringa specifies "tubæ et buccinæ," that is, trumpets and bugles or cornets. The uses of these, he shows, were fourfold, namely: to proclaim sentences of excommunication; to announce the advent of the New Year; to intimate the approach of the Sabbath; and to usher in certain fasts. But, be it observed that only two instruments are mentioned, the harp, even, not being of the number, and that not a hint is given that either of them was used in connection with the service of song, or in any part of the worship proper. A cursory reader, on seeing the words "tubæ et buccinæ" might fancy that these must denote instrumental helps in the worship, but such a notion would be utterly erroneous and at variance with the tenor of Vitringa's remarks.

It may be of interest to insert here a quotation from the "Jewish Record" of August 15, 1879: "When Meyerbeer, the distinguished German musician, was requested by Louis Augustus Frankel to furnish a composition for the dedication of a new synagogue he is reported to have said, 'By all means do not introduce an organ. That is purely a Christian instrument. I reckon it to my credit that, together with Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, who fully shared my views, I have introduced in Berlin a singing choir only. Men, while praying, should speak to their God without any intermediation. This principle has been observed by the Jews since the destruction of the temple. It has been established 2000 years. We should make no innovation. If, however, different music, that is, different from vocal exclusively, is absolutely required, it ought to be produced by trombone and flute, like that which was sounded in Solomon's temple. But the human voice is the most impressive and soul-stirring of all instruments.'" Meyerbeer, who thus expressed himself, was a Jew both by blood and faith. He was born in 1794, and he died in 1864. His testimony is valuable both as showing the traditional view of the Jews as to music in the synagogue, and as revealing the preference of two of the most eminent modern composers for singing without any instrumental accompaniment in worship.

CHAPTER XI.

THE PRECEPTIVE THEORY EXAMINED—ARGUMENT AGAINST IT FROM THE METHOD OF WORSHIP IN THE SYNAGOGUE.

The evidence already adduced, or which can be produced, seems adequate to establish the following points, namely: that for many hundreds of years, singing, or chanting, which Maimonides includes under the general head of prayer, has been an element in the synagogue service; that during this time, no instrumental music has been tolerated in synagogue worship, unless in a few instances of recent date; and that the traditional sentiment among the Jews is adverse to the use of instrumental music in the synagogue, so much so that those of them who advocate its use, do not venture to plead the ancient custom of the synagogue, but have recourse to the temple service for precedent and authority.

It will be remembered that one object in our diverging into the inquiry as to the ritual of the synagogue since the time of Christ, was to obtain help in determining what was its ritual under the Old Testament dispensation. It may be said that our inquiry thus far has brought to light no evidence that instrumental music was absent from the synagogue service under the old dispensation, and I frankly admit that no direct evidence has been, or perhaps can be, presented to this effect, but indirect proof of this point is involved in the facts enumerated. Let us try to weigh the evidence impartially.

To have satisfactory grounds for believing that when, in 1836, a memorial was presented to the synagogue authorities in London, asking that an organ be allowed in the synagogue, the movement was deemed by the mass of the Jews, revolutionary; that the prevailing sentiment of the Jews, is at present entirely adverse to the admission of instrumental music into synagogue worship; that in the twelfth century the synagogue was destitute of instrumental music; and that there is not a particle of direct evidence, and no indirect evidence worthy of notice, to prove that at any previous date, such music formed a part of the synagogue service. So far as the New Testament times are concerned, all the evidence available, and it is considerable, points to the conclusion that in the synagogue no instrumental music found place. Then let it be borne in mind, that the Jews have proved themselves proverbially tenacious of their ancient religious customs, and particularly so since their dispersion. Moreover, let it be considered how strong a tendency there is in men to pass from a simpler to a more florid and pompous ritual. Furthermore, let it be noted how steadfastly the Jews have adhered to the use of trumpets for making proclamations, thus showing that, had they deemed it proper, they certainly could and would have provided instruments for the service of song. Due weight being allowed to all these considerations, and to this in addition that there is no conflicting evidence, it seems a rational conclusion that instrumental music has never formed a feature of synagogue worship, unless in very recent times. Had it ever been a feature of that worship, it is difficult to see how it could ever have ceased to be so; for when the temple had been destroyed and its music hushed, it is but natural to suppose that the Jews would have been doubly zealous for the perpetuation of instrumental music in the synagogue, if

that had been previously a part of the synagogue worship. It is sometimes suggested that owing to their deep depression after the destruction of Jerusalem, and in order to escape the notice of their foes, the Jews may have abandoned the use of instrumental music in their synagogue assemblies. But their stubborn fortitude and tenacity in such matters forbid this supposition; while, moreover, as far back as we can trace, even in the days of Chrysostom, about the close of the fourth century, which were gloomy days for the Jews, the use of the trumpets for making proclamations in the synagogues, was faithfully maintained.

In view of the various facts and considerations enumerated, the assertion may be made, with some confidence, that in Old Testament times the synagogue service included no instrumental music.

But, assuming the correctness of this conclusion, what is its significance? Manifestly this, at least, that in Old Testament days, instrumental music in worship was considered to be a peculiarity of the temple ritual, and to be so identified with it that the abolition of the temple service involved the legal abolition of the instrumental element thereof.

Should the quibble be raised, as by some it is, that there is as little evidence that vocal music was practised in the synagogue, as that instrumental music was, although vocal, as well as instrumental, music was rendered in the temple service, and, therefore, that according to our mode of reasoning, singing, as much as playing on instruments, must have belonged to the temporary ceremonial worship; I would answer, that vocal song, being more directly natural to man than playing on instruments, might be more readily than instrumental music supposed to have entered into the synagogue service; that chanting or singing has from time immemorial been a part of the synagogue worship in the New Testament dispensation and, therefore, presumably formed an element of the synagogue service in Old Testament times; that, moreover, we have express New Testament authority and instructions to praise God with vocal song, whereas, we have no such authority, we believe, for employing instruments for rendering homage to him; while, besides, we know that singing was practised by divine authority apart from the temple, as, for instance, by our Lord and his disciples at the institution of the Supper.

Some maintain that in the Old Testament synagogue there was no devotional service; but for reasons partly hinted, I greatly doubt the correctness of this position. Were it proved, however, we could still turn it to our account. For, if the Jews, unused to any music in their ordinary Sabbath assemblies, began, on being converted, to sing in christian assemblies, but not to use instruments of music, as hereafter will be shown, they must have been authoritatively instructed to make this selection, and by whom instructed, but by the Apostles?

Before passing from this department of the discussion, I deem it important to state that it is by no means an argumentative necessity for the opponents of instrumental music to prove that it was limited as a part of worship to the temple. We could afford to admit that instrumental music was as much at home in the synagogue as in the temple, and yet maintain that it was ceremonial in its nature and

intent. For the ceremonial system was a network that covered all Palestine and extended to the Jewish people wherever they were. While the temple, and before its erection, the tabernacle, formed the great seat and centre of ceremonial rites and forms, these, at least many of them, might be observed elsewhere.

For instance, circumcision might be performed in any place. So, also, the laws regulating the use of "meats" and "drinks," many forms of ceremonial defilement, and the method of deliverance from the disabilities incurred by such defilement, were in force outside the environs of the national seat of worship. If, then, it could be proved that instrumental music was practised in worship in every synagogue and habitation in Palestine, it would not follow that instrumental music does not belong to the transient arrangements of the ceremonial law. Ceremonialism was not confined to the temple or to Jerusalem. It is very vital to the cause of the advocates of instrumental music in worship to prove that they were lawfully used in worship by the Jews anywhere; but it is not vital to the cause of the antagonists of instrumental music in worship to prove that outside the precincts of the tabernacle or the temple such a performance was unlawful. We can take either horn of the dilemma. Our opponents can take only one. Indeed, I hardly know which is more fatal to the instrumental side: the assumption that instrumental music in stated and formal worship was lawful only in the temple, or the assumption that it was lawful anywhere.

While I believe that the former of these positions is the more tenable, I am far from admitting that it is essential to the argument against the use of instruments in worship. Nay, I can see how the latter position might be almost, if not altogether, as serviceable as the former to the opponent of instruments. And, if asked how, I would answer on this wise:—If it can be shown, as it certainly can, that the early church, not now to include the period of the apostolic age, which might be reckoned debateable ground, used no instruments of music in worship, this fact can be accounted for only on the supposition that some powerful arrest had been laid upon the practice, previously so general, according to the supposition. If the Jews had been accustomed to use instruments in their houses and synagogues when they sang their psalms, the absence of the instrumental strains from the services of the early church, after the apostolic times, would prove beyond reasonable dispute that some powerful repressive influence must have been exerted upon the people, many of whom were Jews, to induce them to omit from their worship that to which by the supposition they had been accustomed, and to which, as sensuous in its character, there is so strong a propension in man. And what influence could it have been that thus swayed the early church but the power of apostolic example and teaching?

CHAPTER XII.

THE PRECEPTIVE THEORY EXAMINED. WHAT WAS SYMBOLIZED BY THE INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC OF THE TEMPLE.—PATRISTIC EVIDENCE.

We have been endeavoring to show, by several arguments, that instrumental music as a part of worship belonged to the ceremonial and temporary system of

the Old Testament; but when, at expense of toil, our arguments have been set in array, expert disputants will ask, with an air of triumph, "Of what was instrumental music typical, for typical it must have been if it belonged to the ceremonial arrangements and was intimately connected with the sacrifices?" To this inquiry, which by some is supposed to be very disconcerting to the opponents of instrumental music in worship, various answers may be given. For instance, it may be said that there may be satisfactory grounds for regarding a thing as typical although there might be much difficulty in determining precisely what it typified. There are many things in the arrangements about the tabernacle and temple which hardly any will deny to have been typical, but the import of which can scarcely be ascertained. It might be so with instrumental music. Again, it may be answered, that many things pertaining to the ceremonial rites and provisions were not typical, although symbolical. A type is a prophetic symbol. A symbol is something addressed to the outward senses, but at the same time adapted by some analogy, and intended to represent something spiritual. If the thing which it is meant to represent is future, the symbol contains a prophetic aspect or element, and is properly called a type. But if the thing meant is either past or present, the sensible sign or representative is not a type, but merely a symbol. For instance, the victim offered in sacrifice was a symbol of true substitutionary sacrifice, but inasmuch as the sacrifices of the old economy pointed onward to the advent and substitutionary suffering of the Lamb of God in the fulness of time, we style the sacrifices, types. The bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, represent the body and blood of Christ as offered for sinners, and so are called symbols; but as these material signs point back to the offering of Christ, when he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, they are not called types. Many things embraced in the ceremonial arrangements were symbolical, not typical. For instance, the different forms of ceremonial defilement and objects pronounced unclean to the Israelites were not typical, but symbolical, because they signified present moral influences or conditions, while the modes of removing ceremonial pollution were typical, pointing as they did, to the fountain which was to be opened "for sin and for uncleanness." Indeed, some even of the sacrificial offerings, bore pre-eminently a symbolic aspect, although not entirely lacking in the typical bearing, as for example the thank offerings.

Now, instrumental music may be regarded as symbolical, or, if typical at all, only so in a very general sense. Of what was it symbolical? I answer, of the full and entire consecration of all our powers, mentally and bodily to God; the open and avowed acknowledgment of him in a world that dishonours and denies him. But should this answer be deemed unsatisfactory, let not any one, therefore, commit the blunder of inferring that instrumental music in Old Testament worship cannot have been symbolical. If any one should insist that, if not meant to be a permanent form of worship, it must be typical, then it might be said that it typified the energetic praises which would be rendered to God in this world, and perhaps in all worlds, as a fruit of the atoning work of Christ. I prefer, however, to view it as simply symbolical of the hearty desire of the saints to proclaim with all their

ability the excellence and glorious majesty of God. To this view, I am the more inclined from the representation given in Revelation of saints with harps, just as they are portrayed with palms and linen vestments, and with golden vials "full of incense, which are the prayers of saints," Rev. 5:8; 7:9. The harps are symbolical of the praises, whether expressed in words or acts, just as the vials full of incense are symbolical of the prayers of saints. This, it may be added, is the view taken of this subject by the Christian Fathers for centuries after the time of the apostles. The stream of patristic interpretation in reference to the importance of the instrumental service of the temple, is beyond the slightest doubt substantially this: that the instruments symbolized the various energies of our nature, particularly those of our bodies, and that the music produced on them, represented the melody of a holy life, in which the powers of body and soul blend together in doing homage to God. On this point, I have examined with care in the original, as well as with the aid in some cases of Latin or English translations, the chief writings of the most prominent fathers, inclusive of Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Eusebius, Augustine, Jerome, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Theodore of Mopsnestia, Basil, and Gregory of Nyssa, together with several others, and can affirm that the view just given, is, for substance, that which they give. I grant, indeed, that those writers indulge too freely in tracing fanciful analogies between instruments and the human body, and that the same writer, even in the same passage, is not always self-consistent in his interpretations; but in this they are all and always agreed that the instruments of music in the temple and spoken of in the psalms, symbolized human powers devoted to the honor of God. In some cases they speak of the music of the instruments as typical of the praises which would be rendered to God by the saints after the consummation of the atoning sacrifice of Christ. Occasionally also they trace resemblances between different instruments and certain parts of morality; some, for instance, going so far as to allege that the decachord, or ten-stringed instrument sometimes spoken of, denoted the ten commandments; but into whatever vagaries of interpretation they may lapse, they steadily adhere in the main to this view, that the instruments were symbolical and ceremonial.

A few citations may be given as specimens of the drift of opinion on this point among the Fathers; and I feel the more willing to present these, as they will prepare for an argument which it is my intention to draw from the sentiment and practice of the early church in relation to instrumental music.

Clemens Alexandrinus, who died about A. D. 220, and must have been born not more than 50 or 60 years after the death of the apostle John, has, in his treatise entitled, "Paidagogos," or Instructor, a chapter headed thus:—"How to conduct ourselves at feasts," in which the following sentiments are expressed:—"But the Spirit, distinguishing the divine service, sings, 'Praise him with the sound of a trumpet.' For with the sound of a trumpet he will raise the dead. 'Praise him on the psaltery.' Since the tongue is the Lord's psaltery. 'And on the harps praise him.' By the harp the mouth may be understood, which is struck by the Spirit as with a plectrum. 'With timbrel and with dance, praise

him.' He speaks of the church which is wont to meditate on the resurrection of the flesh in the resounding skin. 'On strings and organ, praise him.' He calls our body an organ, and its nerves strings, by which it is regularly and harmoniously exerted, and when struck by the Spirit emits human voices. 'Praise him on clashing cymbals.' He calls the tongue, the cymbal of the mouth which resounds with the pulsation of the lips. And so he cries to humanity 'Let every breath praise the Lord,' seeing that every breathing thing which he made experiences his care. For truly man is a peaceful instrument. But if any one will inquire carefully about other instruments, he will them find to be martial, inflaming to concupiscence, kindling amorous desire, exciting the mind or fomenting wrath. In their wars, therefore, the Etruscans use a trumpet; the Arcadians, the reed. But the Sicilians used instruments called pectides; the Cretans, the lyre; the Lacedaemonians, the flute; the Thracians, the horn; the Egyptians, the drum; and the Arabs, the cymbal. Therefore, one instrument, the peaceful word alone, we use, by which we honor God; no longer employing the old psaltery and trumpet, and timbrel and pipe, which they were wont to use who exercised themselves in war, and despised the fear of God, and at the same time were wont to resort to gatherings for dances, in order that by such means the mind, listless and dejected, might be roused."

Hippolytus, commonly called bishop of Pontus Romanus, who died about A. D. 236, expresses himself thus in one of the fragments which remain of his writings:—"It is likely also that a similar account is to be given of the fact that David alone of the prophets, prophesied with an instrument, called by the Greeks the psaltery, and by the Hebrews, the naba, which is the only musical instrument that is quite straight and has no curve. And the sound does not come from the lower parts, as is the case with the lute and certain other instruments, but from the upper. For in the lute and the lyre, the brass, when struck, gives back the sound from beneath. But this psaltery has the source of its numbers above, that we, too, may practise seeking things above, and not suffer ourselves to be borne down by the pleasure of melody to the passions of the flesh. And, I think that this truth too was signified to us deeply and clearly in a prophetic way, in the construction of the instrument, namely: that those who have souls, well ordered and trained, have the way ready to things above. And again, an instrument having the source of its melodious sound in its upper parts, may be taken as like the body of Christ and his saints, the only instrument that maintains rectitude; for he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. This is indeed an instrument, harmonious, melodious, well-ordered, that took in no human discord, and did nothing out of measure, but maintained in all things, as it were, harmony toward the Father." Much more to the same effect might be given from this writer.

In his elaborate commentary on the Book of Psalms, Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, whose life extended from A. D. 250 to A. D. 340, expresses himself frequently on the point before us. Commenting on Ps. 68 : 5, 6, he says, "He sings (psalle) to his name, who with his bodily motions and the actions of his

senses displays conduct which induces onlookers to praise the name of God." Again in his exposition of Ps. 71 : 22-24, he pursues this strain:—"But the vessels and instruments agreeable to God, and by which to-day the church of God utters psalms and hymns, and praises to God, the Father, throughout the whole world, what are they but the peoples composing the church of Christ, whose souls framed and bound together in one chain of symphony and harmony by the Word of God, send forth a pleasant and sweet melody? Were any one, therefore, to compare those instruments of the ancient Jews, formed of lifeless chords and producing no articulate sound, with the hymns sent up to God in the church of Christ from the rational souls, he should find no comparison between them. For the multitude throughout the world which with one concert and symphony celebrates God, who is over all, is more excellent than any material psaltery. By the ministrations of this multitude, the Son confesses that he sings (psalle) to the Father."

Still further, on Ps. 92 : 2, he writes, "Formerly, indeed, when the people of the circumcision worshipped God through symbols and figures, it was not incongruous to utter hymns with psalteries and harps, and to do that on the Sabbath, dismissing ease, and so transgressing the law of the Sabbath. But, preserving the Jew in secret, according to the Apostle's saying, 'For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly,' etc., pour ye out a hymn with the living psaltery and animated harp and spiritual songs. For sweeter and more acceptable to Christ than all instruments of music, is the joint symphony of his people in which, in all the churches of God, with one mind and with one heart, we send forth melody in psalm singing (psalmodia). Therefore we are wont to use such psalm singings and spiritual harps, because the apostle teaches so in these words, 'In psalms and hymns and spiritual songs.' In another way, also, the whole body may be the harp by whose motions and operations the soul sends out a becoming hymn to God. But the psaltery of ten strings is the worship of the Holy Spirit exhibited by the five senses of the body and as many virtues of the soul; which things the same apostle declares in these words, 'I will pray with the spirit; I will pray also with the understanding; I will sing with the spirit, I will sing with the understanding also.'"

On Ps. 98 : 4-6, Eusebius remarks, "For he calls the symphony of the body with the soul a harp. Moreover, this law may be seen carefully observed in the churches, for on a spiritual instrument, we produce divine melody. Nay, we even make our mouths rational harps, and for chords use the teeth, for brass the lips, and swifter than any plectrum, the vibrating tongue utters a harmonious sound; but the mind moves the tongue like a skilful musician."

Many other citations of like import can be made from Eusebius, who was thoroughly conversant with the theological lore and expository canons current in his age.

Among the Fathers none holds higher rank as a theologian than Augustine, born A. D. 354, the date of his death being A. D. 430. It is, however, beyond question that his view of the import of the musical instruments mentioned in the Psalms, is substantially the same with that held by Clements, Hippolytus and

Eusebius. One or two quotations will suffice to show this. Discoursing on Ps. 92, he says:—"Psalle ergo nomini Dei, ut fixum sit apud Deum, nomen tuum. Psallere, autem, Deo quid est fratres? Psalterium organi genus est, chordas habet. Opus nostrum, psalterium nostrum est. Quicumque manibus operatur opera bona, psallit Deo. Quicumque ore constetur, cantat Deo. Canta ore, psalle operibus," which may be rendered thus: Sing, therefore, to the name of God, that thy name may be established with God. But to sing, what is it, brethren? A psaltery is a kind of instrument; it has strings. Our work is our psaltery. Whosoever performs good works with his hands, sings to God; whosoever confesses with his mouth, chants to God. Chant with thy mouth: sing with thy works.

Again he thus expatiates on Ps. 149, "Quare assumit tympanum et psalterium? Ut non sola vox laudet, sed opera. Quando assumuntur tympanum et psalterium, manus concinnunt voci. Sic et tu quando halleluia cantas, porrigas et panem esurienti, vestias nudum, suscipias peregrinum; non sola vox sonat, sed et manus consonat, quia verbis facta concordant. Assumpsisti organum, consentiant digiti linguæ. Et ipsum mysterium tympani et psalterii non est tacendum. In tympano corium extenditur, in psalterio chordæ extenduntur; in utroque organo caro crucifigitur. Quam bene psalebatur in tympano et psalterio qui dicebat, 'Mibi mundus crucifixus est,' which may be translated thus:—Why does he assume a timbrel and a psaltery? That not the voice alone may praise, but the works. When the timbrel and psaltery are assumed, the hands accord with the voice. So thou too when thou chantest Halleluia, mayest also offer bread to the hungry, mayest clothe the naked, mayest succor the stranger; not only does the voice sound, but the hand also is in concert with it, because the deeds correspond to the words. Thou hast assumed an instrument, let thy fingers accord with thy tongue. And the mystery itself of the timbrel and psaltery is not to be overlooked. In the timbrel the skin is stretched; in the psaltery the chords are extended; in both instruments the flesh is crucified. How well did he sing on timbrel and psaltery, who said, 'The world is crucified to me!'

On Psalm 150, he observes, "Iidem ipsi sancti, sunt in omnibus musicis organis deinceps significati, ad laudandum Deum," that is, The very saints themselves are in fine denoted in all musical instruments for praising God. Further, he says, "Vos estis tuba, psalterium, cithera, tympanum, chorus, chordæ et organum, et cymbala jubilationis bene sonantia quia consonantia," that is, You are trumpet, psaltery, harp, timbrel, dance, strings, organ and cymbals of joy sounding well, because sounding in harmony.

Jerome, the celebrated contemporary of Augustine, expresses similar views in his Commentary on the Book of Psalms, and in his exposition of Eph. 5 : 19.

Basil, surnamed the Great, born A. D. 328, commenting on Ps. 33, explains the instruments there named to mean the human body, but with this exception that the decachord, or ten-stringed instrument represents or symbolizes the ten commandments.

Of the same tenor in general is the view expressed by Isidore of Pelusium, in his letter numbered 364.

The renowned Chrysostom, born A. D. 347, the date of his death being 407, comments on Ps. 150, thus, "For as the Jews praised God with all instruments (organôn), so he commands us to praise him with all members (melôn), with the eyes, the ears, the tongue, the hands. For the eye praises him when it does not look unchastely, and the tongue when it sings (hôtan psalltê)."

The specimens of patristic teaching now given, which are but a few of many at command, certainly prove that the most distinguished among the Fathers regarded the musical instruments of the Old Testament ritual, as symbolical and ceremonial. Add to this, that, so far as I know there is not a single writer of the first five or six centuries, or even much later, that expresses any different opinion on this subject. The interpretations given by the Fathers on this point, as well as on many others, are often whimsical and fanciful; but it cannot be denied that those men were substantially of one mind as to the symbolic import of the instruments of music employed in the temple worship. From the earliest period, from almost the very age of the apostles down to our own day, we find a chain of witnesses, who coincide in substance with the view we take of the symbolic and ceremonial character of the instruments of music used in the temple service, and the nearer we approach to the age of the apostles, the more unanimous is the mind of the church on this point found to be.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE PRECEPTIVE THEORY EXAMINED—ARGUMENT AGAINST IT FROM THE SPECIFICATION OF PARTICULAR INSTRUMENTS.

(4.) Another indication converging in common with the three already presented, to the conclusion that the instrumental element in Jewish worship was ceremonial and temporary, is, that the specific instruments to be used were prescribed by God; that, moreover, these have been lost; and that no description of them has been given sufficient to enable us to construct exactly the like.

The musical instruments intended for use in the tabernacle and temple were prepared at least in part by David, and doubtless prescribed by him under divine guidance. We know that the pattern of the temple and of all the utensils connected with it was by David, under the immediate inspiration of the Spirit, furnished to Solomon, as an authoritative guide to him in the great work to which he was called, for we read thus in 1 Chron. 28 : 11-13: "Then David gave to Solomon, his son, the pattern of the porch, and of the houses thereof, and of the treasuries thereof, and of the upper chambers thereof, and of the inner parlors thereof, and of the place of the mercy seat, and the pattern of all that he had by the Spirit, of the courts of the house of the Lord, and of all the chambers round about, of the treasuries of the house of God, and of the treasuries of the dedicated things: also for the courses of the priests and the Levites, and for all the work of the service of the house of the Lord, and for all the vessels of service in the house of the Lord." It may, in passing be noticed that "kelê," the word rendered "vessels" in the last clause of the foregoing quotation, might be rendered "instru-

ments," and that it is so rendered in the next verse. After an enumeration of the various items provided for in the pattern, it is added (v. 19), "All this, said David, the Lord made me understand in writing by his hand upon me, even all the work of this pattern."

Whether the musical instruments had already been prepared and brought into use or not, it can hardly be questioned that no less than other vessels of service, they were embraced in the model or plan divinely given for the guidance of Solomon touching the house of God and all its appointments.

Let it be noted, also, that certain instruments for musical purposes were expressly prescribed by God through David, together with the prophets, Gad and Nathan, 2 Chron. 29 : 25. The instruments so appointed are called "the instruments of David," in 2 Chron. 29 : 26, 27; Neh. 12 : 36, partly to indicate that he prepared, or at least prescribed them, and partly, perhaps, to distinguish them from the priestly trumpets which had been prepared and appointed by Moses. They are, however, also designated, "musical instruments of God" (1 Chron. 16 : 42), in token of the fact that they were, by his appointment, employed in his worship, and not used in that service simply because they were then in fashion.

Let it be further observed that the direction to use instrumental music in worship, was coupled with, or conveyed in, a direction to use certain specified instruments. The precept did not run on this wise, "Use musical instruments in praising God;" but on this wise, "Praise God with certain instruments named."

In consonance with all this is the fact that in a time of revival, nearly 300 years after the rearing of the temple, Hezekiah, in restoring the service of song, was careful to provide that precisely the instruments ordained by David should be used in producing the instrumental part of that service. This we learn from 2 Chron. 29 : 25-27, "And he set the Levites in the house of the Lord with cymbals, with psalteries, and with harps according to the command 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 Hezekiah commanded to offer the burnt offering upon the altar. 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."

In the time of Ezra, also still later, at the laying of the foundation of the second temple, the ordinance of David in respect to instruments was observed, and probably was observed in full, although only the trumpets and cymbals are mentioned expressly; the latter being, probably, for brevity, named as a specimen merely of the instruments used by the ordinary Levites. Later still, even at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem in the time of Nehemiah, the very same ordinance, not only in respect to instrumental music, but also in respect to the very instruments used, seems to have been carefully observed; for, in Neh. 12 : 27, it is said, "And at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem, they sought the Levites out of all their places to bring them to Jerusalem, to keep the dedication with

gladness, both with thanksgivings and with singing, with cymbals, psalteries and with harps," and in v. 36, it is expressly stated that certain persons whose names are mentioned took part in the service of the day, "with the musical instruments of David, the man of God."

Now, all this particularity as to the use of certain instruments savors of the rigor of ceremonialism, and forms an indication that the instrumental music appointed for the temple service belonged to that system of rites and ceremonies which was marked by rigidity and minuteness of regulations, and was meant to pass away at the completion of the sacrificial work of Christ. Besides, those who plead for the use of instruments in New Testament worship under cover of the command of God to use them in the temple, are bound to accept the command in its breadth, or in its narrowness, and that was a command not to use any instruments which the worshippers might prefer, or fashion might dictate, but to use certain instruments specified by divine authority. If others are used, they must be introduced on authority as valid as was the harp, the cymbal or the trumpet.

Are our musical enthusiasts prepared to accept the command as issued?

If so, they must sedulously strive to have the very instruments which received divine sanction; not contenting themselves even with only one of the sorts prescribed, but seeking to keep in its integrity and fulness the precept under which they profess to act. To say the least, the fulness of the temple orchestra ought to be the goal toward which they should press, the model which they should closely copy. This should be deemed the ideal toward the realization of which the church should now strive. What right have we to interpret the command to use certain kinds of instruments as equivalent to a command to use any kind of instruments? To say the least, what right have we to omit the instruments expressly mentioned, even if it be granted that some others might be joined with them? It is under the plea of a command to use not one kind, but several kinds of instruments and these kinds, moreover, particularly named, that we are asked now to establish instrumental music in our churches. Those who advance the plea are bound in consistency to press on till they shall have brought the church to recognize the duty of conducting its worship with the music, not merely of one instrument, but of several instruments, at least as many and as nearly as possible the same in kind, as those appointed by the commandment of David, of Gad, and of Nathan. Nothing short of an orchestra, or a band of musicians, duly equipped with prescribed instruments, will satisfy the requirements of the plea, under which the patrons of instrumental music think they can march to victory.

But just at this point, we remember that the reproduction of the same kinds of instruments which were authorized by David, would demand greater antiquarian lore than the world at present possesses. Who can now tell precisely what the instruments were which David prescribed? We may guess what they were, but with respect to some of them at least we can do nothing more. God has not furnished us with a detailed description of them to guide us in any attempt to frame the like; nor has he preserved any of them to be a model for our imitation. And this very circumstance that the instruments have not been preserved, and more-

over cannot be reproduced with any certainty, would seem to be an indication that God meant that those appliances should find no place in our worship.

If the pitiable evasion should be resorted to, as indeed it has been by some, that, according to the line of argument now adopted, we ought to use the very tunes or chants with which the songs of Zion were sung in the temple, I would answer, that it is not said in the Bible that God prescribed the very tunes or musical notes to be employed in the service of song. The style of music seems to have been left to be regulated by taste, subject, however, to the general directions given in the word, touching the sobriety and solemnity of feeling appropriate to worship; whereas the instruments to be employed were specifically named and provided. True indeed, there are certain inscriptions prefixed to particular psalms, which are supposed by some to indicate the tunes to which those psalms respectively were to be sung; but let it be duly noted that the divine origin of the inscriptions in question is by no means certain; that it is a very conjectural matter moreover, whether certain terms that do occur in those inscriptions, are the names of tunes; that not all of the psalms have inscriptions; and that of all the inscriptions prefixed there are only a very few that can with any show of reason be regarded as indicating tunes. On the other hand, outside the book of Psalms, and in passages universally admitted by Christians to be canonical scripture, explicit directions are given as to the instruments to be used; while at long intervals of Old Testament history, the literally binding character of those directions is recognized and declared by the church, under the guidance of inspired men. Had God meant that the selection of instruments should be regulated by the same principles as that of the tunes, would he not have left the matter of instruments as indefinite as he did the matter of tunes? He prescribed the very instruments to be used. He did not prescribe the very tunes to be used, but left the selection of them to be made by the discretion of the church, subject to the general regulations laid down in scripture touching his worship. The fact that the tunes or system of chanting used in the temple cannot be now definitely ascertained, is no sign that God meant singing or chanting to cease in the church at the close of the Old Testament dispensation, for he never appointed any particular tunes or chants, though he did appoint singing or chanting; but the fact that the particular musical instruments appointed for use in the temple cannot now be determined is a sign that God meant the use of musical instruments to cease in the church at the close of the old dispensation, for he did prescribe not instrumental music in general to be used in the temple, but the use of specified instruments.

When thus pressed, those who clamor for instrumental music in worship have sometimes said, that we may deviate from fixed arrangements in worship, and, while observing the spirit of those arrangements, adapt ourselves to the varying tastes of different ages and countries, and the advances made in art and culture. We can understand this kind of reasoning, or rather of assertion in the mouth of one who believes that we may now devise our own modes of worshipping God. In his mouth it would have a measure of consistency and we would

answer him, as we have done, by vindicating the true law of worship. But at least one writer, who professes firm adherence to the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, puts forward the same sentiment and adduces the matter of foot-washing, performed and, in some sense, inculcated by the Saviour, as an instance in which, while we should follow the spirit, we may deviate from the external form of the observance. His reasoning virtually is this, that just as we may duly copy the example set us by Christ, and the instructions given by him in connection with the example, without literally engaging in the operation of washing the feet of the brethren; so we may adequately obey a command to use certain instruments by using some instrument, or instruments, not named in the specification. But is this writer prepared to maintain, that foot-washing was ordained by Christ to be observed as literally in the church as the use of certain instruments was ordained for the temple service? If I understood Christ to have ordained that the observance of foot-washing be maintained in the church, then I would literally observe it. But, for reasons which I cannot now pause to present, I do not believe, nor does the writer alluded to believe, that he ordained such an observance; his purpose being, to teach by his example, in an emblematic way, a great lesson. On the other hand, God of old enjoined the use of specific instruments in his worship, and for centuries, we know, he was understood by the Israelites to have done so. We have on the one side an emblematic lesson; on the other an ordinance of worship definitely prescribed. Because we may be said to obey the emblematic lesson, though we never literally wash the saints' feet, it does not follow that we properly obey the command to use certain musical instruments, unless we do actually use them. The cases are not parallel; for the spirit is all that is required in the one, whereas in the other, the outward form, as well as the spirit, is obligatory. It may be added that if the example of Christ in the matter of foot-washing, may be duly honored by compliance with the spirit of his direction, then, if the cases are parallel, the precept to use instruments can be sufficiently obeyed by our exercising the spirit of that service without any instruments at all.

A quibble drawn from the primitive practice known as the kiss of charity, may be disposed of in substantially the same way as that drawn from the operation of foot-washing.

On the whole, the position taken seems valid, that the appointment of specific instruments of music for use in the temple, the loss of those instruments, and the lack of any definite instructions to guide in constructing them, are circumstances which point to the conclusion that the instrumental feature of the ancient worship was ceremonial and temporary in design.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE PRECEPTIVE THEORY EXAMINED—ARGUMENT AGAINST IT FROM THE SILENCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The ceremonial character of the instrumental music of the Jewish ritual is further indicated by the fact, as I take it to be, that the New Testament affords

no countenance to the opinion that such music is to form a feature of New Testament worship. I do not press the point that for every part of lawful New Testament worship, there must be New Testament authority. That is a view of the question which will probably be presented before the close of this discussion. At present, it is proposed merely to show that the New Testament lends no support to the opinion that instrumental music belongs to the worship of the New Testament church, and to use this consideration as a proof in part that instrumental music as practised in the Old Testament worship belonged to the fleeting ceremonial system.

When we ask for any New Testament evidence that instrumental music belongs to the worship of the present dispensation, we are told in reply that for a time after the death of Christ, and even after the eventful day of Pentecost, the disciples attended the temple service which embraced instrumental music; that, moreover, in the Book of Revelation, John relates that in vision he saw the redeemed, or certain companies of them, equipped with harps while in the act of rendering praise to God; and, furthermore, that in certain texts describing or enjoining the service of formal praise a word, *psallō*, is used, which carries in it a suggestion of instrumental music.

These items of evidence must be noticed in detail.

In relation to the first of them, which alleges that, for a time, the professed friends of Christ, after his death, frequented the temple in which instrumental music in worship was practised, it is conceded to be correct; for we read in Acts 2:46, of their "continuing with one accord in the temple," and are informed in Acts 3:1, 8, that Peter and John on a certain day "went up together into the temple at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour," and that in their company, the lame man whom Peter healed on that occasion, entered into the temple, "walking and leaping and praising God." It would seem that at first the temple was resorted to for the purpose, chiefly, perhaps, of rendering praise to God, but manifestly, also, with the view on the part of the christians, of meeting and conferring with each other in the spacious courts of that edifice; while soon the prominent aim in repairing to the temple seems to have been either to impart or to receive instruction in the gospel. That this last supposition is correct may be argued from Acts 5:12, 20, 21, 25, 42.

It is also to be borne in mind that for a season, many of the Jewish converts considered themselves even bound to observe circumcision and other rites of the Old Testament service, and felt strongly disposed to demand that all who should join them from the Gentile world must come under the same yoke, Acts. 21:20, 21, 26. For a time after the death of Christ, the separation between the temple and the church was not very complete, and even so long as the temple stood there may have been a measure of forbearance exercised toward those, who though followers of Christ, still fondly looked toward the long established services there maintained. The transition from the ancient service was made gradually in consideration of human weakness, so that the old saying is not an unapt description of the light in which the ceremonial law in its terminating stages may be viewed, "The law for a season was dying, then it was dead, and then deadly."

Hence, it would be unwise to argue that the temple service, which, for a time, may have had an attraction and been, in a measure, allowable for the members of the New Testament church was meant to be perpetuated in that church. If the argument under consideration would prove aught in favor of instrumental music, it would prove equally favorable to the retention of sacrifice and incense; that is to say, the argument would prove too much for those who advance it, and, therefore, it proves nothing to their purpose.

A question has been asked which may as well be answered at this point as at any other. It is this:—"Accustomed, as the Jews were, to instrumental music in the worship of the temple, how could they, on embracing Christ, have abandoned such music so quietly that no record comes to us of a struggle in its behalf?" The answer which this question, as put by the advocates of instruments, is deemed sufficient to elicit is, "Preposterous! Had they been required to surrender the music of instruments, they would have offered resistance so vigorous that a report of it would surely have reached us. Hence they, doubtless, retained the music when they relinquished the temple."

Not to insist at present on the evidence which the history of the early church supplies in support of the view, that from apostolic days the worship of Christians was unmingled with music of instruments, it may be said that being accustomed to instrumental music as an element of worship in the temple only, the Jewish converts to Christ would no more expect its transfer to their meetings than they would expect the transfer of the practice of offering sacrifice and incense. And here it may be remarked that the entire silence of the New Testament and of the records which come down to us from the early church, as to any dispute about instrumental music, is a formidable fact in the way of those who desire to persuade us that in the time of the apostles, the christian church used in its services instruments of music. For if such music had been in the temple only, and not in the synagogue also, how could it have been brought into the New Testament Church without a struggle? And if it had been in both synagogue and temple, how could it have been excluded from the christian assemblies without our hearing of a struggle in the case? The only view which comports with the facts of history, is that instrumental music was regarded as an element of temple worship, no more to be transferred to the services of the New Testament church, than sacrifice itself. On this supposition all is plain. On any other all is mystery, or contradiction.

Turning to the second item of evidence put forward to prove that the New Testament sanctions the use of instruments in the worship of New Testament times, namely, that John in vision, as recorded in Rev. 5:8, 9; 14:1-3; 15:2, 3, saw certain companies of the redeemed having harps, while engaged in praising God, to this, I would say in general that it appears far from forcible. It is a matter of dispute whether those particular visions relate to the redeemed in heaven, or to the saints on earth. If to the former, the instances adduced are aside from the question, which pertains to the worship of the church on earth. If to the latter, the question arises, How far are the visions to be regarded as exhibiting New

Testament worshippers in imagery drawn from the Old Testament? It is to be remembered that the book of Revelation is thoroughly pervaded by allusions to Old Testament institutions and customs. For we read in it of a temple, of censers, of incense, of a Lamb slain, of priestly robes, and of palms in the hands. Is it any wonder then that we should read in it of harps in connection with worship? If the representations of John touching the worship of the redeemed must be taken literally, we must suppose that worshippers now should be clad in white vestments, and have palms as well as harps in their hands. Nay, if exact conformity must be secured, each worshipper must have a harp, or, at least, an instrument of music; for in chapter 5 : 8, the four living creatures and the four and twenty elders, are expressly described as having each of them, a harp in his hand; while in chapter 15 : 2, those who stood on the sea of glass, victors over the beast, had harps of God, each of them seemingly being furnished with that instrument. Moreover, in the former of the two passages, just referred to, those spoken of as having harps, are described also as having golden vials, full of odors, which vials with their contents, we are distinctly informed, were, that is symbolized, "the prayers of saints." Does it not seem entirely natural then to understand the harps as symbolizing the energetic praises of the saints? And to the cavil, that the singing of the new song must, on the same principle, be taken as symbolical, it may be answered that the whole scene, depicted in those visions, is symbolical in a general way of all the homage in thought, word, and deed accruing to God from his redeemed people, without being meant to set forth the precise forms in which this homage should be rendered. The apostle, familiar with the Old Testament order and stately service, has the future revealed to him under Old Testament forms.

It is, at the same time, not a little singular that in none of these apocalyptic passages is it stated, that any music was produced upon the harps, which John saw. The worshippers held harps in their hands, but are not said to have played on them, although they engaged in singing. Even in chapter 14 : 2, according to the most approved reading, it is not stated, that any instrumental music mingled with the song of the redeemed. The Revised version is here, I have no doubt, correct, in which the words, "And the voice which I heard was as the voice of harpers harping with their harps," are substituted for these words of the authorized version, "And I heard the voice of harpers harping with their harps." Just as the sound which John heard is said to have been as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder, although not actually produced by a rush of waters, or a flash of lightning, so it might be as the voice of harps, without being actually the product of the harp. May not the harps which in two of the passages under consideration, John says he saw in the hands of worshippers, have been simply, though unused, symbols signifying that the singers were all like the priests, or the Levites of the former dispensation, permitted to come near to God, and abide in his courts giving him praise?

CHAPTER XV.

THE PROCEPTIVE THEORY EXAMINED—ARGUMENT AGAINST IT FROM THE SILENCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT—MEANING OF PSALLO.

Two of the items of New Testament evidence, alleged to be favorable to the retention of instrumental music in worship, even after the abrogation of the Jewish ceremonies, having been examined, the third and last item must now be weighed. This, it will be remembered, turns on the meaning of the word psallo, which occurs in a few texts, having or supposed to have a bearing on the worship of the New Testament church. This verb occurs only five times in the Greek Testament, namely in Rom. 15 : 9; Eph. 5 : 19; Jas. 5 : 13, and twice in 1 Cor. 14 : 15. In the text named it is intimated that whatever is meant by this verb, might and should be done in worship during the New Testament times. But it is asserted that the word in question means to sing with an instrumental accompaniment, and hence it is contended that instrumental music should, or at least, may have a place in the worship of God now. It behooves us, therefore, to look carefully into a word supposed to be fraught with such a consequence. This verb is commonly supposed to be derived from "psao," meaning to touch, and signified in successive stages of its history, to touch lightly and quickly, to twitch or twang, to play on a stringed instrument, to play on the harp as an accompaniment of singing, to sing, to sing to or in honor of any one, that is to praise in song. It would be easy to swell these pages by quoting definitions of the word from various authorities in lexicography, or interpretation; but I choose to forbear in this matter. This may be said, however, that while there is a general agreement that the word, at least in classical usage, involved the idea of playing on an instrument, particularly a stringed instrument, there are very many who maintain or admit that it came, in the lapse of time, to mean simply the act of singing. So strong is the evidence that the word at length lost the reference to instrumental music, and retained that of singing or praising, that Dr. Charles Hodge, though connected with a church which permits instrumental music in worship, frankly says, that in the New Testament psallo means, simply, to sing. See his commentary on 1st Cor. 14 : 15. It is worthy also of notice that in the English translations of the New Testament, which have been in use to any considerable extent, the word is always rendered to "sing," not to "play and sing," or "sing and play." It is so in our authorized version. It is so in the recently issued Revised version. It was so in the earlier version, and even in the Rhein's version, made by Roman Catholic scholars. In the version last named, the rendering in Eph. 5 : 19, is, "chanting and singing," instead of, "singing and making melody," as given in our authorized version. There seems to have existed in the minds of the historic translators, the very idea for which we now argue, that in the apostolic age, psallo had lost its instrumental sense, and meant merely to sing or praise. If it had been the view of those men that an allusion to instrumental music is involved in the word, they could have found words in English to indicate that allusion. The fact that they resorted to

no such means for exhibiting the alleged allusion shows that they did not believe it to exist. Even in Jas. 5:13, where the Revised version deviates from the authorized version, the change has not been made in favor of instrumental music, but rather the contrary, for instead of "let him sing psalms," as it is in the old version, the New has, "let him sing praise." How easy it would have been, when making a change at all, the propriety of which is very questionable, to have brought out the full force of the original, as some would have us understand it, by translating thus, "let him sing and play," or, "let him sing praise with an instrumental accompaniment."

There are reasons for thinking, that, at the time when the New Testament was written, psallo had gradually lost its earlier reference to instruments and acquired the sense of singing simply, or of singing praise. Some reasons for so thinking are here subjoined.

(1.) Such a change is not at all antecedently improbable. Those, acquainted with the history of any language, can easily recall numerous instances of greater changes in the meaning of words, than we now suppose to have occurred in the case of psallo. For instance, our word, choir, which means a company of singers, comes from a Greek word, which denoted, first, a circle, then a circular dance or a circle of dancers, then a band of singers and dancers, and finally a band of singers without any reference to a dance. Out of a multitude of available illustrations of the mutability of words let the example now given, suffice.

(2.) It is admitted on all hands, that the word we are now considering, psallo, did manifest, in the course of its history, very considerable mutation. Meaning radically to touch gently, or twitch, it came to mean, to twang the bow-string in archery, to play on a stringed instrument with the fingers, without a plectrum or striking implement; then to sing and play. It is easy to see how a word, evincing such fluctuation in sense, could finally lose the signification of thrumming and playing altogether, and assume that of singing simply. The supposition we make, therefore, so far from being incredible, is not even improbable, nay, it might almost be said is rendered probable, by the variation confessedly traceable in the history of this word.

(3.) There is reason to think, that nearly three centuries before the birth of Christ, when the translation of the Old Testament from the original Hebrew into Greek, known as the Septuagint translation, was made, this word psallo was in a state of transition, the older sense of singing with an instrumental accompaniment not having entirely disappeared, though giving place rapidly to the sense of singing simply, or of praising in song. This assumption seems best of all to meet and explain all the facts in the use of psallo by the authors of that venerable translation, and by subsequent writers. Among the facts alluded to are these, that in the Septuagint, psallo is apt to be employed when instruments of music are named or suggested in the context; and that on the other hand, when no instrument is named or plainly suggested, it is used seemingly in the general sense of praising by song. One thing is obvious, that the Seventy considered psallo, as a proper equivalent of the Hebrew "zimmër," the Piel form of the verb "zamar." Plainly,

the authors of the Septuagint version, regarded psallo as the most exact rendering of "zimmër," although in one instance at least, they have used another verb, "hummed," as the translation of "zimmër." Now some aid may be derived from "zimmër" in determining the importance of psallo. If "zimmër" can be proved to have had considerable latitude of meaning, the legitimate inference would be, that the Seventy used psallo with like latitude, its modal sense of singing with an instrument being little, if at all regarded.

Turning to zamar, which, in different modifications, occurs forty-eight times in the Hebrew scripture, forty-five of these being of the Piel form, we find much diversity of opinion as to the primary meaning of it. The older Hebraists recognized but one root of this form, and this they supposed primarily meant, to cut. To this central meaning they were wont to trace the two uses or applications made of the word; one of these being to prune, in which it occurs thrice, namely, in Lev. 25:3, 4, where it is in the Kal species, and in Isa. 5:6, where it is in the Niphal species, and the other being to praise in song or in rhythmical language. But by what process of thought, could a word which originally meant to cut, come to bear significations so diverse as pruning and praising? Might it not have come thus:—To prune is to cut off or remove redundancies, and to praise in song, especially in Hebrew, implies a process of cutting off, and the reduction of thought to certain measures and limits. Beza, Drusius, Leigh, Parkhurst and Lowth, are among the number of those who have expressly favored this view. In his "Preliminary Dissertations" to his Translation of Isaiah, Lowth, adverting to this point, says, "This peculiar conformation of sentences, short, concise, with frequent pauses and regular intervals, divided into pairs for the most part of corresponding lines, is the most evident characteristic now remaining of poetry among the Hebrews as distinguished from prose, and this, I suppose, is what is implied in the name 'mizmor,' which I understand to be the proper name for verse, that is for numerous, rhythmical, or metrical language."

The opinion which now prevails among the best Hebrew scholars is that there are two distinct roots of the same form, zamar, one denoting to cut or prune, and the other to produce musical sounds. But it is a question still whether the sound primarily meant is that made by the human voice, or that produced on instrumental strings. Gesenius, a high authority, pronounces in favor of the latter view, and understands the Piel, zimmër, to have meant primarily to play on a stringed instrument, and then to sing with an instrumental accompaniment.

Now, the judgment of Gesenius in such a question is entitled to great respect, but it is far from being final or conclusive. Hupfeld, hardly if at all inferior to Gesenius in Hebrew scholarship, regards humming or singing as the central and primary meaning of this word, while Fuerst, the peer at least of Gesenius in Oriental learning, and enjoying the advantage of that great scholar's researches, holds that zamar meant originally to hum with the voice, to sing, and only from association of instrumental music with singing to have come by degrees to be suggestive of such music, but that in this last case it is attended by the name of the instrument with a connecting preposition.

I believe that Fuerst's view is substantially correct, and that *zimmër* contains in itself no allusion to instrumental music; although being sometimes coupled with the name of an instrument, it may have become so far suggestive of an instrumental performance that the translators employed *psallo* nearly always as its equivalent.

As an acute writer, Rev. Robert Nevin, has observed, the word "play" in English does not suggest the production of instrumental music, unless an instrument is named, or is from the connection implied. "Will you play?" may mean "Will you play at billiards," just as readily as, "Will you play on the piano?" the connection or circumstances determining in which of these senses, or in what other sense, the word, in any given case is to be taken. In like manner, the word *zimmër*, while suggesting the idea of musical sounds or rhythmical modulations, does not of itself indicate that these are produced by, or in connection with an instrument. In order to present this idea the instrument must be named or plainly suggested in the context. There is no more reason for saying that *zimmër* means to play on an instrument, because it is sometimes attended with the mention of instruments, than for saying that "*balal*" means this, for it, too, is often attended with similar mention. Yet who will say that "*balal*" means to make instrumental music, or to sing with such music? In Ps 33: 2, the Hebrew verb "*yadhah*," is followed by a preposition which connects it with the name of an instrument, yet who will venture to affirm that "*yadhah*" means to produce instrumental music?

The generic meaning of *zimmër* seems to be to celebrate or praise in a musical, or rhythmical way, without specifying whether with music, vocal or instrumental, or both combined, although vocal would be more readily understood, unless something external to the word indicated something else.

Guided by Fuerst's Hebrew Concordance, I have examined every instance in which *zimmër* occurs in the Old Testament, and have found that only in six instances, if I have computed aright, is an instrument named in connection with it, the connection being made by an intervening preposition. In eight instances it is connected directly with the name of God, the object of praise, and must mean to extol or celebrate. In these cases how grotesque would it sound were we to translate thus, "I will sing and play God!" Feeling this, the Septuagint translators have supplied a preposition equivalent to our word "to." This, however, they have done unwarrantably, as the verb plainly means, to praise or laud. The verb is connected, by a preposition, with God, the object of praise, in twenty-two instances, an instrument being named in only five of those occurrences. In nearly all the other occurrences of the word, it either governs directly the word "name," that is the name of God, or is connected with it by a preposition. Before passing from this point, it is but candid to state, that Delitzsch, an acknowledged authority in Hebrew learning, holds that *zimmër* means to make music on stringed instruments, although, in his commentaries, he has not adhered to this rendering, which is one that would probably be as inconvenient to the advocates, as to the opponents of an organ in worship.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE PRECEPTIVE THEORY EXAMINED—NEW TESTAMENT EVIDENCE—MEANING OF THE WORD *PSALLO*.

What light is shed on the meaning of *psallo* by the preceding investigation of the meaning of "*zimmër*?" This I think, that as "*zimmër*" meant to praise or celebrate, without any necessary implication of instrumental music, so *psallo*, the Greek equivalent employed by the Seventy, must have been reckoned by them, as of like latitude of meaning, that is, as denoting to praise melodiously or rhythmically without involving necessarily the idea of instrumental music. When, moreover, this translation had been disseminated, it would aid in accelerating the transition already begun, in virtue of which, *psallo* drifted away from its earlier classical meaning.

Confirmation of the view that in the lapse of time, the instrumental suggestion involved in *psallo* faded away or receded to the back-ground, may be found in the writings of the Greek Fathers, who, though perfectly aware, as they often show, of the classical meaning of *psallo*, and aware too, that in the New Testament we are commanded to do whatever is meant by it, never used or favored the use of instruments in the worship of God.

Besides, in their writings, we meet with instances in which they use *psallo* to mean the act of singing simply. For example, Chrysostom, in a passage already quoted from his Commentary on Ps. 150, says, "For the eye praises, when it does not look unchastely, and the tongue when it sings." (In Greek *hotan psallë*.) Here the tongue is represented as doing all that is meant by *psallo*.

Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus in Syria, who flourished about the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century, commenting on Eph. 5: 19, says, "For he sings (*psallei*) with the heart, who not only moves the tongue, but also excites the mind to the understanding of those things which are uttered." Here again, the only instrument named or apparently applied, is the tongue.

Similar language is used by Basil, the Great, in his Epistle to the clergy in Neo Cæsarea.

In the Fifteenth Canon of the Council of Laodicea, held probably about A. D. 364, *psallo* and its derivative *psaltës* are used in the sense respectively of singing and singer.

In very many cases also, the Fathers, while distinctly recognizing the classical sense of *psallo*, yet undertake to show, in an allegorical way, that in praising God with the voice, or with the life, we perform fully what is meant by *psallo*. For example, Eusebius, commenting on Ps. 33: 2, 3, where *psallo* occurs, uses this language, "He means instruments prescribed according to the first delivery of the law. Whoever preserves the inner as well as the outer senses pure and blameless, sings on a ten-stringed psaltery to God. 'Sing ye to him a new song.' An old song is sung with the ancient harp and psaltery, that is lifeless instruments, symbols and as it were images, in which the former people delighted. But a new song, grander and worthier of God, is uttered to him through the living harp and the devoted ten-stringed psaltery." Again, expounding Ps. 66: 2, he says, "Then

secondly, he commands to sing (*psallein*) to his name, which is wont to be observed by us in all places." Then he goes on to show that the command is obeyed by using the human body as an instrument by which to praise God. In their interpretations, Eusebins, and others of the Fathers, are often fanciful and self-contradictory. They appear thoroughly conscious of the classical meaning of the word *psallo*, yet labor to show that this might be adequately realized in the absence of all musical instruments. It is at least obvious that they would not have needed to resort, in their explanations of *psallo*, to far-fetched analogies, had instrumental music been used in the church in their day. If instruments had been employed, what need was there to resort in their interpretation of *psallo* to the analogies alluded to? If not employed, why not, seeing the word *psallo*, classically used, was so suggestive of musical instruments? It is worthy of notice also that the Eastern or Greek church, which might be presumed to know the force of *psallo*, is both theoretically and practically opposed to the use of instruments in worship.

The verb, *psallo*, was at an early date transferred to the Latin vocabulary. Andrews, in his "Latin Dictionary on the basis of Freund," says that *psallo* means "in ecclesiastical Latin to sing the Psalms of David." It is used by the leading Latin Fathers, in the sense of singing without any suggestion of instrumental music. Jerome, for instance, in his Commentary on Ephesians, remarks on Ch. 5, v. 19, "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,' that is, We ought to sing and make melody, and praise God rather with the mind than with the voice. This is of a truth what is said, Singing and making melody in your hearts to the Lord. Mark that Jerome understood "mind and voice" as competent to do all that is denoted by *psallo*.

Isidore, of Seville, makes the following remark, "Primitiva, autem, ecclesia ita psallebat, ut modico flexu vocis faceret resonare psallentem, ita ut pronuncianti viciniore esset quam canenti," which means, The primitive church so sung psalms as to cause the singer to sound with a slight modulation of voice, insomuch that he appeared more like one speaking than one singing.

It is not to be wondered at, whether we consider the usage of the Septuagint, or of the Greek Fathers and of the Latin Fathers as well, that Sophocles, in his "Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine period," covering the state of the language from B. C. 146 to A. D. 1100, should have defined *psallo* as meaning "to chant or sing religious hymns."

CHAPTER XVII.

THE PRECEPTIVE THEORY EXAMINED—NEW TESTAMENT EVIDENCE—CONSIDERATION OF PSALLO CONCLUDED.

It may be said that the evidence adduced from the writings of the Fathers, as to the meaning of the word *psallo*, represents the state of the language at a date, 200 or 300 years later than the days of the apostles, and therefore does not avail

for the interpretation of *psallo* in the New Testament. But on the other hand, let these considerations be allowed due weight:

First, This word is one which confessedly changed in meaning, going through several modifications, and appearing in a state of flux even within the limits of classical usage.

Second, Employed in the Septuagint to represent "zimmër," *psallo* must, nearly three centuries before our era, have been understood as possessing considerable latitude of meaning, for "zimmër" seems to have been so used by the sacred writers. The Seventy may the more readily have accepted *psallo*, as the standing equivalent of "zimmër," because the former had been already associated, even in classical usage, with rites of worship. Those who were familiar with Hebrew would, in reading the Septuagint, be led to regard *psallo*, as meaning to praise or celebrate, and that with the voice alone, unless an instrument were named or manifestly implied in connection with it. The influence of the circulation of the Septuagint would be to accelerate and confirm the change of meaning in the case of *psallo*.

Third, With thorough knowledge of the classical meaning of *psallo*, and with the fact fully before them, that in the New Testament Christians are exhorted and directed to do what is implied in that word, the Fathers, whether Greek or Latin, never understood that instruments of music must be used in worship in order to compliance with those exhortations and directions. In connection with this let it be borne in mind, that the Eastern or Greek church, which might be presumed to know and feel the force of *psallo*, is, and always has been, utterly opposed to the use of musical instruments in worship.

Fourth, Those early Christian writers must have understood *psallo*, as used in the Epistles, to mean either simply to sing, or else to retain its later classical meaning, of singing with an instrumental accompaniment, but only in a figurative sense, just as the word sacrifice is often used in such a sense. Practically, however, the result is the same on either supposition.

Fifth, Had the view that *psallo*, as used in the apostolic precepts, does not require the use of musical instruments in worship, been an after growth posterior to the apostolic age, we should have expected to find some tokens that it had taken shape, and gained acceptance only gradually; whereas the earlier Fathers, who touch upon the subject, are as definite and settled in this view as the later.

Sixth, If we assume that musical instruments were in use in the service of the early church, it will be difficult, if not impossible to account for the view taken by the Fathers of the directions given by Paul and James, in which the word *psallo* occurs, and if we suppose that they were not in use in those services, we cannot understand how this could be, unless the church regarded the directions in question as neither commanding, nor countenancing, the employment of instrumental music in worship.

The word *psallo* having been dwelt upon so long, the New Testament texts, in which it occurs, may be dismissed in a somewhat summary manner. One of these, as already mentioned, is 1 Cor. 14: 15, where the apostle says, "What is it

then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also." If the verb *psallo* means to sing and play, then in using it, as he does here, the apostle pledges himself to sing and play on an instrument to God. Must he not then have been an instrumental performer, seeing that he intimates his resolution to do whatever is meant by *psallo*, which is, according to the view we combat, to sing and play, not merely to sing while others play? I cannot help thinking with Dr. Hodge, that the apostle binds himself to no such performance, but to singing simply in the praise of God.

In Eph. 5:19, the Apostle directs us to do whatever is meant by "*adontes kai psallontes*." In our version these words are rendered, "singing and making melody." The Revised version leaves this unchanged. Even the Rheims version, produced by Romanists, translates the words under consideration thus: "Chanting and singing." Against these renderings it is urged by the patrons of instrumental music that they are tautological, and that, if "*adontes*" be translated singing, "*psallontes*" must mean something different. But to this it may be replied that, even on the supposition of our opponents, there must be a measure of repetition; for they hold that *psallo* means to sing and play, nay, that singing is the principal element in the complex meaning of the word. Besides, in scripture, the use of various words in the same clause, to express and emphasize one idea, is not uncommon, as any one may see, who reads with care the 119th Psalm. Moreover, as the Apostle had just adverted to the Book of Psalms, as there is good reason to think, under the several name of psalms, hymns and songs, he here uses a variety of musical terms to enforce the one duty of using, in the way of song, the compositions named; the two participles which he employs being but echoes of two of the terms he had used to designate the psalms. In addition to all the considerations presented, let this be noted: that if the Apostle refers to instrumental music at all, he enjoins the use of it just as much as the use of singing, a conclusion from which most friends of instrumental music recoil.

As to Jas. 5:13, where the word rendered "let him sing psalms" is "*psallete*," it may be said that it contains not only a recommendation, but an injunction. If so, and if, moreover, *psallete* means "sing with an instrument," then it is the duty of every one who is merry or cheerful to play on an instrument of music, just as much as it is the duty of every one who is afflicted to pray. It is to be feared that but very few Christians, hitherto, have ever complied with the Apostolic injunction, so understood. The proper rendering of the word, I am persuaded, is that given in our authorized version. The feebler rendering in the Revised version, "Let him sing praise," suits the purpose of our argument quite as well, although I prefer, in this case, the older version. It is a suggestive fact that, in all the New Testament, there is no express mention made of the use of any instrument in New Testament worship, unless it be in the symbolical book of Revelation. In one instance besides, Paul, by an incidental touch, suggests the rapidness of instrumental music, when he says, 1 Cor. 13:1,—"*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.*"

The survey now taken of the passages in the New Testament, supposed by some to favor the use of instruments of music in the worship of the present age, warrants, as I judge, the conclusion that such passages have no such bearing, and therefore tends to prove that instrumental music was ceremonial.

Thus a series of considerations has been submitted, converging to the establishment of this proposition, that instrumental music in worship was ordained simply as a part of the ceremonial system; and as our discussion has been somewhat extended and intricate, I shall here recapitulate the considerations advanced. It has been urged that instrumental music is in keeping with the sensuousness and carnality of the ceremonial law; that it sustained a peculiarly close relation to the ritual of the Levitical worship; that it was not used in formal worship, unless at the tabernacle and temple; that, in consonance with the rigidity of the ceremonial law, particular instruments were specified, which, moreover, are lost, while no description of them has been given adequate to guide in reproducing them; and, finally, that in the New Testament the continuance of instrumental music in worship receives no countenance.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE PRECEPTIVE THEORY EXAMINED—ARGUMENT FOR IT, DRAWN FROM DIRECTIONS IN THE PSALMS TO USE INSTRUMENTS, CONSIDERED.

Two of the arguments drawn from scripture in favor of the preceptive theory as to the use of instrumental music in worship have now been disposed of. These are that such music, having been once prescribed by God, cannot be, in itself, sinful; and that it must still be obligatory in worship, because there is no indication of the repeal of the appointment.

THIRD. A third point urged from scripture on the same side, is that in the book of Psalms, there are numerous commands addressed, apparently to men without restriction, to praise God by using musical instruments in worship. The 150th Psalm, with which the Psalter closes, is a rousing summons to the performance of the duty of praising God, and that with various instruments of music. Now, it is contended, that if these psalms were meant to be used in the worship of God in the New Testament age as well as in the Old, nay, even if they are worthy to be read as a part of scripture, it must be lawful and even obligatory to use instruments of music now in the praise of God. This argument is supposed to bear with double force on those who hold with the writer, that the songs of the inspired Psalter, and only they, should be sung in the formal worship of God.

In reply a few remarks are submitted.

I. It is a significant fact that the great mass of Christians, since apostolic times, have never felt it obligatory in praising God, to use instruments of music either personally or by proxy, while many of them have felt it to be their duty to oppose the use of them.

II. It is an awkward fact for those who advance this argument that those bodies of Christians, who have been most zealous for the use of the Psalms in the

service of song, have been the most averse to the use of instruments of music in that service. In the early Church, when the Psalms were in universal and almost exclusive use in the exercise of formal praise, no instruments of music were employed in that exercise, and in the Reformation period, those churches that used the inspired Psalter alone, as the matter of praise, opposed the use of instrumental music in worship. We may challenge our opponents to name a church, since the days of the apostles, which has assigned to the scripture Psalter the place of honor due to it, as the only divinely authorized hymn book of the church, and yet has favored the use of instrumental music in the celebration of the praise of God. This is a phenomenon which the world has not yet seen I believe, although strenuous efforts are now being made to afford mankind such a novel spectacle. The Church of Holland, which for a long time, adhered to the exclusive, or nearly exclusive, use of the scripture psalms in worship, did retain to some extent the use of organs; but the retention was much against the judgment and wishes of the best men in that church, and was due rather to the influence of the State, which became the patron and, in some measure, the tyrant of the church. In the year 1554, the Synod of Holland and Zeeland, resolved to urge the magistrates to expel organs and all instruments of music from the churches. In 1574, the Synod of Zeeland took similar action, and even the great Synod of Dort (1618), in its 50th canon, decreed that the magistrates "be asked to abolish the playing of organs in churches, even outside the stated worship, whether before or after meetings." Somewhat later, Voetius, one of the most learned theologians of whom Holland can boast, devoted an extended section of his famous work on "Ecclesiastical Polity," to a refutation of the pleas advanced in behalf of instrumental music in worship. I do not now stop to account for the fact that, in proportion as the psalms are honored, instruments of music as helps in worship, are deprecated and despised; but I note it, as constituting presumptive evidence that the plea under consideration is not weighty. Those who desert the psalms are those who take most kindly to the organ.

III. In the Psalms, we find embodied numerous calls to offer sacrifices; to enter the courts of the temple, and to walk about Zion, or promises on the part of the writer to do such things. Are these utterances to be understood as either binding or warranting us to do the very things indicated? If not, why should kindred utterances, in regard to the use of musical instruments, be counted a valid plea for using them in worship now?

For instance, in Ps. 5 : 7, the Psalmist says, "But as for me, I will come into thy house in the multitude of thy mercy; and in thy fear, I will worship toward thy holy temple." In singing this, do we promise to visit Jerusalem, and worship toward the literal temple or tabernacle?

We read thus, in Ps. 26 : 6, "I will wash mine hands in innocency, so will I compass thy altar, O Lord!" Must we then have in our churches, a literal laver, and a material altar? We shall be in close fellowship with Rome, when we shall have procured those improvements.

"Therefore, I will offer in his tabernacle sacrifices of joy," says David, in Ps.

27 : 6. In singing this language, do we pledge ourselves to offer such thank offerings as were no doubt primarily meant by the writer of the psalm?

In Ps. 43 : 4, the Psalmist indeed says, "Yea, upon the harp I will praise thee, O, God, my God;" but he also says in the context, "O, send out thy light and thy truth and let them lead me; let them bring me unto thy holy hill, and to thy tabernacles. Then will I go unto the altar of God." If we cannot consistently sing this, and at the same time refuse to use the harp, how can we consistently sing it, and refuse to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in quest of the sanctuary and of the sacred altar? If we can and should dispense with the literal, material altar, why not with the literal harp?

In Ps. 47 : 1, the summons is issued, "O, clap your hands, all ye people." Must we then literally engage in the exercise of hand clapping, in order to sing these words consistently, and in order to obey them whether we sing them or not?

We are called upon in Ps. 48 : 12, "to walk about Zion," and "go round about her," and "tell the towers thereof." Can we duly honor this call without making a visit to Palestine and searching for the towers of Zion? If we can, may we not duly honor the call to use musical instruments, without using them in a literal sense?

In Ps. 51 : 19, David says, "Then shalt thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with burnt offering and whole burnt offering: thus shall they offer bullocks upon thy altar." Are we then in this dispensation to perform in a literal sense what is here predicted or promised?

We read these words in Ps. 66 : 13-15, "I will go into thy house with burnt offerings: I will pay thee my vows, which my lips uttered, my mouth hath spoken when I was in trouble. I will offer unto thee burnt sacrifices of fatlings, with the incense of rams; I will offer bullocks with goats."

In Ps. 81 : 2, we are told to "take a psalm and bring hither the timbrel and the pleasant harp;" but in verse 3, we are also told to, "blow up the trumpet in the new moon, in the time appointed, on our solemn feast day."

"Bring an offering and come into his courts," it is said in Ps. 96 : 8. Undoubtedly this meant in the first instance to inculcate the duty of visiting the tabernacle or temple, and of bringing a gift according to the Levitical law. Do we feel that we are now bound to do these things?

Ps. 100, contains the address, "Enter into his gates with thanksgiving and into his courts with praise, which primarily is a call to repair to the central seat of Jewish worship; yet we do not feel under obligation, or at liberty, though we read and sing thus, to go in quest of that place of resort.

In Ps. 107 : 22, it is said, with reference to men at large, "And let them sacrifice the sacrifices of thanksgiving;" yet do we hold ourselves even at liberty to offer now the literal sacrifices primarily meant?

The Psalmist in Ps. 116 : 17, expresses the following purpose or vow. "I will offer to thee, the sacrifice of thanksgiving," yet we sing this language without deeming ourselves delinquent, because we render no Levitical thank offering to God.

In Ps. 118 : 27, near the close of a passage which clearly relates to the New Testament age, the command is expressed, "Bind the sacrifice with cords, even unto the horns of the altar;" yet we do not comply literally with this mandate.

When we sing the 122d Ps., we use these words, "Our feet shall stand within thy gates, O, Jerusalem." When we sing these words, do we expect the issue, in a literal respect, which they express?

In Ps. 149 : 3, the direction is given, "Let them praise his name in the dance." The Skaters comply with this literally. It is to be feared that too many comply literally with the call to dance. Not many, however, propose to praise God thereby. In passing, it may be mentioned that the word, "machol," rendered dance here, is supposed by some to mean an instrument of music. The matter is hardly important enough for the object now in view to merit any special discussion, and I will content myself with saying that the very highest authorities, ancient and modern, in Hebrew literature, sustain the rendering in our version.

In verse 6 of the same psalm, it is said by way of indirect command to the saints, "Let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hand." Must we then brandish a literal sword when engaged in singing the praises of God?

Is it not apparent, from these specimens of the phraseology of the Psalms, that no stress can be laid on the references which they contain to musical instruments, as an argument for the use of instruments now? By the same line of argument, the entire Levitical ritual might be proved worthy of imitation in our worship. This, indeed, is a consideration which lends a great degree of practical importance to the discussion in which we are now engaged. For it is hard to tell to what extremes ritualism may go, if once the principles of interpretation used to procure the admission of musical instruments into the church service be adopted.

4. In the offering of praise to God by lip and life, we carry into due effect the exhortations, commands and professions contained in the Psalms concerning the use of instruments. This is substantially the view taken of this matter by the entire ancient church. In the call made upon all men to praise God with instruments, there may be an intimation intended that the time was coming when all the people of God would be Levites, and the mode of worship by the mediation of human priests, or agents, should come to an end.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE PRECEPTIVE THEORY EXAMINED—THE ARGUMENT IN ITS FAVOR, FOUNDED ON CERTAIN OLD TESTAMENT PREDICTIONS, CONSIDERED.

FOURTH. An argument closely akin to that which has just been considered, in support of the pro-instrumental preceptive theory, is drawn from certain passages in the Old Testament, which are supposed to foretell, with apparent approval, the use of instruments in the worship of God during New Testament times.

The following are the passages alluded to: Ps. 68 : 25, "The singers went before, the players on instruments followed after; among them were the damsels

playing with timbrels;" Ps. 87 : 7, "As well the singers as the players on instruments shall be there;" Ps. 66 : 4, "All the earth shall worship thee, and shall sing unto thee; they shall sing to thy name;" Isaiah 12 : 4, "And in that day shall ye say, Praise the Lord, call upon his name, declare his doings among the people, make mention that his name is exalted."

Even granting what is claimed, that the texts now cited relate chiefly to New Testament times, they do not yield any aid to the cause in behalf of which they are marshalled. In general, it may be said that they express, in language saturated with allusions to Old Testament rites and customs, the joy and exultation which the appearance of the Son of God in the flesh should and would produce.

In the first of the texts just quoted, the scene depicted is that of a triumphal procession, such as it would have been among the Israelites. Thus, in vivid imagery, is conveyed to us an idea of the joy and ecstasy with which the friends of Christ would celebrate the victories achieved by the great Captain of their salvation. If any one should demur to this view, and claim that a literal fulfilment of the scene delineated must be expected, then I would say that the use of an organ, or of several other instruments, in the church would not meet this demand. If literality be insisted on, we must have in our churches processions composed of singers and instrumental performers, the singers taking the lead, and the rear being composed of players on instruments, among whom girls, furnished with timbrels, must form a conspicuous quota. Among the denominations professing Christianity, the one which seems to approach nearest to the literal realization of this ideal sketch is the Roman Catholic, which delights in processions and spectacular displays. The priests of Rome can hardly walk in like ordinary mortals, when about to officiate in the presence of the congregation, but must lend to their entry the pomp of a procession. And how frequently, in connection with certain festivals, are the people of that communion entertained with the pageantry of ecclesiastical processions! In passing, it may be remarked that, in some denominations, whose very names are suggestive of protest against Rome, feeble imitations of their old foe are becoming common, the entrance of the officiating minister being the signal in many congregations for an outburst of song called a "voluntary." All this looks pretty, and by some may be deemed edifying; but the student of human nature and of history will discern in it the buddings of sacerdotalism.

The second of the aforementioned texts, namely, Ps. 87 : 7, does not warrant the inference that in New Testament worship there must, or may, be instrumental music; but merely this inference, that the joy and strong emotion of the worshippers shall be such as were expressed in the temple when vocal and instrumental music, blending together, filled its courts and precincts with a flood of song. It is noticeable that the Psalmist does not say, "as well the players on instruments as the singers shall be there," which might have been deemed the natural statement, inasmuch as the singing was the principal element in the service of song, but he says, "as well the singers as the players on instruments shall be there;" the design perhaps being to intimate that the worship of the church would not be a mere out-

ward mechanical service, such as might be signified by the use of instruments; but that it would be vital and hearty, such as vocal music might suggest. If any one should still insist that the prediction of this clause demands the use of instruments in worship now, we might reply, that by the same rule of interpretation, the New Testament worshippers must have literal vessels for drawing water, when they engage in worship, for the Psalmist adds to the words we have been noticing, the clause, "All my springs are in thee." In the whole psalm, the church of Christ, under the symbol of Zion, is described, and just as music of various sorts marked the worship with which Zion was associated, so the Psalmist describes the church as fully supplied with musical performers, both vocal and instrumental, nothing, necessary for Christian enjoyment, edification, and expression being absent.

The applicability of the texts, Ps. 66 : 4, and Isa. 12 : 4, so far as the point before us is concerned, turns on the meaning of the word "zimmër," which occurs in them; but as that word has been separately discussed, I do not deem it needful to dwell further on the texts in question.

The arguments usually employed to support the preceptive theory, that is the view that instrumental music ought to have place in the worship of the church during the New Testament age, have now been stated and scrutinized. Longer time has been devoted to the review of them, than may seem advisable, but I have been induced to pursue this course from the conviction, that when once it is shown, that instrumental music is not an imperative or indispensable part of New Testament worship, the victory is virtually won for the opponents of instruments. Assuredly, none who admit that divine appointment is necessary to legalize any form of worship, can deny that we have gained the victory, if we have proved that instrumental music has not been appointed by God, as an observance in the New Testament church, unless they hold, as indeed some of them do, that this music is of the nature of a mere incident or circumstance of worship, which does not need any distinctive appointment, but is involved in the command to praise God in song. There are those however who hold, that although God has not enjoined musical instruments in the New Testament church, he has not forbidden them, and has even sanctioned the use of them; the use being not imperative but optional. To this theory, attention must now be turned.

The Optional, or Permissible Theory.

CHAPTER XX.

THE OPTIONAL THEORY EXAMINED—THE PLEAS IN ITS BEHALF FOUNDED ON ALLEGED CHURCH AUTHORITY, AND ON THE FACT OF DIVINE APPOINTMENT AND ALLEGED NON-REPEAL CONSIDERED—NOTICE OF THE POSITION THAT INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC, AS A PART OF WORSHIP, ANTEDATED THE MOSAIC ECONOMY AND SURVIVED IT—CERTAIN QUIBBLES DEALT WITH.

The tenor of the Optional theory, which has been stated more than once, is that it is lawful, and, in certain circumstances, may be a duty, at least an advantage, to combine instrumental with vocal music in the praise of God. The

arguments wont to be adduced, at least most of them, in support of this position have also been already briefly stated, and my object will now be to refute them.

The first of these which may be noticed is, that the church is invested with authority to decree rites and ceremonies not positively forbidden in scripture, and may, when it deems it for edification, employ musical instruments, and even enjoin the use of them, in worship.

This argument rests on the assumption that the authority claimed is vested in the church; an unwarrantable assumption, as I have already tried to prove. To the discussion of the law of worship some pages have been devoted, and to them I refer for a virtual, if not formal, refutation of the claim in question. The church has no right to use, much less enjoin, forms of worship additional to, or different from those appointed by God in his word.

A second argument used to sustain the Optional theory, is that God having once appointed the use of musical instruments in his worship and never having repealed that appointment, it must be lawful to use them now in worship.

This, it will be observed, is an argument, and probably the most formidable argument for the Preceptive theory, and, as such has already been extensively handled in these pages. When used in behalf of the Optional doctrine, this argument entirely overshoots the mark. For, if the old law touching the use of instruments, is still in force, ought it not to be obeyed now just as literally and exactly as when it was first issued? The argument brought forward, would prove too much for those who bring it; for it would prove that instruments of music must be used in worship, whereas all that is meant to be proved is that they may be so used. The point to be proved is that instrumental music in worship is lawful, but not imperative. The argument advanced, if good, proves, indeed, that it is lawful, but inconveniently goes beyond that point and proves that it is imperative. Such an argument is like a gun which bears as disastrously on the gunner, as on those against whom it is levelled.*

*A writer, whose pamphlet on Instrumental music I had not read till after the plan of this discussion had been sketched, not, indeed, till a day or two ago, is so alive to the difficulty just suggested, that he abandons to a large extent the customary and, I am convinced, the more successful way of advocating the use of instrumental music in worship, and contends for it chiefly on the ground that the use of such music in worship was a patriarchal institution, if not explicitly appointed, at least sanctioned, by God, which was taken up and connected closely with the temple worship, but, not pertaining originally to the ceremonial system, did not pass away, any more than did the Sabbath, with the abrogation of the Mosaic economy. It is, moreover, assumed in this mode of arguing that, apart from the temple service, instrumental music might, or might not be used at the option of the worshipper, and so the matter, it is contended, stands now.

I can, hardly, call this line of argument ingenious. It might rather, did courtesy not restrain, be characterized as reckless. It owes its paternity, if I be not much mistaken, to Professor Wallace, an Irish champion of the organ, whose ability is readily conceded, but who has betrayed on deeper questions than that of music, a tendency to rash speculation, for which he has been justly chastised by more than one of his fellow-countrymen.

Our American pamphleteer is constrained by stress of weather to put into the friendly port, so familiar to the pro-instrumental party, namely, the direction of the Apostle (Eph. 5 : 19) to do whatever is meant by "psallo," which, it is maintained, denotes to sing and play, together with the use of the Hebrew word "nizmor," and its Greek equivalent, "psalmos," as descriptive of the songs of the authorized Jewish and Christian Psalter.

In this embarrassment, the pleaders for instruments have recourse to certain quibbles.

Thus, they allege that some things have been authorized by God without being enjoined; a certain discretionary liberty being left to us to observe or not observe them. In this category, they think instrumental music in worship is to be placed.

Although this position has been already combated substantially in our discussion of the law of worship, it may be wise to scrutinize it somewhat more closely, and offer some strictures in detail upon it.

1. It is granted that there are certain things connected with the church of Christ, and divine worship, which God has left to be regulated by human prudence subject to the general rules of his word. For instance, God has not determined precisely for us, as in respect to the tabernacle and temple he did for the Jews, what must be the fashion and dimensions of the houses in which we shall assemble for public worship; at what hour or hours we shall meet on the Sabbath; how long the services shall continue; how many shall be the prayers offered at each meeting; how many and what particular psalms shall be sung on each occasion; how much scripture and what parts of it shall be read at any meeting; and how long the sermon shall be. These are matters in which we must use our judgment under the general guidance of the word.

2. Be it observed that matters thus left discretionary belong rather to the head of "circa sacra," than to that of "sacra" that is they are circumstances closely connected with the worship of God, but not properly rites or forms of worship. Even among the Israelites, rigorous and minute as were the regulations about their worship, there must have been many things of this discretionary sort. So in

The objections to this view, it may be briefly stated here, are numerous, most of which will be apparent from our previous or subsequent discussion. Particularly it may be urged against it: (1) That the writer can adduce no clear instance of worship with musical instruments before the time of Moses, nay not before the time of David; (2) That even if instrumental music in worship had flourished as a practice in patriarchal times, this fact would not prove that it was not symbolic and ceremonial, for the very essence of the ceremonial law was recognized in the worship of the patriarchal age. Bloody sacrifices and the correlated distinction of animals into clean and unclean were not unknown in pre-Mosaic times; (3) That only an enthusiast, I feel tempted to say, a fanatic, for instrumental music can regard it and the Sabbath as having an equal right to be reckoned as permanent moral institutions. The one is, and the other is not, incorporated expressly and enthroned in the moral law. The Sabbath, moreover, was as definitely associated with the Levitical ceremonial in the legislation of Moses as it ever afterwards came to be; but no provision for the use of music in worship was made by Moses, unless in the latent form of the silver trumpets; (4) That the argument, so far as it rests on Eph. 5: 19, and the alleged reference to instrumental music involved in the very word, psalm, labors under the difficulty of the sly substitution of a "may be" for the rigorous "must be" to which the premises point, for, where the Apostle gives a direction, our author recognizes only a permission, hardly an advice; and (5) That this line of argument is exposed to most of the objections drawn from the references in the Psalms to instrumental music, objections urged so pertinaciously against us. Nay these objections may be urged with greater plausibility against the position of this writer than against ours; for he holds that instruments may lawfully be used in worship, yet he calmly ignores the commands in the Psalms to use them or treats them as mere advices, whereas we maintain that it is wrong to use them now, and try to show that the commands in question neither require nor countenance the use of musical instruments in this age, any more than certain other passages in the Psalms sanction the observance of the rite of sacrifice in our time.

our case, God may have accorded to us liberty in this direction, while allowing us no right to modify or disregard any forms of worship which he has enjoined.

3. Even if it could be proved that we are at liberty to add somewhat to the ordinances of worship prescribed by God, this would not prove that we have a right to disobey or neglect any positive injunction laid on us by him. Those with whom we are now reasoning do not claim that the church has authority to introduce a form of worship not sanctioned by God. They do not maintain that it would be right, without divine warrant or authorization to use instrumental music. But how do they prove that God has warranted the use of it? By citing the commands issued by him to the Old Testament church to employ it, and affirming that these commands have never been revoked, but are even repeated in the New Testament. That is to say, they argue that we may use instruments in worship, because God once commanded that they be so used, and has never withdrawn the command. Nor this only, but they also repudiate the principle, that instrumental music is imperative, alleging on the contrary, that it is optional, a discretionary power in relation to it being allowed us. But how preposterous is such reasoning! When God appointed through David, and other prophets, the use of musical instruments in the central seat of Israelitish worship, was the matter of using them as indicated, left optional with the Israelites? Even granting that, under extraordinary circumstances, the omission to use such instruments might have occurred without blame, would that have warranted the Israelites in neglecting to praise God with the instruments which he had appointed to be used for that end? It is palpably evident that the use of instruments in the temple, was not a matter left to the discretion of the priests, or of the priests and people combined, but was obligatory. Under that appointment, together with numerous calls in the Psalms to use instruments, as well as alleged exhortations and injunctions in the New Testament to the same effect, or under part of these pleas, our opponents claim the right to use instruments now in worship. They ought, however, to notice that the very passages of scripture which give, as they think, the right, impose also the obligation to use instruments of music in the worship of God. If they will appropriate the commands as their plea and authority for using instruments now, they must accept those commands as authoritative directions to employ them. If the law as to music is still in force, and if that law in Old Testament times obliged to the use of instruments, does it not still do the same? If the law has been relaxed so far as to leave the use of instruments to human option, will those who say so point to the passage or passages of sacred writ which tell us that such a modification has been made by him who gave us the law? We hold that the law touching instruments was ceremonial and has passed away; but our opponents hold the reverse. Holding this, will they be so good as to show us their authority for believing that the law has been changed, and is no longer imperative but permissive, or, at most, advisory? Even though the law should be understood to be advisory, surely advice or exhortation from such a quarter bears in it the force almost of command, and, if so, it is difficult to see how those who count the law advisory, can claim the liberty of neglecting it, or can say so serenely to their

brethren, "You can use instruments or not, as you choose." The advocates of instrumental music believe that God appointed the use of vocal music in his worship. Are they prepared to say that this too is now optional, and that the church may without fault resolve to drop out practically from its ritual, the singing of the praise of God. The Quakers object to singing as well as to instrumental music in worship, but they do not limp in their logic as do those with whom we now deal, for the former maintain that singing and instrumental music were alike ceremonial, and are now neither obligatory nor allowable.*

CHAPTER XXI.

THE OPTIONAL THEORY EXAMINED—THE ARGUMENT IN ITS FAVOR DRAWN FROM INSTANCES SUPPOSED TO BE PARALLEL CASES CONSIDERED.

It may be said that the New Testament dispensation is characterized by a degree of liberty which did not pertain to the previous dispensation, and that, therefore, what was imperative in the one is permissive or mildly advisory in the other. But this would be to misinterpret New Testament liberty, which does not consist in the right to disregard divine injunctions applying to us, but in ex-

* Some of the considerations advanced above will not apply to those, who, on the assumption that instrumental music was optionally used in worship before the giving of the law, plead that it may be so used now. But they who take this ground need to show that instrumental music was used in worship with divine approval before the giving of the law at Sinai; that the use of it was then optional; and that because it preceded the Levitical law it cannot have partaken of a ceremonial character.

Now, the only evidence presented to prove that it was used acceptably in worship before the giving of the law is the record of the action of Miriam and the other women at the Red Sea. On this I have already commented, and have sought to show that there is not adequate ground for the belief that the procedure of Miriam and the other women was an act of formal worship at all. But were we to admit that this was an instance of worship proper, what proof can be given that the instrumental music was a mere optional element? Might not this have been as imperative as singing?

Furthermore, what right has any one to claim that this music was not ceremonial because it was used before the giving of the law? Its precedence of the establishment of the full ceremonial system does not prove it to be non-ceremonial. Sacrifice existed as a religious rite from the Fall onward. The distinction into clean and unclean existed at least as early as the time of Noah. The Passover was appointed before the passage of the Red Sea.

Moreover, if the arrangements of the great occasion on which Miriam is presented to us as an instrumental performer still survive in force, even as optional arrangements, may not the singing without accompaniment in our worshipping assemblies be confined to one company consisting of men, and the instrumental performance be limited to another company consisting exclusively of women?

What also is to become of the exercise of dancing? Miriam and her attendants appear to have danced. The word "Meholah" occurring in the plural in Ex. 15:20, is properly translated "dances." In every instance in which it occurs in the Old Testament it may fitly be so rendered, and in some places, for example, Judges 21:21, and Jer. 31:4, it seems most reasonably to demand this translation. May not then a strong plea on the ground taken by our opponents be made out for dancing as at least an optional exercise in worship? David certainly danced on one solemn occasion before the Lord, while in Ps. 149:3, some countenance is given to it, unless the translation of that verse must be changed,

temptation from numerous and minute ceremonies, such as were imposed upon the Israelites. We have no more right than they had to dispense with the Sabbath or the duty of prayer; nor have we any more right to omit the observance of the Lord's Supper than they had to omit the observance of the Passover. The sum of these remarks, then, is that if the directions to use musical instruments in worship is still in force, as some of our opponents plainly say, and all of them constructively say, it is no more discretionary with us whether or not we shall use them, than it was with the Jews of old.

Ingenious attempts have been made to mystify this subject and to draw us into general discussions wide of the mark; but the attempts are far from being as subtle as those which Romish controversialists make to befog simple minds in relation to the use of pictures and images in worship. For instance, the writer referred to in a previous note, in laboring to show that the use of instrumental music in worship is optional, not obligatory, cites the fact that although none but male Israelites were commanded to attend the three great feasts of the Levitical economy, women in many cases also, and apparently with divine approval, attended them. The inference which he would have us draw, is that some things connected with the worship of God may be warranted, though not enjoined. But were we even to concede this, it would not follow that a rite or form of worship is warrantable, unless it has been prescribed by God as a rite or form of worship. Nor would the supposed concession avail the advocate of the optional theory, unless he could moreover show that the use of instrumental music is only permitted, but not enjoined. So long as he quotes in support of his view, as even the writer particularly alluded to, is forced to do, such a text as Eph. 5:19, and maintains that those originally addressed by the apostle must have understood him to refer in part to instrumental music he cannot avail himself of the concession, if made, unless besides he can show that the text in question embodies only a permission, not a direction. After the male Israelites had been directed to attend the feasts, had they a right to attend or not, according to their whim? Assuredly not, and just as little right have we to neglect the use of musical instruments in worship, if we have been directed to use them, and directed we have been, if Eph. 5:19, contains a reference to musical instruments.*

* It may be noted that the maxim "Whatsoever is not commanded (or appointed) by God is forbidden," has reference to modes of worship merely. Due regard to this restriction would silence many cavils against the principle. God has not expressly commanded us in his word to make a steamboat or a microscope, or a thousand other things which are in use among us; but to make these things is no sin of presumption. It is different however in the matter of worship, to which, and to which alone, the Second commandment relates. The commandment to use bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, limits us to the use of these in that ordinance, even although there is no prohibition expressly of other things. In the case of free-will offerings under the ceremonial law, the worshipper was not at liberty to present to God something which he had not prescribed or appointed for such a purpose. Nor might the appointed way of presenting a legitimate offering be neglected with impunity. For a lamb, for instance, a lion or a horse might not be substituted, nobler victims though these seemingly might have been. Nor might they be offered even in addition to the lamb, or to whatever victim God had prescribed. Any allowable alternative in offerings must be an alternative specified by God himself, as, for example, in the

The same writer, with the same intent, mentions the fact that God prescribed the public reading of the law at the Feast of Tabernacles once in every seven years, and adds that the command to read the law on those set occasions did not preclude or discountenance the private reading of it at other times. If this illustration be to the point, it must be the view of the writer that it was optional with the Israelites whether or not they should read the law privately, if they possessed a copy of it. I think, however, on the contrary, that it was their duty to seek the knowledge of God's law at all times, whether by reading it or hearing it read. But, aside from this, it may be said, as in the case previously commented on, that the appointment to read the law every seventh year admitted of no optional treatment, and so the direction contained in Eph. 5:19, admits of no optional treatment.

Again, the same advocate of the optional theory thinks he can find countenance for the principle involved in it in our Lord's supposed sanction of the Feast of Dedication, of the divine origin of which we have no intimation. See John 10:22, 23.

Prelatists were wont, in the days of George Gillespie to cite the fact mentioned in those verses as a proof that the church may decree stated festivals, and bind men in conscience to observe them, as any one may see who consults his powerful treatise against "English-Popish Ceremonies," in which treatise also it may be seen how Gillespie demolishes the plea. At present, I will only say that the feast in question may have been appointed by God, although no record of the original institution of it has been transmitted to us; that there is no evidence that Christ sanctioned the feast; that, if he did sanction it by observing it, the Jews were, at least thenceforward, under obligation to keep it till the time of repeal came; and that, if he did sanction it, this would not prove that we may play fast and loose with such directions as are embraced in Eph. 5:19, not to speak of numerous other passages which most advocates of instrumental music are accustomed to interpret as favoring their view.

It is further urged by the same author that, as, in the Levitical law, provision was made for the presentation of voluntary or free-will offerings, as well as for that of fixed or imperative offerings, so there may now be services of worship which God simply authorizes and does not enjoin. All this is brought forward with the view of proving that some such arrangement as that pertaining to the free-will offerings may exist in relation to the use of instrumental music in worship, so that the use of instruments may be lawful, but not imperative. Without stopping to show in detail that even the free-will offerings were positively provided for by God in his legislation, the legitimate kinds of these offerings and the proper occasions for bringing them being specified, I remark that, had our author only shown us that God placed instrumental music on a level with free-will offerings, leaving it to us to use it or not, at our pleasure, in his worship, his object would have been somewhat served. But, instead of producing proof that instruments of music were merely permitted, he unavoidably presents, in several parts of his case of the passover, a kid might be substituted for a lamb; but God specified the permissible substitute, Ex. 12:5. The law of worship is substantially the same in all ages.

dissertation, evidence which, if it proves anything in favor of instrumental music, proves that the use of it has been enjoined. Beyond any reasonable doubt, the references to instrumental music in the Old Testament present such music in worship under the aspect of a fixed and imperative offering, not of a free-will offering. Besides, were this music even on a level with the free-will offerings, would it not be egregious offense to omit it from the service of the church, just as it would have been a flagrant sin, in the case of the Israelites, to have ignored the ordinance of free-will offerings? It was the duty of the Old Testament church to maintain, honor and enforce the law of free-will offerings, and if instrumental music now is on the plane with free-will offerings, it is no less the duty of the church now to maintain, honor and enforce the law as it relates to instrumental music.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE OPTIONAL THEORY EXAMINED—THE "CIRCUMSTANCE" PLEA CONSIDERED.

A third plea put forward to sustain the optional theory is what may be styled the "Involution or circumstance plea," the tenor of which is that the command to sing in the praise of God carries with it, as an incident or circumstance, the right if not the obligation, to use instruments of music as aids to the voice in that exercise. "The command to sing," it is said, "involves the obligation to sing in a becoming manner, according to the apostolic rule, 'Let all things be done decently and in order;' but instruments are serviceable, if not indispensable for the attainment of such a result; therefore, it is proper and may be a duty to employ them in rendering formal praise to God." According to this plea, instrumental music is one of those circumstances about the worship of God, which do not require a divine appointment, but are implied in the direction to praise God in song. A few comments on this argument are here subjoined:—

1. It is granted that there are certain circumstances about the worship of God, for which no express appointment is needed, but the warrant for which is included in the general direction to worship God. For instance, if we are to have meetings on the Sabbath, as we are required to have, we must have some agreement as to the places and times for meeting. These are matters, as has been elsewhere shown, that are to be ordered by human discretion, in accordance with the general directions and spirit of the word of God. Again, we have no specific instructions touching the tunes or chants to be used in praising God. What, and how many these shall be, and when one shall be used, and when another, are matters not fixed by statute, but to be ordered on the general grounds of prudence and edification as indicated in the scripture. If instrumental music belonged to the category of these circumstances about worship, we should be constrained to admit that it is warranted, under the general appointment, to sing the praises of God.

2. There are sufficient reasons, however, for rejecting the assumption that instrumental music is in such a sense an incident or circumstance of song, as that

the prescription of the latter implies the right to have the former. Among these reasons, are the following:—

(1.) The unaided vocal organs of men are adapted to render, in an appropriate manner, the praises of God in song. There is no instrument of music fit to be compared to the human voice, for flexibility, richness of tone, and above all, expressiveness. Some of the greatest masters, in the department of music, have declared their preference for unaided vocal music, at least in worship; and it is a current remark of travellers, that the singing in some of the churches of St. Petersburg, where no instruments are tolerated, is not excelled, if even equaled elsewhere in the world. The human voice, it may be affirmed, has in itself all the resources requisite for the most appropriate expression of the praise of God in song.

It needs, however, to be noted that, in praising God, it is neither necessary, nor in ordinary circumstances, desirable that the singing should be elaborate. It should be artistic, but true art is always in harmony with the ends to be attained. Hence, the simplest style of music may be really the most artistic, the end and laws of the service being taken into account. The artistic is not to be confounded with the artificial.

There is no countenance given in the bible to the notion, that the music in the praise of God is to be intricate and complex. It may be admitted that the Davidic arrangements, in virtue of which, many persons were set apart for the performance of the service of song, indicate that this part of worship was to be skillfully rendered, 1 Chron. 15 : 22. Yet how very little is there even in the Old Testament, to inculcate the idea that the singing of the praise of God should be complex or florid, or to use a modern epithet, "operatic!" There is one text often quoted, and it is the best, I think, that can be quoted, that our singing in worship should be elaborate, namely, Ps. 33 : 3, "Play skillfully with a loud noise," but not to say that this refers to instrumental performance, not vocal, at least if "zamar" is to be understood as our opponents understand it, it is very doubtful whether it means to play in good time and execute delicate and difficult musical combinations. It most probably means no more than to do with energy and zeal whatever is denoted; for the literal rendering of the original is "Make good to play (or sing) with a loud noise." Besides, what is very simple in music admits of a skillful, or on the contrary, of a careless rendering.

Moreover, in the entire New Testament, there is not a word of command or exhortation, to offer an artificial and elaborate service of song to God. There is a general direction given, 1 Cor. 14 : 40, "Let all things be done decently and in order," but the word "decently," which very fitly represents the original, is equivalent to "suitably" or "decorously," and the question arises what is becoming or suitable in the matter of song in the praise of God? Nowhere does the bible tell us that the music in worship, must for brilliancy and complexity rival that of the opera, or of the secular concert. This itself is significant, and is in striking contrast with the tone of the church in our day; for the musical element in public worship is now exalted in many quarters to a level with the exposition of

the scriptures, and by not a few is deemed even more essential than preaching to the success of the church. If this modern and growing "rage" for fine music in churches is just and wise, it seems rather unaccountable that the apostles failed to give directions as to the style of music which all the churches, but especially those in seats of refinement and wealth, should strive to acquire. In giving instructions to Timothy how to behave himself in the house of God, why did Paul omit to urge upon him the great importance of forming a well-trained choir that strangers might be attracted to the place of Christian worship, and that the children of the church might be retained? Paul laid stress incomparably more on soundness in the faith and earnestness in the proclamation of the gospel, than on the sound of singers and players. And this is obvious from the fact that, while he has much to say about preaching the word, he never drops a hint to the effect that an effort should be made to improve the singing of the converts to Christianity, so that the church music might equal, if not excel, that of the Pagan temples. Even when he touches on the subject of singing, although he enjoins it as a duty to sing to the Lord, he does not give a hint as to the importance of elevating the standard of church music, so as to produce a favorable impression on all who should hear, and especially help to keep the young people from seeking the gratification of their musical tastes in heathen festivals and rites.

Is the church to-day of the same mind with Paul in this matter? I am persuaded it is not, and that, on the contrary it lays a stress on the mere music in the service of song, vastly disproportioned to the stress which the New Testament, or even the Old Testament, lays upon it.

Moreover, I do not hesitate to maintain that the most truly artistic sacred music is the most simple, and the freest from flourishes and intricacies. Singing, when practised as a mere musical entertainment, may be complicated and difficult of execution and yet be in good taste; but the singing of praise to God, especially in New Testament times, should be simple and comparatively artless. The music of the sanctuary should be influenced and regulated by the fact that it is the will of God, that the poor and illiterate who may be found in the church should sing, no less than the rich and refined. The singing of public worship is to be congregational singing, as distinguished from solo singing and mere choir singing; and as it is the will of God that the poor and ignorant as well as the rich and educated should compose the church and its public assemblies, so the singing should be adapted to the company by whom it is to be executed. The Apostles Paul and James tell us indeed to sing, but they do not tell us to sing tunes of a difficult and ornate style; and there is reason to believe that for at least two centuries after the apostolic age, the singing in the church was in general of the most unartificial kind.

Even, therefore, if it could be proved that for the best vocal execution of difficult music, instruments are necessary as aids, it would not follow that for the best music in worship, such aids are either requisite, or desirable. The really artistic is the fit and becoming, and the really artistic music of the sanctuary is the simple and sober, or, if not always what might be called "sober" or grave, at least simple.

Besides, if even it were proved that instrumental help is essential to the attainment of the highest grade of vocal culture, it would not follow that instruments of music should be introduced into the actual worship of God. The singer may train himself in whatever way deemed best, yet not have the right to employ those subsidiary or preparatory arts when he appears before God to praise him.

(2.) By some high authorities in musical matters, the use of musical instruments, and of none more than of the organ, is deemed detrimental, rather than helpful, to vocal execution. The instrumental current may fill up and cover the discords and defects in the singing, thus leaving them unnoticed and unimproved. This has been touched upon already, but is mentioned here in refutation of the view that instrumental music is virtually sanctioned in the appointment of singing in the worship of God.

(3.) The fact that God expressly commanded the use of musical instruments, as well as of the voice, in his worship, militates against the notion that the instrumental element is a mere incident or circumstance of the vocal element in the exercise of praise. If the direction to sing necessarily included in itself a direction, or even permission, to use instruments, why did God give such special commands to use them, and to use certain specified ones? If, as a matter of course, the appointment of singing authorized the use of instrumental music, why was there so much prominence given to the latter, especially if it is assumed, as it is by some of our opponents, that instrumental music in worship had been used since patriarchal times? How is it that the mere incident or adjunct is as precisely prescribed as the main element of the service? Why is the subordinate element, that of instrumental music, seemingly made co-ordinate with the vocal music, the chief element? Indeed, there is, perhaps, more prominence given, in the account of the arrangements of the temple, to the instrumental department than to the vocal. This does not prove that the instrumental is as important as the vocal music, for, being less directly natural, the former, if meant to be used, needed to be more distinctly specified than the latter; but it does seem to indicate that the command to sing in the worship of God does not carry in it either a command or a license to employ instrumental music. God never says that he prescribed the instruments just to improve the singing, or to keep it correct. Even many who advance the doctrine that the right to use instruments is implied in the right to sing are fain, in arguing for instrumental music in worship, to avail themselves of the commands, contained in the Old Testament, to use instruments, whereas every such command strengthens our position that, according to the tenor of scripture, instrumental music is not a circumstance or implied accompaniment of singing. Singing in worship can be performed as well as is necessary, or as is desirable, without the use of an instrument of music, for our Lord, all of whose service was perfect, sang, together with his disciples, on a memorable occasion, without instrumental aid; and that operation which may be lacking in a perfect performance is not a circumstance implied in that performance, or in the command enjoining it.

Still further, should any one who holds that instrumental music is a circum-

stance necessarily implied in the command to sing, seek to account for the distinct prescription of instruments, by saying, that they were so specified because of their importance as aids to song, then I would ask, ought there not, on the same ground, to be as much zeal shown for them by the church, as God manifested in the commands which he issued? Let us, for sake of argument, admit that instrumental music is an incident of vocal music, and that there was nothing ceremonial in the instrumental music of the ancient Israelitish worship. Ought we not then, in view of God's obvious urgency in relation to the use of instrumental aids, to be vehemently urgent to have all worshippers use musical instruments in rendering praise to him? Yet, what branch of the church has ever issued a pastoral letter urging that every congregation embraced in it, should take immediate measures for acquiring instrumental help in the service of song? The heart of the church has never really throbbed in sympathy with the conclusion toward which tends the view which I am now combating.

On the whole, the position seems a correct one, that if the right to use instrumental music is involved in the right to sing in the worship of God, there needed not to have been such an explicit appointment of the use of instruments, as is met with, in the legislation touching the services of the temple. Thus the positive commands of the Old Testament to use instruments in praising God discountenance the view, that instrumental music is so far a circumstance or incident of vocal music, that the right to use the latter implies the right to use the former, and so the circumstance plea in favor of the optional theory fails.

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE OPTIONAL THEORY EXAMINED—THE "TUNING FORK" PLEA CONSIDERED.

A fourth argument, known in logic as an "argumentum ad hominem," is sometimes advanced in support of the optional theory, and is briefly this:—"You do not object to the use of a tuning fork or note book in connection with the praise of God, but if not, you have no right to object to the use of musical instruments in that exercise." So strong is this appeal to consistency counted by some, that a distinguished lecturer, in addressing the students of Yale Theological Seminary, as previously mentioned, expressed the opinion, that this whole controversy might be condensed into a nut shell, thus, "Those who object to the use of an organ might as well object to the use of a tuning fork, or a note book in worship."

In relation to this antiquated quibble, a few remarks will suffice.

In the case of the tuning fork, its use ends the instant the service of song begins; while in the case of the organ, its sound continues as long as the singing and commingles with it.

Moreover, the sound of the tuning fork is intended for the ear of him alone who uses it. Not so with the organ. It may, and often does, produce the most perceptible element of the sound made in praise of God. The sound of the tuning fork is no more a part of the service of worship, than is the preliminary use of a

lozenge or the clearing of the throat. If musical instruments, as used in worship, are simply on a par with a tuning fork, they must not be viewed as yielding any distinct element of the enjoyment found in the service, or any enhancement directly of the song; for no one will say that the sound of a tuning fork, however useful it may be for "starting the tune," acts independently and directly as a source of elevation and enjoyment. It serves simply as a guide in striking the first note of the song, and if musical instruments occupy precisely the same footing, in so much that we may reason from the use of the one to that of the other, they must merely aid in raising the tune, or at the utmost help the voice to do its work well. The moment they are regarded as contributing an additional element of enjoyment to that which the voice affords, they are distinguished from a tuning fork, which partakes of the nature merely of a preliminary expedient for the production of proper vocal music. A tuning fork and a note book contribute no element directly of the enjoyment derivable from singing. There is not an ingredient of pleasure and enhancement, directly yielded by the tuning fork or pitch pipe. Neither is there by the note book, for in fact the note book is silent, and neither it nor the fork is heard, or intended to be heard by the audience. But is this all that is meant by the use of musical instruments? Is it not understood and intended that these not only guide the voice, but supplement it, or yield to it a new element, which, blending with the human voice, adds to the impression it produces? The instruments are prized, not merely because they may help to produce finer singing, but also and, I think, chiefly because they supplement the voice, contributing what may be lacking in it, as to volume and variety, and drowning all discordant tones. In this point of view, they are presented in the scriptures. "Praise him," it is said, "with the sound of a trumpet," not, "Seek by aid of a trumpet to guide the voice in praising him." Besides, if guidance was all that God meant in prescribing instrumental music, why did he prescribe so many instruments and such a variety? A cornet, or at least two or three cornets might have served the purpose.

The tuning fork and the organ are not parallel, and therefore to allege that he who tolerates a tuning fork cannot consistently object to an organ, is illogical. Principal Candlish, who was at least as vigorous of intellect as our Yale lecturer, did not hesitate to write this language, "I will not condescend to recognize 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." To this, it may be added, that a shrewd lawyer, Mr. Reddie, the town clerk of Glasgow, made bold to use these words, "The argument which would identify an organ with a pitch pipe does not merit a serious answer."

As to the note book, I must confess that I have no wish to see attention largely taken up with it during the service of praise. The attention should rather be given beforehand to the notes, so that in actual worship, there might be no distraction of the mind from the worship proper, by close inspection of notes. But the note book certainly makes no sound, and, in that respect, forms no factor,

as the sound of an organ does, of the audible service. Besides, if we sing at all in melody and unison, the mind must, in some degree refer to the musical cadences which notes indicate, and it is quite possible that there is less distraction of thought caused by the discreet use of a note book, than by the effort of memory to recall the proper notes. There is nothing sacred in the mere letters of a printed bible, yet we may read the bible in worship without perceptible distraction, and why might not also musical notes be read in time of worship without undue distraction? We may sing a psalm from the pages of the Psalter. In doing this, we must give some heed to mere letters and words; yet we do not count such a direction of attention incompatible with the proper spirit of worship, and why may not some heed be given to musical notes without marring the spirituality of the service of song?

Furthermore, if note books are on a par with instruments, how happens it that when God prescribed the latter, particularly, he said nothing about the former? Does he not seem to have regarded the use of notes as an incidental circumstance for which no specific appointment was needed, while not so regarding the use of instruments? The mass of men do not feel that a tuning fork, and a note book, and instruments of music are on a par, and equally circumstances of worship which need no express appointment. Most men, if asked on the subject, and not prompted by some special pleader, would say that instruments occupy a different place from the other appliances named. The Greek church has magnificent singing, and I presume, also tuning forks and note books, but it admits no instruments of music as aids in its worship. John Calvin is commonly supposed to have been possessed of some acuteness, yet, while he strongly disapproved of the use of musical instruments in worship, he had no objection to a note book in connection with the song of praise. The argument we have been considering looks too much like a subterfuge and makeshift, reminding one of the subtleties to which Romanists resort in defending or commending their erroneous tenets and corrupt practices.

The Optional Theory as well as the Preceptive, having now been discussed and rejected, we turn to the theory of prohibition, the only alternative.

The Prohibitory Theory.

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE PROHIBITORY THEORY VINDICATED—RECAPITULATION OF SOME ARGUMENTS ALREADY ADVANCED—ARGUMENT FROM THE ABSENCE OF NEW TESTAMENT SANCTION OF INSTRUMENTS IN WORSHIP.

The substance of the prohibitory theory is, that so far as the present dispensation is concerned, the use of musical instruments in worship is unlawful. It is of course obvious from the drift of the previous discussion, that this is the view which seems to the writer warranted and demanded by all the evidence available in the case. It is not here asserted that nothing plausible can be presented in

favor of the rival theories. Neither is it affirmed, that there are no difficulties attaching to the view now propounded and about to be further advocated; but it is maintained, and that with a confidence which increases with reflection, that the evidence which can be adduced in behalf of the use of instrumental music in New Testament worship is weak, as compared with that which can be marshalled on the opposite side. In combating the other views, it has been necessary to anticipate most of the arguments by which the prohibitory theory may be substantiated, and hence, while deeming it best to furnish a direct line of argument in its support, I shall feel at liberty to assume some points as already proved, and to adopt a somewhat summary method of treatment. The following line of argument is submitted:—

1. The considerations already presented in disproof of the competing theories. A bare enumeration of these will suffice. It has been urged that on æsthetical grounds, no warrant for the use of instrumental music in worship now can be obtained, but rather indications to the contrary; that the sensuousness, characteristic of the instrumental arrangement, forms presumptive evidence that it pertained to the ceremonial system; that the intimate relation which instrumental music actually sustained to the ceremonial temple services, is suggestive of its temporary design; that there are strong indications that instrumental music in worship was confined among the Israelites to the tabernacle and temple ritual; that specific instruments were appointed to be used, and that these have been lost; and no description given adequate to guide us in reproducing them; that the New Testament yields no support to the view that the instrumental service in worship was to be continued lawfully in the New Testament church; and that if the precepts of scripture, enjoining the use of instruments in worship, apply to the present dispensation, we are guilty of a sin of omission, so long as we attempt to praise God in song, unaccompanied by instrumental music, a position from which most advocates of the use of that music in worship recoil. If this line of argument is valid against the imperative and permissive theories, it is valid in favor of the only alternative theory, that of prohibition; for if God neither commands nor permits the use of instruments in his worship now, he certainly forbids such use.

2. The lack of New Testament sanction for the use of musical instruments in the worship of the New Testament church.

This, it will be seen at once, is nearly identical with an argument already produced in proof of the ceremonial nature of the instrumental music of the temple. The special point, however, to be insisted on now, is that the absence from the pages of the New Testament of any hint that in the ritual of the New Testament church instrumental music should, or might be, included, is damaging, if not fatal, to the view that such music is admissible in the service of song now. Formerly the silence of the New Testament was used to prove that the instrumental element in the service of the temple was simply ceremonial. Now this silence is used to show more directly that instrumental music is not a part of the order of the New Testament church.

There are two questions which present themselves here, and need to be deter-

mined in order to the just appreciation of this argument, namely:—First, Does the New Testament give any hint that instruments of music must, or lawfully might, be used by the New Testament church in worship? Second, Does the absence of any such hint, supposing the absence to be a fact, indicate that instrumental music is not among the features or forms of New Testament worship?

To the first of these questions our answer has already been given, which is to the effect that, although the New Testament plainly contains directions to use vocal music in praising God, it yields no evidence that instrumental music may be so employed, no instrument being ever named as in use in worship under apostolic direction, and no other hint being given in the New Testament sufficient to show that it is the preceptive will of God that in this dispensation he should be worshipped with musical instruments.

To the second of the questions just stated I would give an affirmative answer, meaning thereby that the absence from the New Testament of any evidence in favor of the continued use of instrumental music in worship, is an indication that such music is not authorized in the devotional services of the New Testament church.

Let it be marked here that, in taking this ground, there is no intention to slight the Old Testament scriptures, as if nothing revealed in them were authoritative or lawful in doctrine or practice unless endorsed in the New Testament. What is alleged is simply this: that, as a matter of fact, God has seen fit to furnish New Testament support and sanction to every ordinance of worship which he meant to have place in the New Testament church, unless, indeed, instrumental music is an exception. It seems peculiarly appropriate that those parts of the bible which were prepared under divine inspiration, at the time when the church assumed its New Testament form, should exhibit the various rites and forms which were intended by God to mark the church in its New Testament development. Before his ascension, our Lord talked much with his disciples, instructing them in respect to matters pertaining to his kingdom (Acts 1:3), and the Holy Spirit, it had been promised, would, at a later day, bring these instructions to their remembrance. It is but natural to look, therefore, to the writings of those men, trained by the Saviour himself, and qualified by the gift of inspiration, for information touching the form which the church was, under their direction, to assume, and the worship it should render.

The more ancient sacred writings, it is freely granted, might furnish fore-shadowings and strong intimations of the coming order and worship; but we should anticipate that the New Testament pre-eminently should afford guidance as to New Testament ordinances. But, as we cannot always trust our own judgment as to the fitness of things, we would hesitate to assert the principle now contended for, did we not find, on actual inspection, that, aside from instrumental music, which is now in debate, every ordinance of New Testament worship and government does obtain sanction in the New Testament writings.

What are the commonly acknowledged ordinances of the New Testament church? The sacred observance of the Lord's day; the reading of the scriptures;

preaching; the benediction; prayer; the singing of psalms; the giving of our substance for the cause of God; fasting in certain circumstances; vowing to God; the observance of baptism and the Lord's Supper; the form of church government; and the administration of discipline. Now, some of these, doubtless, have a more explicit and definite appointment in the New Testament than others of the number have; but every one of them finds, if not original appointment in the New Testament, at least sanction and endorsement therein, a fact which leads us to suspect the claim of any rite to be accepted as belonging to the worship of the present dispensation, if the claimant has not the countenance and support of the New Testament. The survey of the facts seems to justify this position, that the whole ritual of the Old Testament church is abrogated, except so much of it as has received the sanction of the New Testament, as a part of the worship and order designed for New Testament times. The counter-rule, that everything in the Old Testament ritual remains, except so much as is expressly, or clearly exempted in the New Testament, is not safe; for under it there might be a difficulty in excluding the use of incense, of lighted lamps as symbols, of priestly vestments to be worn by all believers who are priests unto God. To say the very least, the evidence in favor of the perpetuation of instrumental music as a part of worship, would need to be greatly stronger than it is to countervail the presumption which lies against it in the fact, as I take it to be, that, while all the other parts of the order and worship of the New Testament church have New Testament sanction, instrumental music has none.

CHAPTER XXV.

THE PROHIBITORY THEORY—THE ARGUMENT IN ITS FAVOR DRAWN FROM THE SILENCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AS TO INSTRUMENTS—THE CAVIL DRAWN FROM INFANT BAPTISM ANSWERED.

At this point we encounter an objection which is supposed to be fatal to our line of argument. The objection is this, that in contending that instrumental music is inadmissible in New Testament times unless it be supported by a New Testament sanction, we virtually accede to the principle of the Baptists, who, to our argument for infant baptism from the Old Testament, reply that infant baptism is not sanctioned in the New Testament, and, therefore, cannot be admitted. Quotations are made also from treatises written by eminent advocates of infant baptism, in which they maintain that he who would lawfully refuse to recognize the infants of church members as entitled to the initial sign of membership, must be able to produce from the New Testament some prohibition of such recognition.

Touching this objection, which again is a sample of the "argumentum ad hominem," these remarks are offered:—

(1.) It is quite possible that the defenders of infant baptism have sometimes been betrayed into the use of unguarded language. It is one of the benefits arising from a complete survey of the field of theology, and a wide acquaintance with the controversies of the ages, that we thereby learn to correct extravagances and rectify mistakes, into which, from a partial survey, we may be led, and are compelled to test our principles and rules of interpretation by an extended range of application. And if any one, in his zeal for infant baptism, should adopt the principle, that a positive prohibition of it in the New Testament would be necessary to neutralize the Old Testament evidence in its favor, I would be disposed to demur to his position.

(2.) In arguing for infant baptism, no judicious controversialist will depend solely on the fact that, in Old Testament times, the male infants of the Israelites were circumcised, and so recognized as a part of the church as then constituted; but he will seek to show, moreover, the essential unity of the church in all ages, the probability that in the new dispensation the privileges of parents and children

would be enlarged rather than diminished, and various hints in the New Testament, which seem to imply the right of the children of professing Christians to the seal of baptism. Now, where do we look for the strongest proofs of the substantial identity of the church of the past with that of the present dispensation? Is it not in the New Testament, particularly to the Epistle to the Romans, and that to the Galatians? Where do we find the clearest evidence that the covenant made with Abraham was evangelical in its character, and that circumcision was not a mere national badge, but a seal of the righteousness which is by faith? Is it not in the Epistle to the Romans? Thus we are in a large degree dependent on the New Testament for the most fundamental argument we can produce in favor of infant baptism, while, besides, from the same source we have a very considerable amount of collateral or coincident evidence on the same question. Will any one be bold enough to say that we have in the New Testament similar countenance given to the view that the instrumental music of the previous dispensation is to be perpetuated in this dispensation?

(3.) In one respect, we who oppose instrumental music occupy a position more akin to that of the advocates of infant baptism, than do those who contend for instruments. While the Pædobaptist strenuously insists that the church, especially since her more formal organization in the time of Abraham, is essentially one great society, he, at the same time, admits that the Old Testament mode of recognizing infant church membership, has been changed, so that baptism now supplants circumcision. The great fact of infant membership remains, but the form of recognition is altered. In like manner, the opponent of instrumental music holds that the ordinance of praise, and of praise rendered to God in musical form, survives, while he also maintains, that in the transition from the Old Testament to the New Testament dispensation, a change in the form of praise has been made by the elimination of instrumental music. The fixed feature is music. The variable and transitory feature is instrumental music. The essence, that is, vocal music, is retained. The accidental or accessory form is dropped. An analogous change is discernible in the transition from the Passover to the Lord's Supper. In both, there is an act of eating, but in the Passover, the substance eaten was flesh, while in the Lord's Supper, what is eaten is bread.

(4.) Infant baptism was practised in the church from at least near the time of the apostles, as can be shown by credible, though uninspired writings; whereas instrumental music found no place in the church for centuries after the apostolic age. If we found that for some centuries after the first century of the Christian era there was no trace of the practice of infant baptism in the church, and much positive evidence that there was no such practice, as we do in relation to the use of instrumental music in worship, we should begin to feel rather uneasy as to our interpretation of the bible on the question of baptism.

(5.) Most of those who use the objection under notice wish simply to prove that instrumental music in New Testament worship is allowable, not imperative; but are they prepared to say that infant baptism is only allowable, not imperative? If, however, the plea for it and that for instruments are essentially the same, how is it that the conclusion in the one case is "a must be," and in the other "a may be?" This argument may apply at least to those who employ as part of the plea for instruments the commands of scripture on that point. Besides, it may be urged that the Baptists themselves, at least most of them, do not feel compelled by regard to consistency to exclude from their religious services instrumental music. Hence, it may be inferred, that our line of argument against instrumental music, which the objector says is substantially one with that which the Baptists use against infant baptism, does not seem to be so accepted by them, which, we might presume, it would be, if of the character attributed to it in the objection which we have been considering. It may be added, without much attempt to expand the thought, that those who dispute our method of reasoning in relation to instru-

mental music, will experience some difficulty in consistently maintaining against the Seventh Day Baptist, the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week.

The seventh day, it will be admitted, was once appointed by God to be kept as the Sabbath. It was so observed by the Saviour, and certainly for a time by the apostles. The appointment of it has never been expressly repealed, and no clear disapproval of the observance of the seventh day has been expressed in the New Testament. Ought it not, therefore, according to the reasoning of the opponents, to be still observed? And if it should be replied that the fourth commandment gives us six days for our own employments, while we know that on the first day of the week, Christians of apostolic times held their religious meetings, and that it therefore must have been to them the Sabbath, it might be replied, that the seventh day may still have been held as the Sabbath, and that the first day was, in addition, kept as a day for meetings, though not as the Sabbath strictly so called.

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE PROHIBITORY THEORY—NEW TESTAMENT EVIDENCE IN ITS FAVOR.

A third argument for the prohibitory theory is, that, in addition to its silence which in such a matter is significant, the New Testament contains sundry indications, that in the devotional services of the New Testament church, no place should be given to instrumental music. Among those indications may be mentioned:—

(1.) The contrast suggested in the New Testament, and not dimly predicted in the Old, between the worship of the New dispensation and that of its predecessor. The worship of the Old Testament times, at least during the Mosaic period, was outward, sensuous and encumbered with minute regulations and restrictions; whereas the worship of the New Testament times, it is broadly hinted, would be comparatively inward, direct and simple. Such a contrast seems to be dimly intimated by the words of our Lord to the woman of Samaria, John 4 : 23, 24, "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." It is obvious that our Lord in these words contrasts what was about to be with what had been in the matter of worship, and the point of contrast suggested is, that the worship, in the age then at hand, would be rendered in spirit and in truth, implying that such had not been the character of the worship in the age then closing. In addition, he hints that the Father was in quest of worship of this character, and proceeds to show the consonance of such worship with the nature of him who is a spirit. Now, what does our Lord mean when he speaks of worshipping in spirit and in truth? Surely he does not mean simply, purity of purpose and fervor of soul in worship; for who will assert, that in Old Testament times there were none who so rendered homage to God? To worship God in holiness was as much a requirement of the Old Testament as of the New, and is as clearly set forth as such in the former as in the latter. See Lev. 19 : 2; 1 Kings 8 : 38, 39; 2 Chron. 30 : 18, 19; Ps. 15 and 26, 51 : 17. Every true worshipper since the world began has worshipped God in sincerity and holiness. In this respect, all dispensations are alike, and no contrast exists between them. Yet a contrast our Lord surely speaks of, as distinguishing the age which was at the door when he spoke, from the age which was then coming to an end. By "spirit and truth," must he not have meant comparative independence on outward sensuous rites, and on the shadows of the typical economy? This interpretation receives countenance from the previous words of Christ to the Samaritan woman (verse 21), "Woman believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem

worship the Father," that is, when the sanctity of particular spots on the face of the globe shall no more be acknowledged, and when men, untrammelled by ceremonial restrictions, shall with equal acceptance worship God anywhere. Afterwards he declares the general principle, that in all genuine worship, under whatever dispensation, the worshipper must have penetrated through all external rites and held real fellowship of soul with the Father of spirits. Now, such teaching from the lips of the great Prophet, prepares us to expect a simplicity in the forms of worship, and a directness in our religious services, in contrast with the arrangements of the Mosaic economy; and hence, we may not be disconcerted if we discover that the pomp and sensuousness of instrumental music are to be excluded from the worship in the present dispensation.

It is needless to occupy time in showing that in the Epistles, particularly in the Epistle to the Galatians, and that to the Hebrews, the same strain of sentiment abounds, to which our Lord, in the conversation with the Samaritan woman, gave utterance. Judging from all these representations we might expect a reduction in the rites and forms of the Old Testament ritual, when the transition was made to the New Testament order. The elimination of musical instruments might, in the circumstances, be rather a matter of anticipation than of surprise.

(2.) Another indication of the exclusion of instrumental music from the worship of the New Testament church, is, that in the New Testament no instrument is named as being used by the apostles, or in the church under their care. This is a fact which may well stagger those who tenaciously maintain that the verb, psallo, involves the idea of instrumental music. Had that, or some kindred word been connected expressly with some instrument, be it harp, or psaltery, or any other, and had we been told to do, what psallo in such a connection would suggest, the matter would have been altogether different; but there is no such mention made of an instrument. What is said about musical instruments, in the symbolic book of Revelation, has already been considered.

(3.) A third New Testament indication, unfavorable to the view that musical instruments must or may be used in worship under the present dispensation, is found in the account given of the institution of the Lord's Supper. As we learn from Math. 26 : 30, and Mark. 14 : 26, our Lord and his disciples sang a hymn, or more literally "hymned," on that occasion; the hymn or hymns used being, beyond much doubt, selected from the inspired Psalter, in which our Lord took such delight. It is not mentioned that a musical instrument was used on the occasion, and besides, the word rendered "sung a hymn," is not any part or cognate of psallo; but a word which means, without any reasonable doubt, simply to sing praise.

(4.) Now be it observed that our Lord was, at the time alluded to, instituting an ordinance which was to show his death till he should come, an ordinance the most solemn of any belonging to the prescribed service of the New Testament church. He doubtless intended that his disciples, in all future time, should closely copy the form of observance then exemplified. But he coupled no instrumental music with the service, though he did link singing with it. Is it wise or safe for us to deviate in this particular from the example set us by the Master? If instrumental music may be to advantage dispensed with at the observance of the Lord's Supper (and who, with the example of the Saviour before him, can deny that it may), is it needed in any other part of our worship? The objection has been raised that this occurred before the close of the Old Testament dispensation, and therefore is not an example to us now. But is it necessary to show that our Lord instituted the Supper with reference to New Testament times and gave the direction that what he had done should be imitated by his disciples in after days? The cause which needs to resort to such paltry evasions is not a good one. Besides, as the Supper was instituted within the limits of Old Testament times, when instrumental music was employed in worship, the omission of such music from the institution

of the Supper is the more noticeable and significant. If, moreover, it should be said that the omission may be accounted for on the ground that there were no instruments of music at hand, the answer is obvious that our Lord had deliberately provided beforehand all the appliances deemed necessary or proper for the occasion. He had secured "a large upper room, furnished," and had he desired instruments of music, he could have provided them, too. I cannot help thinking that our Lord, by using vocal, not instrumental, music on this memorable occasion, intended to indicate that in the worship of the New Testament church the music of the voice, not that of lifeless instruments, should be heard. We are sure that we are right in omitting instruments, as did he. Have those who use them equal ground for confidence that they have his approbation?

(5.) In Heb. 13: 15, there is another hint adverse to the use of instrumental music in the New Testament church. "By him, therefore," says the inspired writer, "let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is the fruit of your lips, giving thanks to his name." These words seem to intimate that, in contrast with the temple service, the only instruments needed or proper for rendering to God the sacrifice of praise are our lips. If any one should be so fond of petty and pitiable evasions as to say that the writer does not exclude a flute and such instruments as are played upon by the lips, I would answer the "fool according to his folly," by saying that, at least, such instruments as an organ, melodeon and harp are excluded.

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE PROHIBITORY THEORY DEFENDED—HISTORICAL EVIDENCE IN ITS BEHALF.

4. A general argument, which is our fourth, for the prohibitory theory is afforded by the history of the church from the close of the Apostolic age onward to modern times. For sake of clearness, it may be advisable to make three stages in this historical investigation, and inquire: first, What was the attitude of the early church toward instrumental music in worship? second, What were the circumstances in which such music acquired a place in the worship of the church? and, third, What lessons on the subject in hand does the history of the church, at and after the time of the Reformation, yield?

The first of these three branches of inquiry, which seems rather uninviting to those who favor the use of instruments in worship, I can afford to treat in a somewhat summary manner, both because several citations bearing upon it have already been made, and because I do not know that any reputable writer is bold enough to assert that instruments of music were used in worship by the early church. Learned writers of various schools, and favorable, moreover, to the practice which I am opposing, frankly admit that, in worshipping God, the primitive Christians used no instruments of music. For instance, Bingham, a minister of the Church of England, whose erudition in the department of Christian antiquities was profound, and whose approval of the use of instrumental music in praising God is undisguised, confesses, in his elaborate treatise, "Origines Ecclesiasticæ," that the reason why he gives no account of the instruments used in the early church, as some might have expected, is that no such appliances existed in the church of the early centuries of our era.

Bellarmino, the ablest of all Romish controversialists, though pleading for the use of instruments, says: "We confess, indeed, that musical instruments began at a late date to be admitted into the church." An acknowledgment of the same tenor is made by Cajetan, Navarre, Molanus, and many other noted Romish writers.

Neander, whose thorough acquaintance with the history of the ancient church none will dispute, says: "From the French church proceeded the use of the

organ, the first musical instrument employed in the church. A present of the Emperor Constantine Copronymus to King Pepin gave occasion to its use." In connection with this extract, let it be noted that the transaction alluded to by Neander occurred about the year 756.

John Mason Neale, a minister of the Church of England, who died in 1866, and of whom Dr. Schaff says that "he was the most learned Anglican ritualist and liturgist, who studied the Eastern liturgies daily, and almost knew them by heart," thus writes, in his Commentary on the Psalms: "Here," that is in Ps. 33: 2, "we have the first mention of musical instruments in the Psalms. It is to be observed that the early fathers, almost with one accord, protest against their use in churches, as they are forbidden in the Eastern Church to this day, where yet, by consent of all, the singing is infinitely superior to anything that can be heard in the West."

Testimony to the same effect from the highest authorities of modern times, and from those among the number who are zealous for instrumental music, can be produced in abundance, and I am not aware that any scholar alleges aught to the contrary. In view of this posture of the case, I might assume, without any further attempt at proof, that for some centuries, probably not less than five or six, after the death of the Apostles, there was a total absence of instrumental music from the worship of the church. And even if it were conceded, as some claim, that there may have been, in a few places, a use made of instruments of music in worship, during the 4th and 5th centuries, no one, who has a right to give an opinion, will presume to say that instrumental music was much used in the Christian church in the centuries named, or for several centuries afterwards.

It may be proper, however, to present, out of a large stock of evidence, derivable from patristic sources, a few specimens additional to those already given in the course of our discussion.

Clemens Alexandrinus, in his "Paidagogos," has a chapter headed thus, "How to conduct ourselves at feasts," in which, as shown in a previous quotation, the following sentiments are expressed: "The Spirit, distinguishing from such revelry the divine service, sings, 'Praise him with sound of trumpet,' for with sound of trumpet he shall raise the dead; 'Praise him on the psaltery,' for the tongue is the psaltery of the Lord; and 'Praise him on the lyre.' By the lyre is meant the mouth, struck by the Spirit, as it were by a plectrum. 'Praise him with the timbrel and the dance,' refers to the church meditating on the resurrection of the dead in the resounding skin. 'Praise him on the chords and organ.' Our body he calls an organ, and its nerves are the strings by which it has received harmonious tension, and when struck by the Spirit, it gives forth human voices. 'Praise him on the clashing cymbals.' He calls the tongue cymbal of the mouth, which resounds with the pulsation of the lips." * * * * "The one instrument of peace, the word alone by which we honor God, is that which we employ. We no longer use the ancient psaltery and trumpet and timbrel and flute." *

It is true, Clemens, in the same chapter, says: "And even if you wish to sing and play to the harp or lyre, there is no blame. Thou shalt imitate the righteous Hebrew king in his thanksgiving to God." In so expressing himself, however, he plainly refers, not to the use of instruments in stated, formal worship, but to their use at feasts for more Christian enjoyment and edification. Besides, if instrumental music had been then used in the church, there would have been no need for Clemens to say what has just been quoted. He does not say, "Thou shalt imitate the church in its services," but "Thou shalt imitate the righteous

* It will be observed that, between the translation given above and that of the same passage given in a previous chapter, there are some minute differences.

The translation given above is taken from T. & T. Clark's "Ante-Nicene Library." The translation previously given was made independently by the writer.

It may be added that the extract from Hippolytus, formerly presented, was also taken from the publication aforementioned.

Hebrew king." Calvin, whose opposition to instrumental music was avowed, and even in a passage in which he makes such an avowal, uses language, which may be quoted in the sequel, almost identical with that of Clemens.

Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, who was born A. D. 200, and who fell a martyr in A. D. 258, uses this language, "Such instruments were then permitted to them for this cause, even for the sake of their weakness, to excite their minds to perform their external worship with some delight."

Isidore of Pelusium, born in the latter part of the fourth century, says (Book I, Ep. 176), "When God tolerated victims and blood-shedding, on account of the puerility of the sacred rites which then marked them, why do you wonder that he also tolerated that music which is produced by harp and psaltery?"

Augustine, commenting on Ps. 33: 2, expresses himself thus:—"Nemo convertat cor ad organa theatra. Quod ei jubetur in se habet, sicut alibi dicitur, 'in mensunt, Deus, vota tua, quæ reddam laudationes tibi.'" that is, Let no one think of theatrical instruments of music. What is enjoined upon him, each one has in himself, as it is said in another place, In me, O God! are thy vows, which I will render as praises to thee. Then he proceeds to show the symbolical import of the instruments mentioned in the Psalm.

In his exposition of Ps. 150, Augustine uses these words:—"Ne quis autem cymbala intelligeret quæ sine anima sonant, ideo puto aditum 'in cymbalis jubilationis.' Jubilatio manque, id est ineffabilis laus, non nisi ab anima proficiscitur," which is to say, But lest any one should understand lifeless cymbals, it is, I think therefore added, "On cymbals of joy." For joy, that is unutterable praise, proceeds only from a soul.

Chrysostom, the eloquent bishop of Constantinople, discoursing near the close of the fourth century, says in reference to instrumental music:—"Like sacrifice, it was permitted to the Jews for the heaviness and grossness of their hearts. God condescended to their weakness because they were lately drawn off from idols; but now we may employ our bodies, instead of instruments, to praise him."

The witnesses now summoned are all that we need, not all that can be produced, and let us now see how the case stands.

In the first place, we have a stream of testimony extending from the second century onward to the beginning of the fifth (and we might trace it still farther down if time allowed), the drift of which is that in the services of the church, in the time specified, there was no instrumental music.

In the second place, this testimony comes from men in prominent positions, some of them, as, for instance, Chrysostom, in the very centres of wealth and fashion, where, if anywhere, the pomp of instrumental music must have found a place in worship.

In the third place, these men deal with the subject of instrumental music, not as if combating a practice which had found a footing in the church. On the contrary, they invariably speak of it as something entirely external and foreign to the Christian church.

In the fourth place, they give us (and they were, in their days, the great lights of the church) their views as to the symbolical meaning of the instruments of music used in the Old Testament worship. On this point there is a remarkable unanimity among them.

In the fifth place, there is not, so far as I know, a single sentence of conflicting testimony, from any writer of the first five centuries, or even much later, that is to say, there is not a single statement from those early times, to the effect that instrumental music was then used in worship. What Clement of Alexandria says, which some have taken to be evidence to the contrary, has already been considered.

In the sixth place, the ancient writers frequently refer to the exercise of singing the praises of God, without the least allusion to the use of instruments, and that,

too, in circumstances in which, had instruments been employed, there would have been an inducement to speak of them. A notable instance of this kind occurs in Jerome's Commentary on Ephesians, where, in his exposition of chap. v. verse 19, he censures very sharply the theatrical mode of singing which had begun to be exhibited in churches, but says not a word about instrumental music.

In the seventh place, in the accounts transmitted to us of the persecutions sustained by the Christians of the early ages, while we read of the destruction of their places of worship, of their psalm-books, and of their copies of the scriptures, we never read of the destruction of their instruments of music.

In the eighth place, the first definite hints which come down to us, as to the introduction of instruments of music into the churches, indicate that this did not take place until the seventh or, more probably, the eighth century.

In the ninth place, it was not till several centuries later still that the practice of using instrumental music in praising God acquired any prominence in the church. Thomas Aquinas, one of the great lights of the Romish church, writing about A. D. 1250, uses the following language: "In the old law, God was praised both with musical instruments and human voices. But the church does not use musical instruments, lest she should seem to Judaize. 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. Under the Old Testament, such instruments were used, partly because the people were harder and more carnal, and partly because these bodily instruments were typical of something." There is some ground to think that, at the time when Thomas wrote thus, there were instruments used in worship in some places. But had the practice been common, he could not have thus written. Moreover, he indicates that the church, as such, had not sanctioned such a practice. The first instance of the use of an organ in Scotland, for purposes of worship, occurred about, I believe, the year 1460.

In the tenth place, the Eastern, or Greek Church, now numbering about seventy-five or eighty millions of members and adherents, has never, to this day, permitted the use of instruments in her worship. It is a fact, also, that in some of the most ancient Romish cathedrals, as, for instance, that of Lyons, in France, no instrumental music has ever been heard; while from the Pope's chapel, at Rome, it is utterly excluded, at least when he is present. Some Roman Catholic writers, themselves, such as Molanus and Bouvier, note these facts, and understand them, justly, I think, to be lingering echoes of the remote past, when in none of the churches was the music of instruments tolerated.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

THE PROHIBITORY THEORY ASSERTED—VALUE OF THE HISTORICAL FACT THAT, IN THE EARLY CHURCH, INSTRUMENTS OF MUSIC WERE NOT USED.

Now, assuming, as surely we may, that in the ancient church, during the 2d and 3d centuries, and even some centuries later, instrumental music formed no feature or element of Christian worship, what confirmation of the prohibitory theory does this yield? To answer this duly, several remarks must be made.

(1.) The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the only rule of faith and practice. The writings of the Fathers and the usages of the ancient church are no more authoritative over our consciences than the writings of modern authors and the customs of the modern church.

(2.) The order and worship established by the Apostles are, so far as discoverable, to be reckoned as binding on the church now.

(3.) In order to ascertain what forms of worship were established by the Apostles, we must examine closely the New Testament writings.

(4.) In the effort to determine what the meaning of the Scriptures is, we may obtain aid from many quarters, as, for instance, from a knowledge of the customs of the times when the Scriptures were written, of the writings of uninspired men who used the language which inspired men wrote, and of the practices of the church soon after the Apostolic age.

(5.) Now, if it is a fact, as it certainly is, that, in the worship of the church for centuries after the time of the Apostles, there was no instrumental music used, how can this be accounted for, except on the supposition that the church, as constituted by the Apostles, used no instrumental music in its worship? I hold that this conclusion is inevitable; and if the worship of the church, as settled by the Apostles, was destitute of instrumental music, is not that a sufficient proof that the Apostles never inculcated, nor commended, nor countenanced this music in the services of the New Testament church, and that it should be excluded from the church still? Of course, if the evidence in the bible made it clear that instrumental music in worship was sanctioned by the Apostles, in settling the worship of the church, that must end the controversy; but we most strenuously deny that any passage, or combination of passages, in Old or New Testament, makes it clear or probable that such sanction was given; and, in addition to this, we adduce the fact, as a proof that our view of Scripture teaching on this point is right, that, so soon as the curtain is removed after the demise of the Apostles, we discover the church to be entirely without instrumental music in its worship.

Those who hold the rationalistic principle that the church order and worship settled by the Apostles form no authoritative guide to us may not feel the force of our argument; but those who hold the opposite view cannot afford to slight the point now urged. Nay, even Rationalists, themselves, must be constrained to concede that, if instrumental music may lawfully be used in the New Testament church, it is most remarkable that the Apostles, shrewd, not to say inspired, men, did not, at least, recommend it, in view of the fact that both Jews and Gentiles had been accustomed to the use of such music in their respective rituals of worship. And had they recommended it even, is it possible that no attention should have been given for centuries to their advice?

(6.) The attempts which have been made, and I know none better adapted, to invalidate our argument, serve only to reveal its strength. It is said, for instance,

A. "That the early Christians were poor and unable to procure the instruments desirable for musical purposes in worship."

To this it may be answered that a pipe or flute or harp would not have been too costly for the poorest congregation to procure; that we are not to form our judgment as to the cost of musical instruments in those days from the expensive organ of our times; that the early Christians were not all poor, for, even in Apostolic days, rich men were among them, and liberal contributions for benevolent objects were made by them, while, at a somewhat later date, men of affluence ranked among the followers of Christ; and that, such was the spirit of self-sacrifice evinced by the early adherents of the Christian cause, that, had they deemed it a duty, or even an advantage, to have instrumental music in their services, they would, even out of their deep poverty, have procured all the needful appliances for that end. It is urged, further,

B. "That they abstained from using instruments of music, lest they should draw upon themselves the notice and rage of their persecutors."

It is sufficient to say, in reply, that those Christians did not fear to sing in their meetings, as we definitely learn from Pliny's celebrated letter to Trajan, as well as from other sources; that they were not so timid as to disobey, through fear, any apostolic command, or ignore, even, any apostolic example or advice, for one of the faulty features of their conduct was that they often, of their own accord, went to the magistrates and confessed their faith in Christ, hoping thereby to win the much-coveted martyr's crown. He who resorts to this evasion knows not the

temper of the Christians of the first three centuries. Besides, it would be passing strange if, in the entire church, the utter suppression of instruments should have taken place through fear. It is suggested, moreover,

C. "That they were repelled from the use of instruments of music, because, in their view, these were closely identified with Pagan worship and theatrical entertainments."

My answer is that instruments of music were connected with the temple worship of the Jews, and, at least, the Jewish element of the early church might have felt attracted to the use of instruments on this ground; that vocal music was used in heathen worship and theatrical exhibitions, yet the Christians did not repudiate singing; and that, surely, if they had understood the Apostles to have enjoined, or even favored, by word or example, the use of instrumental music in worship, this direction or advice would not have been universally neglected by the church for centuries after the Apostolic age.

D. The surmise has been offered that "the early Christians declined from the use of instruments after the personal Apostolic supervision ceased, just as they degenerated into prelay in church government, and into many gross superstitions and errors." It may serve as an offset to this objection to say that, if a declension of the kind suggested took place, it must have occurred very abruptly, for, as soon as the veil is raised after the death of the Apostles, the church appears as destitute of instruments as it ever became—that is, totally destitute; that there is not a single hint from the ancient times that such a serious declension, or that any declension, in this matter ever occurred, whereas the growth of prelay and kindred corruptions can be clearly traced; that the marked tendency of the church, from the time of the Apostles onward till popery stood forth undisguised, was in the direction of sensuousness and pomp, not in the direction of simplicity of worship, as it must have been, so far as music is concerned, were this objection well founded. To account for the coming in of instrumental music into the services of the church, we need only to consider the general drift or tendency which characterized the early church; but to account for the expulsion of instruments, supposing them once to have been admitted, especially under Apostolic supervision, nothing known to me, in the general tendencies of human nature, or in the peculiar tendencies of the times alluded to, will suffice.

In view of the facts and principles enumerated, it is to me utterly inconceivable that instrumental music can have had place in the worship rendered by the Apostolic church, or that the Apostles can, either by word or act, have favored the use of it in worship; nor can I understand how the practice and sentiment of the church for centuries after the time of the Apostles, in relation to instrumental music, can be accounted for, unless on the supposition that it had been swayed by a mighty influence repressive of the tendencies of fallen human nature and adverse to the use of instruments in worship. I know not whence that influence can have come, except from the Apostles, and through them from the great Head of the Church.

The second proposed stage of our historical investigation relates to the circumstances in which instrumental music found entrance into the worship of the church. This department of research is subsidiary to that from which we have passed, and, although interesting and important, is yet but of secondary moment. Hence, a superficial treatment of it is all that will be here attempted.

Whatever may be thought about the use, in a very limited degree, of instrumental music in some parts of the church, at a somewhat earlier date, it cannot be denied that the first tangible and trustworthy evidence of its use in worship dates from about the middle of the eighth century. But at this time the church had become grievously corrupt, and the papacy had actually arisen. Popery is the product of unsanctified human nature, acting under peculiar influences, and is at once paganism superficially transformed, and a Satanic travesty of the Mosaic

hierarchy and worship. No wonder that, when the priestly order, with the great Pontiff at its head, had acquired control in the church, and when rites and ceremonies were multiplied to an enormous extent, musical instruments should be welcomed, and their pomp enlisted in support of the magnificent and imposing ritual in which Rome delighted, and still delights.

These general hints, which are all that can now be afforded, may serve to show that the very circumstances in which instrumental music gained a foothold in the church are fitted to beget suspicions as to the legitimacy of the addition.

CHAPTER XXIX.

THE PROHIBITORY THEORY DEFENDED—EVIDENCE IN ITS FAVOR DERIVABLE FROM MODERN CHURCH HISTORY.

The third section of our historical inquiry pertains to the lessons on the subject of instrumental music derivable from the history of the modern church, beginning with the Reformation. In order to extract the lessons, we must know the facts; and these, in a very cursory and imperfect manner, will now be submitted.

(1.) The leading Reformers, among whom may be mentioned Luther, Zwingli, Calvin and Knox, were opposed to the use of instrumental music in worship. Eckhart, a Lutheran advocate of such music, admits reluctantly that Luther called organs "ensigns of Baal."

Zwingli's opposition to instrumental music in worship was vehement. Calvin's mind on the subject may be learned from his own writings, and from the record of the order of worship which he established in Geneva. Among his deliverances on the subject under discussion, are these:—"Musical instruments were among the legal ceremonies which Christ abolished at his coming, and therefore we, under the gospel, must maintain a greater simplicity." Again he says, "I have no doubt that playing upon the cymbal, touching the harp and viol and all kinds of music, which is so frequently mentioned in the Psalms, was a part of the education that is the puerile instruction of the law. I speak of the service of the temple; for even now if believers choose to cheer themselves with musical instruments, they should, I think, make it an object, not to dissever their cheerfulness from the praise of God. But when they frequent their sacred assemblies, musical instruments in celebrating the praises of God would be no more suitable than the burning of incense, the lighting up of lamps, and the restoration of the other shadows of the law. The Papists themselves have foolishly borrowed this, as well as many other things, from the Jews."

As to John Knox, the tone of the church which he was the main instrument of establishing, may serve to indicate what his mind was in regard to the use of instruments in worship. In reference to the principle that every part of lawful worship must be divinely appointed, he says significantly, "This principle not only purified the church of human inventions and popish corruptions, but restored plain singing of psalms unaccompanied by instrumental music."

Let it not be said that the great men, whose views have now been presented, were destitute of an ear and taste for music; boorish men, unfit to give an opinion in the case. Luther was noted for musical enthusiasm and taste. Zwingli also, whose opposition to instrumental music in worship, might almost be styled fierce, was possessed of an unusual faculty and taste for music. Dr. Schaff, in his "Creeds of Christendom," bears this testimony to Zwingli, "His preference for Puritanic simplicity in public worship gave rise to the fiction of his hostility to music. He was on the contrary singularly skilled in that art, and was called in derision by the Papists, 'the evangelical lute player.' A contemporary says, that he never knew a man who could play on so many musical instruments, the lute, the harp, the viol, etc."

Calvin appreciated music, and was at pains to have the Psalms set to music, and took active measures to have the young trained to sing them. Dr. Schaff, in the work already named, has this to say of him, "Although Calvin was devoted to the severe simplicity of evangelical worship, he did not overlook the inherent love of mankind for poetry and art. He himself had a taste for music and knew its power."

John Knox, so far manifested his zeal for music in the church that he endeavored to have the singing of psalms established, and to have them sung according to the principles of correct taste.

(2.) The Reformed churches, as distinguished from the Lutheran, were averse to the use of instrumental music in worship. In the churches of Switzerland, France and Scotland, no instruments were allowed in worship. In the church of Holland, owing to the pressure of the civil authorities, instruments were admitted or rather were retained from Romish times, but, as has been already mentioned, the church, as such, was restive under this arrangement.

In the Church of England, organs, which were confined chiefly to the cathedrals or principal places of worship, were retained, but greatly against the will of the powerful Puritan party in that church. The Puritans were the proper successors of the Lollards or Wickliffites in England, who, before the Reformation, had opposed the organs, in this, resembling the Waldenses, who never used instruments in their worship.

The protestants of Hungary, Transylvania and Poland, together with the Reformed churches in Germany, as Voetius tells us, used at least in former days, no instrumental music in their worship.

The Puritans of New England were vigorous opponents of instrumental music in worship, as any one may see by consulting Cotton Mather's "Magnalia."

(3.) No protestant church has ever enjoined, or, as far as I know, recommended the use of instrumental music, as well fitted to express and promote the true spirit of praise. Nay, even the popish authorities have never issued a mandate directing that all congregations provide themselves with organs, or less expensive instruments for the celebration of praise, and as a matter of fact, instrumental music is not yet established in all popish places of worship. Even in the Council of Trent, it is said, a resolution was introduced, providing for the abolition of instrumental music in the churches, but, at the urgent entreaty of the Emperor Ferdinand, was abandoned.

The Lutherans, more probably from state influences than from the desire of the genuine members of the church, have been all along their history identified with instrumental music.

CHAPTER XXX.

THE PROHIBITORY THEORY DEFENDED—EVIDENCE IN ITS BEHALF FROM MODERN CHURCH HISTORY.

(4.) Within the present century, and notably since the outbreak of the ritualistic spirit in England about the year 1830, a disposition to use instrumental music in the services of the sanctuary, has been developed among the Congregationalists, Baptists and Methodists in England. Of late years, the English Presbyterian church, anxious, it would seem, to meet the tastes of Episcopalians, from whom they hope for accessions, have permitted the use of instrumental music in worship.

In Scotland and Ireland, the organ has been producing anything but harmony or melody. In a few congregations, belonging to the Church of Scotland, the innovation of instrumental music has been admitted, and although the opposition to it has been, and is, strong throughout the church, the prospect that the grievance shall be removed, is not cheering.

In the Free Church of Scotland there has been as yet, so far as is known to the writer, but one instance, that of Broughty Ferry, in which a congregation has been disturbed by the use of an instrument of music in its worship, and according to the latest accounts, the General Assembly having been notified of the disorder and having commanded that it cease, the nuisance has been stopped. There are noble men in the Free Church, prominent among whom are Dr. Begg, Dr. Kennedy of Dingwall, and, I think, Dr. Hugh Martin, the author of several excellent works, especially a treatise on the atonement, who are resolute in the defense of truth, and in the maintenance of the true liberty of the church, its freedom from the yoke of ceremonialism. But a generation has arisen which is not disturbed by the second-hand rationalism of Professor Robertson Smith, and to a large extent is disposed to screen him from the stern censure which his course merits, and should this generation gain the mastery, the flood-gates, not only of rationalism, but also of ritualism in respect to music and other matters will soon be opened in that church.

In the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, the tendency toward an ornate and florid style of worship, has for many years been manifest, some of the congregations of that body having with permission of the Synod, resorted to the use of musical instruments, and while there has set in a strong reaction in that church against laxity of doctrine, such reaction against lax practices in worship has not taken place, and does not seem likely soon to arise.

The Irish Presbyterian Church has been for several years afflicted with practical rebellion in respect to instrumental music on the part of a few, not more it is believed, than five congregations, a rebellion, however, aided and fomented by a powerful party in that church. But though all the arts of political tricksters have been employed by the party aforesaid, the cause of instrumental music has not yet prevailed; its failure being due in a large measure to the wholesome hatred of prelatial ritualism, which still pervades the church, and to the sagacity, firmness and formidable debating powers of such men as, Rev. Francis Petticrew, Rev. A. Robinson, Rev. Dr. Robb, and Rev. Dr. Corkey. Long may these men live to fight the battle of genuine protestant liberty! In the churches of Australia and New Zealand, even those of the Presbyterian order, a strong tendency toward instrumental music exists.

In the Canada Presbyterian church, instrumental music in worship is tolerated, though, I believe, but little used, and in many quarters vigorously opposed.

In the United States, most of the religious denominations allow the use of instruments in worship. It was only toward the end of the first half of this century that the Presbyterian Church in the United States (frequently distinguished now, by other branches of the Presbyterian family, by the name of the "Re-united" Presbyterian Church) succumbed to the ritualistic spirit, and permitted the use of musical instruments in worship; but there is reason to think that this procedure was distasteful to some of the clearest heads of that communion. In an article in the Jan. No., for 1843, of the Biblical Repository, afterwards known as the Princeton Review, may be found a brief and very modest expression of opinion in favor of the use of instrumental music in worship. The editor of the Review, who at that time was Dr. Charles Hodge, subjoins, in a foot-note, the following remarks: "The opinions expressed above, on the subject of instrumental music, are adverse, as is well known, to those which have prevailed, and continue to prevail, in the Presbyterian church. As a calm and guarded vindication of a practice which we would by no means be understood to recommend, we have given place to expressions from which our readers, no less than ourselves, may choose to dissent." It was, perhaps, in deference to the feeling of this great man in relation to instrumental music that not till after his death, as I have been credibly informed, was an organ introduced into the Seminary chapel at Princeton. Other distinguished men of the same communion felt more averse than even Dr. Hodge to the introduction of an instrumental service into public worship.

In the United Presbyterian Church of North America, to which the writer belongs, a positive stand has been taken against the use of musical instruments, for in its "Directory for Worship," the use of musical instruments in worship is forbidden, and that on the ground that such music in the New Testament church has no sanction in the word of God. For some time, however, a spirit of disaffection toward this rule has been at work, culminating, as in the Irish Presbyterian church, in practical rebellion on the part of six or eight congregations. Instead of commanding these congregations to desist from the palpable violation of law in this matter, and directing the presbyteries having immediate jurisdiction to take the proper steps for the correction of the evil, the General Assembly of the church, at its meeting in May of the current year (1881), resolved, by a large majority, to submit to presbyteries the question whether or not the rule referred to, in the "Directory for Worship," shall be repealed, the result of the vote in presbyteries to be reported to the Assembly at its meeting next year.

Now, let us seek to gather up some of the lessons which this hasty and incomplete survey of the attitude of the modern church toward instrumental music is fitted to yield.

First, It appears that the greatest leaders whom, in his mercy, God has given to the church, since the days of the Apostles, were opposed to the use of instruments in the worship of God. It may be said that they swung off to an extreme because of the abuse of instrumental music in the Romish communion, from which they had withdrawn. But singing, too, had been abused by the Romanists, yet the Reformers did not oppose singing. Rather, they extended its use, by calling on the congregation, instead of the selected choir merely, to sing. Besides, those great men were possessed of minds so well balanced that, all things considered, they preserved a marvelously sober temper in dealing with the errors and abuses of Romanism. The opposition of Calvin and Knox, in particular, to instrumental music in worship rested expressly on the ground that such music is unwarranted by God, in this dispensation. Small men, in our day, will, no doubt, sneer at the citation of the opinions of those men, but no one who is competent to measure the real grandeur of those departed heroes will be disposed to rate lightly their settled judgment in this matter.

Second, It is noticeable that those branches of the church that took the highest and purest protestant ground at the time of the Reformation were the most opposed to the use of instruments in worship. The Lutheran church, retaining largely the Romish tincture, took very readily to organs. The Calvinistic, or Reformed churches, in general, opposed organs. Is there no significance in this?

Third, Those branches of the church that have most tenaciously adhered to the scripture Psalter in offering the service of praise have been the most noted for their aversion to instrumental music in worship. It is easy to see the reason of this, for the principle that, in worshipping God, we must be regulated by his own appointment, underlies at once the opposition to uninspired hymns and to instrumental music in worship.

Fourth, A certain timidity in relation to instrumental music has marked the churches that have admitted it. As already noted, not one of them has enacted it as a law that congregations should avail themselves of instrumental help in worship; nay, not one of them has earnestly urged or recommended such a course. Is not this singular, if those churches feel confident that God either commanded or recommended the use of such help? Does not this timidity argue some misgivings as to the propriety of employing instrumental aid? This I know: that ministers, belonging to churches which use instruments, have intimated that, if we who have no organs in our churches only knew what they experimentally know, we would not fight much for instruments.

Our historical argument, then, for the prohibitory theory amounts to this, that in the early church, for some centuries after the time of the Apostles, no instru-

mental music was used in worship, the common sentiment being that such music had been appointed by God for the Jewish church and dispensation alone; that the facts just mentioned are unaccountable on any other ground than this: that, in the Apostolic church, instrumental music in worship had been unused and discountenanced; that the notion that the word psallo, as found in the Apostolic writings, includes the idea of instrumental music is thus rendered highly improbable; that the view of the condition of the church, at the time when instrumental music began to be used in its services, is fitted to beget suspicions as to the propriety of the innovation; and that, since the Reformation, the churches most distinguished for their desire to adhere closely to the teaching of the word of God have been the most averse to the practice opposed in these pages.

Thus the proposed discussion of the three rival theories as to the use of instrumental music has been completed. Almost all the pleas urged in favor of the use, whether imperative or optional, of instruments in worship have been considered with some care. No difficulty has been consciously overlooked, that may press, or that might be supposed to press, on the side I maintain; and no argument of any weight for the opposite side has been wittingly left unnoticed. I have written especially for those who, like myself, profess adherence to the Westminster formularies; but some pains have been taken to frame an argument to meet the case of those who hold a different creed. I am not ignorant that the doctrine advocated in these pages is unfashionable, especially among the rich and those who make pretensions to "culture," and, doubtless, sneers about tithing "mint and anise and cumin," and about blind prejudice, will greet this production, if it be not deemed entirely beneath notice. I can clearly say that I should not thus have addressed the public, had I not felt that duty demanded the attempt. A crisis had come, when to be silent would have been to act the craven part of a recreant to some of the deepest convictions of my soul, and no abuse which may be heaped upon me, much as I naturally shrink from such an experience, could be so terrible to me as the consciousness that, when the fair form of truth lay prostrate in the street, I did not try to raise her up, or, at least, evince my sympathy and reverence by standing as a friend at her side.

PART THIRD.

Ecclesiastico-Political Aspects of the Question.

It now remains for us to inquire how the question of instrumental music should be dealt with by churches in their organized capacity. Especially, our inquiry will relate to the manner in which a denomination of the Presbyterian order should deal with this matter.

Shall the use of an instrumental accompaniment be commanded? or, Shall it be recommended? or, Shall it be simply permitted, each session being left to decide for the congregation under its care whether to admit or reject instruments? or, Shall it be prohibited?

Of course the answers given to these questions will turn largely on the divergent views held, not only as to the instrumental question in itself, but also touching the form of church government, and the proper terms of ecclesiastical communion. Occupying the ground that the church, organically considered, as well as individually, is under obligation to seek, receive, profess and maintain the truth as far as possible, as revealed in scripture, I shall attempt to answer briefly in the spirit of this principle, the questions proposed.

1. The church ought not to require the use of instruments unless God has

required such use. That he has not, it has been one leading aim of the previous discussion to prove.

2. The church should not recommend the use of instrumental music in worship. Those, who think God has recommended the use of this music for the present dispensation, will of course answer differently.

3. The church ought not to permit the use of instruments unless the principle be accepted that God has left the matter to human option, which I think he has not.

4. If uncertain, whether God has sanctioned instrumental music in the worship of this dispensation, or not, the church should practically debar the use of it till the matter should be made clear, for any rite or ceremony of worship ought to have a positive divine authorization.

5. If satisfied that God has, by clear implication, forbidden or not sanctioned instrumental music in worship, the church should positively prohibit such music, and state the ground of the prohibition.

Different objections to the course indicated may be urged, and that even by persons who profess to be unfavorable personally to the use of instrumental music in worship. Perhaps most of these objections are embodied in the following proposition:—The unlawfulness of using instruments of music in worship in the present dispensation, is not so clear as to justify the absolute prohibition of such a mode of worship.

To this it may be answered:—

(1.) If the unlawfulness of using instruments of music in worship is shown to be even more probable than the opposite view, though not absolutely certain, it would be a duty to shun the use of them; for we ought to be careful in offering any sacrifice to God, that we have his sanction or approval of it. We must aim at offering in faith, for whatsoever is not of faith is sin; and nothing can be offered to God in faith, unless there be reasonable ground to believe that he will accept the offering. In order to be warrantable a form of worship must not come as an unaccredited adventurer, but have a positive introduction from him who alone can grant, in such a matter, authoritative credentials. Instruments of music must be excluded until a satisfactory warrant for the use of them can be produced. They must be shut out not merely when we are certain that they are wrong, but also when we are uncertain whether or not they are right. It is true, if God in his word has sanctioned the use of them for this dispensation, and we with that word before us, fail to discover his mind in this matter, we are culpable; but we shall certainly be culpable, and that in the form of a sin of presumption, whether or not he has sanctioned the use of instruments in his worship, if we so use them without being persuaded that in doing so we have his approval. Now, if it would be the duty of an individual to abstain from adopting a form of worship without satisfactory evidence that it has the sanction of God, it would be no less the duty of the church in like case to abstain, and if it is the duty of the church to abstain from such usage, it is the duty of the church to prohibit it.

(2.) The optional theory is that which most generally prevails among those who desire instrumental music, and those theorists do not profess to be bound in conscience to have this music in worship, in other words, do not think they inevitably commit a sin in leaving it out. Now, ought not those who feel so, to be willing, for the sake of brethren who object to instruments, to abstain from using them, and to be willing, moreover, that the church should prohibit the use of them, on at least the ground of expediency? Rather than cast a stumbling block in the way of a weak brother, Paul professed that he would be willing to abstain from meat while the world lasted. Would he not have been willing then to forego, for the sake of the weak, a preference for instrumental music in worship, if at least he was allowed to state the ground on which he surrendered his preference and further if he had the prospect that such weak brethren would soon be won, over to his side, or be removed by death, as is the confidence of the advocates of instru-

mental music, touching the ultimate and even speedy prevalence of their views? But if an individual ought to restrict his liberty out of charity in such a case, ought not an organized company or a church to do so, that is agree to prohibit, at least on the ground of expediency, the doing of that which would be likely to offend a weak brother?

(3.) This is a practical question, which must be decided in some way. In the circumstances which in the present day surround us, a church which does not prohibit the use of instruments in worship sanctions it constructively. If there was a common understanding that no instruments of music should be employed in worship till a general consent to such use had been obtained, it might be less needful to lay an interdict on the use of them; but some, in their haste, will rush recklessly forward in the path of innovation, and hence, if confusion and strife would be prevented, a prohibitory policy must be adopted.

(4.) It may be found, on close inspection, that more can be said against the lawfulness of instrumental music in worship than against many other opinions and practices which most churches condemn, and if we begin to expunge from our "Directory for Worship" an article forbidding the use of instrumental music in worship, we may feel ourselves compelled, by a regard for consistency, to eliminate from our Standards not a few other provisions. Let conservative men, who may lend help in the effort to cancel the prohibitory rule touching instrumental music, take note that there are breakers ahead.

(5.) In a Presbyterian denomination, one conspicuous feature of whose church polity it is that each part is subject to the whole, and that whatever is the profession of one part is the profession of the entire body, to relegate to sessions the right and responsibility of deciding as to the admission or exclusion of instrumental music would be incongruous and suicidal. To do so would be to erect a kingdom within a kingdom, to sanction a system of conflicting local tests and creeds, and break up the unity of the body. Such a condition of matters would be anarchy, and, worse still, legalized anarchy. As an illustration of the working of such a policy, let the case of a minister be taken into account, who is conscientiously opposed to the use of instrumental music in worship. Such a man must be shut out from as many congregations of his own church as shall have in their worship the element to which he is in principle opposed. He cannot accept a call from any of those congregations, nay, can hardly, with a clear conscience, conduct the services of public worship in any of them. He is in good standing, yet he is virtually, on the ground of principle, excluded from a number of the congregations of the same church to which he belongs. Is there nothing preposterous and disorderly in such a state of matters? Still further, it is conceivable that all the ministers of a church having such a policy might become opposed to the use of instruments of music in worship, whereas all the sessions might be in favor of the practice, and might introduce it into the congregations of which they had the charge, respectively. Thus it is supposable that all the ministers might be practically shut out from accepting a call to any of the congregations of the church to which they belonged. This would be a legitimate fruit of the principle that such a matter as deciding in reference to the admission of instrumental music in worship be left to the local option of sessions. But the logical consequence being bad, the premises from which it properly flows must also be bad.

It has been stated, that not only may the use of instruments be forbidden, but the ground of the prohibition may be declared in the standards of the church. There might be circumstances in which it would be sufficient to shut the instruments out of worship practically, without explicitly asserting that they are unsanctioned by God. As a matter of fact, this has been hitherto the attitude maintained by most churches from whose services instrumental music has been excluded. But there may arise such a rage for this music that the church, in resisting it, shall be compelled to state the ground of its opposition. For, the

question will be continually recurring, "Why do you debar the use of musical instruments in your services?" Opposition forces a faithful church to enlarge its explicit creed from age to age. Step by step, such a church is driven to assume a positive and decided attitude. Never since the world began, was there greater need than now, for a firm and explicit condemnation of instrumental music, as unwarranted by the word of God in the worship of New Testament times.

Having once taken such a positive ground, the church should not readily abandon it. A position calmly and solemnly taken, and only in a calm and solemn way should a position be taken on such a question, is not lightly to be relinquished, lest haply the sin of backsliding from just attainments should be added to the sin of not maintaining the truth. And at such a time as this when the very atmosphere seems to be tainted with the poison of ritualism, as well as of rationalism, we should be doubly jealous of any step backward, especially when the retrogression is in the direction manifestly of one of the dangerous currents of the day. The cautious steersman seeks to brace himself against the wind which is driving him too fast toward the rocky shore, even though that shore may be the very one for which he is bound.

The strong position indicated would not necessarily exclude from membership those who felt unable fully to assent to it. Dissenters, or at least persons feeling unable to assent, might state their mind to church courts, and yet agree to abstain from practical insubordination. In such a case they might be received, or, if already received, might remain as members in good standing. There are questions, such as that pertaining to the supreme divinity of Christ, respecting which the church should not evince such inclusiveness; but in relation to a point of less moment like that under consideration, such a mode as has been suggested of composing difficulties is allowable.