

and trembling, and over dark and unfathomable chasms, may look out upon a view, such as can be seen at no other spot of earth. From that eminence he may look down upon mountains that stretch far away on every side, all crowned with their thawless snows,—upon lakes that sleep in quiet beauty at their feet,—upon the forests at the north,—upon the rich vineyards of France,—and far to the southward, upon the golden haze overhanging Italy,—upon the historic plain of Marathon,—and upon the shores that are washed by the waters of the Mediterranean sea. But who would not rather live in the secluded valley, than upon the snowy summit of Mont Blanc! Who would not rather abide in the lowly vale, from which we could lift our eyes to the calm, pure heaven above us, and be cheered and warmed by rays from the great Sun of Righteousness, than to ascend the heights and breathe the rare and chilling air, to which a godless philosophy would lift us! In the vale, we could live,—live joyfully, and gladly, and peacefully: upon the mountain top, we would perish in a single night.

Of the Positive Philosophy we may then say, that while its author must be acknowledged to be a man of comprehensive scientific knowledge, and is evidently a master in the art of generalization, yet, the fundamental principles of his philosophy are so hopelessly wrong, as to ensure the downfall of the whole structure,—while the opposition which the system assumes towards the Religion of Christ, will only necessitate another fulfilment of the prediction, that upon whomsoever this stone “shall fall, it will grind him to powder.” Let him that is attracted by its specious generalizations and its scientific pretensions, beware.

ARTICLE IV.

ON ORGANS.

by the Rev. John Douglas [1809-1879]

If we agitate this subject, and seek to expel from the house and worship of God, all the lovers and devotees of

Jubal, who was a descendant of that wicked one, Cain, it is simply because we know the beginning of evil is as the letting forth of water. The most deadly poisons are usually administered with the most pleasant and healthy food. The most dangerous errors and falsehoods on earth, are those presented with a large amount of truth. A scar, accidentally made, on the face, may afterwards be deemed an important element to a perfect portrait. So customs, formed without the shadow of authority, may, by consent, become as binding and solemn as law itself. Hence, upon the use of organs, as a regular part of the services of the sanctuary, we say, "*Obst principis.*"—*"*Qui dat formam, dat consequentia ad formam,*" Let an error or evil, in any way, gain a foot-hold in the church, and how long will it be before tradition will bow down to it, as a relic of profoundest veneration? Like the long and angry controversy waged between the Eastern and Western Churches, as to whether the bread they used on sacramental occasions should be leavened or unleavened, —or of the amusing mistake mentioned by Herodotus, which occurred by a mere slip of the pen in transcribing the word *mumpsimus* for *sumpsimus*; at first it was regarded a mistake, but time soon gave to it, a veneration, which a logomachy of years could not correct. For what we have to advance upon this subject, we would neither excite the hatred of Lavater, who says, "Never make that man your friend who hates music": nor the reproach of him who says:

"The man that hath not music in himself,
Nor is not moved with concord of sweet sounds,
Is fit for treason, stratagems and spoils.
The motions of his spirit are dull as night,
And his affections dark as Erebus.
Let no such man be trusted."

Though not entirely destitute of musical taste, or musical knowledge, still we are free to admit, if our lot had fallen in the reign of queen Elizabeth, we might have been something of a wonder among men: For those who could not then, join in a madrigal, or take their part in a song for various voices, were treated as persons whose education had been neglected, and folks wondered where such people had been brought up"—

*Lex Rex. P. 2.

We have no idea, if our life were suddenly terminated by death, the world would ever say of us, as was said of the celebrated musician, Paganini, "The whole man was an instrument,—a musical sensibility seemed to vibrate through every fibre of his frame." Or, as was said at the death of Pope: "The power of *song* and *force of music* died." But we confess, ours is a dull ear, for what some persons call "the luxuries" of public worship, viz.: the organ, with its *attaché*, an operatic choir, which, too often, is no more, even on the Sabbath, in the house of God, than ἀχροαματα, (ear-sports.) Such a remark may subject us, in the estimation of many, to the charge of narrow-minded prejudice,—and the amateurs of the organ and dance, may denounce us as stiff-laced Puritan,—disturbers of the peace, and long-established good order in the worship of the Sanctuary. But shall we obey God, or please man? If ours be the work of men, it will come to nought; but if it be the work of God, ye cannot overthrow it. Hence "stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls." We shall here only bear our testimony against evils which we have seen, or believe to exist, among the professed people of God. We are well aware that an argument, drawn merely from the silence of the Scriptures, is obviously inconclusive,—nothing would be a more dangerous or unwise conclusion than to maintain, what the Scriptures do not condemn, they approve. In this way, the praying to saints, or praying for the dead,—the use of oil, chrism and spittle in baptism,—the belief in such places as limbo and purgatory, would soon find a place in our creed. For doctrinal knowledge, or the established order of public worship,—we are not willing to take the *ἄυτοη εφς* of any individual, or sect,—we demand a—"Thus saith the Lord." "Salus Populi suprema Lex." It is not the sanctity which custom, or age, gives to any part of religion, that makes us respect it, but its Divine original. Music of any sort, is not to be held sacred by us, merely because it is performed in the house of God. Too much, we fear, is thus offered, of which the Lord may well say: "When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand

to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations: incense is an abomination unto me: the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with: it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting." A "sin-offering hast thou not required." It is not because praise is a pleasant thing—pleases the ear—and stirs up the deep feelings of the soul, that we employ it in the worship of God: a much stronger reason than this enjoins its use upon us,—it is a "positive institution of God." "Sing ye praises with the spirit, and with the understanding also." "Let every thing that hath breath, praise the Lord."

If music—if praise, is a necessary and important part of our worship, and derives its efficacy from its appointment, and our method of performance,—surely, it is no vain enquiry, how? or with what, shall we praise God? The design of sacred music is to express our devout affections towards God, and make melody in the heart to the Lord." Says Dr. Fuller, "The intent of singing is, by a musical pronounciation of affecting truth, to render it still more affecting." "Singing" says Dr. Gill, "is speaking melodiously, musically, or with the modulation of the voice; for there is no such thing as mental singing, or singing in the heart without the voice." In its place, praise is as necessary and important a part of our worship, and should be as faithfully improved and performed, as the preaching of the word or prayer. For He who said "Hear the word at my mouth"—"preach the word,"—who hath taught us "how to pray," and "for what we should pray,"—with the same authority enjoins it upon us "to sing with the spirit, and with the understanding also." "Speaking to yourselves in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs: singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord." "In this," *Emmons says, "the apostle did not address the Ephesians, as singers, but as men of piety, who would wish to express their holy love and gratitude to the Author of all their mercies." Speaking is the natural language of the understanding, and singing is the natural language of the heart. "We always use words to express our thoughts, but we do not always use words to express our feelings.

* Vol. 2, p. 391.

These we can clearly and forcibly express by simple sounds." Sound may arouse and excite the feelings, but will leave no deep or lasting impression on the heart. "Melodious sounds have only a mechanical operation upon the mind but when they are connected with appropriate language, they produce a moral effect. For this reason, men have always connected music and poetry together." Music has no human father. It claims to have descended from the skies. It is no modern invention. For sacred song is as ancient as the creation, the eldest born of all the daughters of Music. So does instrumental music go back far in the history of man, for Jubal, the sixth from Cain, long before the deluge, taught men to play on instruments, and was called "the father of all such as handle the harp and organ. By the way, we here take occasion to remark, what was then called an organ, was not such as we now use, and call by that name. Parkhurst says, it denoted some fistular wind instrument with holes, resembling our flute: and answering to the "*fistula Panis*" of antiquity, whose invention was ascribed to Pan, the great sylvan god, who made it of the reeds which grew by the river banks, and played on it while his goats were feeding, which shows it was a pastoral instrument, and not such as we now use. Originally, the word *organum*, whence organ is derived, had a very extended acceptation, and designated all instruments, whatever their uses. By degrees it was applied solely to musical instruments: it was afterwards confined to wind instruments, and at last the word *organum* only signified the instrument we now call an organ. If we may rely on statements in the British Minstrel as authority,* The first true indication of an organ is dated about the 8th century. At that period, the Greek Emperor, Constantine Eupronymus, presented an organ to Pepin, king of France. For a long time it was used only in princes' courts, and not thought of being introduced into churches." Elsewhere, the same historian informs us—From the French church proceeded the use of the organ—the first musical instrument employed in the church. Music in churches, is as old

* Neander, vol. iii: p. 128.

as the church itself: but not so with the use of instrumental music. Bingham says, "It is generally agreed by learned men that the use of organs came into the church since the time of Thomas Aquinas, (1250.) For he said, "Our church does not use musical instruments, as harps, and psalteries, to praise God." The gradual introduction of them was concurrent with the gradual corruption of the church in all other respects. So long as she retained her virgin purity, and was uncorrupted by the world, did she most sedulously keep aloof from all such innovations and improvements. Marinus Sannus, who lived about 1290, was the first who brought the use of wind organs into churches. In honour of which, he was called Torcellus,—the Italian name for an organ. Let it not be forgotten—the art of playing on the organ, and its use in Divine service, was first brought to perfection in the Church of Rome. Here it is, we ascertain the parentage off this so-called grand improvement in the praise of God. Whenever the church puts on the mask of the world, she is not only sure to lose something of her dignity, but of vital godliness.

But, to take up again the thread of Scriptural history upon this subject: Moses, the leader of God's ancient Israel, composed a song and sung it when he passed through the Red Sea. David was both a lover and great proficient in music—was called "the sweet singer in Israel." He was such a lover of it, and so enthusiastic in his performance, that in the eyes of his queen, Michal, he so far outstripped the bounds of decency, in dancing and playing before the ark, that she came out to meet him with the ironical reproach: How glorious was the king of Israel to-day, who uncovered himself to-day in the eyes of the handmaids and his servants as one of the vain fellows shamelessly uncovereth himself."* For upwards of *six hundred* years after the deluge, the Scriptures do not record the practice of music, but in Genesis, chap. 31, where Laban says to Jacob, "wherefore didst thou flee away secretly, and steal away from me, and didst not tell me, that I might have sent thee away with mirth, and with songs, with

2 Sam. vi: 5-20.

tabret and with harp?" And during the period of the administration of Moses, no other musical instruments are mentioned than trumpets and timbrels,—the blowing of the ram's horns at the destruction of Jericho,—and the song of Deborah and Barak. From this, to the period when Saul was chosen king, about 1095 before Christ, the Bible has no reference to musical instruments, except the trumpet on military occasions. As there is no precept of Christ,—no example of the apostles, enjoining or enforcing the introduction of musical instruments into Divine worship, under the gospel,—no dictate of reason, and no sentiment of piety requiring their use, it is devoutly to be wished that they may be entirely and universally excluded from the house of God. Justin Martyr says, "The singing with instrumental music was not received in the Christian churches, as it was among the Jews in their infant state; but only the use of plain song." Justinus remarks: "The use of instruments was granted the Jews for their imperfection, and that therefore such instruments have no place in the church."—Long after this, we learn from Gillespie: "The Jewish church, not as it was a church, but as it was Jewish, it had musicians to play upon harps, psalteries, cymbals, and other musical instruments, in the temple.

As David was known on different great occasions, both himself to use, and recommend the use of instruments to others, we may be asked, if it was proper for David to use them, under the law, why not, equally so, for us, under the gospel? The middle wall of partition is broken down. David submitted to the rite of circumcision—the offering of sacrifices: must we do the same under the gospel? But we would answer this question with the words of another,* "To this it may be sufficient to reply, that God appointed instrumental music in the temple service, for the same reason that he directed the temple to be decorated with the richest ornaments, the high priests to be arrayed in the most beautiful and costly robes, and all the sacred utensils to be made of solid silver and gold. This magnificence of the temple and all its appendages, was necessary to render it a pro-

* Emmons, vol. 2: p. 397.

per type of Christ, and an effectual bulwark against idolatry.” The instruments of music used in the temple service, were all appointed by God, and separated from a profane to a sacred purpose. Since we have no such musical instruments of Divine appointment under the gospel, what right have we to appoint any, or to use any, without a Divine appointment? If we once introduce musical instruments into Divine service, we shall never know when, or where to stop. True, the ancient Hebrews had a great taste for music, such as they used in their religious services,—in their public and private rejoicings, feasts, and even at their mournings. God gave the pattern of the Temple, in which every piece of timber was described,—and all the utensils and ornaments, even to the tape-strings: where do we find the directions of its instruments, to be used on all ordinary occasions? And, on what private occasion do we find them mingling instrumental music with their songs of praise? Trumpets and horns are the only instruments concerning which any directions are given in the law, and these are scarcely mentioned as musical instruments; but as suited to, and employed for, making signals, calls, and conveying instructions during the religious solemnities. The trumpets sounded every morning at the opening of the court-gates (i.e. of the Temple. In the Temple, the trumpets were sounded exclusively by the priests, who stood, not in the Levitical, but apart and opposite to the Levites, on the other side of the altar, both parties looking toward it,—the priests on the west side, and the Levites on the east. The trumpets did not join in the concert; but were sounded during certain regulated pauses in the vocal and instrumental music. The song and music began not to sound, till the pouring out of the drink-offering: so we may understand the passage, (2 Chron. xxix: 27,) “And when the burnt-offering began, the song of the Lord began also, with the trumpets, and with the instruments *ordained* by David, the king.” If instrumental music formed any part of the Jewish worship, it was at some religious festival, national jubilee, or to celebrate some great natural deliverance,—such as crossing of the Red Sea—deliverance from Egypt. When David ascended the throne of Is-

rael, we hear of many a sacred concert. When he brought the ark of the Lord from Kirjath-jearim, David and all Israel played before God, with all their might, and with singing and with harps, and with psalteries, and with timbrels, and with cymbals, and with trumpets." "And the sons of Aaron, the priests, shall blow with the trumpets: and they shall be to you for an ordinance forever throughout your generations. In the day of your gladness, and in your solemn days, and in the beginnings of your months, ye shall blow with the trumpets, even your burnt-offerings: that they may be to you for a memorial before your God."* This was doubtless the origin of the choir of the Hebrew ritual. Asaph, Hedan and Jemuthun, were chiefs of the music of the Tabernacle, under David, and of the Temple, under Solomon. Asaph had *four* sons, Seduthun *six*, and Heman *fourteen*. These *twenty-four* Levites, sons of the three great masters of the Temple music, were at the head of *twenty four* bands of musicians, which served in the Temple by turns. Ezra, in his enumeration of those whom he brought back with him from the captivity, reckons *two hundred* singing men and singing women. Lightfoot,† quoting from Maimonides, says, "The singers were Levites and Israelites together, and the song of the Temple was properly with voices, and not with instruments."

The fact that David so often speaks of instrumental music, and recommends them in the praise of God, is proof positive, for many, that instruments were of universal use in the Temple service. He speaks also of them in the heavenly state. Must we conclude from this, that any gross or material instrument will there be used?—or anything else than the sincere praise of the heart? "Even admit that the Jewish ritual was made up solely of instrumental music, and that the whole Jewish public worship consisted of performances on musical machinery, it would not prove that all that was even **the** smallest lawful part of our Christian worship." We would not even seem to speak lightly of revelation. But "it should be remembered, it was not Moses, nor the

*Numbers x: 8 & 10.

† Vol. ix: 55.

Prophets," but it was David who arranged the whole musical economy of the Jews: whatever it may have been—David, the king, as well as David, the Psalmist, must be considered. Besides, we are not Jews; neither is our church Jewish. "The Jewish church was a church, but it never was *the* church of God." And the fact that they did this, or that, does not now obligate us to do the same. Some things were restricted to the church in her infantile state. She was as a minor under governors and tutors. "These things are now done away."

Besides, take the Jews themselves, the most remarkable people that ever lived upon the face of the earth,—remarkable for their nationality,—for their undeviating adherence to the faith and form of worship of their forefathers. Nothing must be added to, or taken from. They hold to be the same now they were in the days of David or Moses. Is it not an argument strongly in our favour, *against the use of organs*, that "probably in the tens of thousands of Jewish synagogues which have covered the earth during the whole career of that wonderful people, not one can be found in which the congregation of (orthodox) enlightened Jews, who adhere to the institutions of their religion, and their race, allowed any instrument of music, much less an organ, to form any part of their system of the public worship of God?"—The Persian Jews have introduced organs into their synagogues, and the Greeks have done the same. By all other, this is held an innovation upon old customs, and they are no longer regarded as of the number of the faithful. But more than this: In "*Orach Chaiim*," (the highest Jewish authority,) in a Treatise on the Sabbath, (Sec. 338,) there it is recorded as a law of the Medes and Persians, "It is improper to produce sounds from any musical instrument on the Sabbath day." Not only is the organ, but the use of all other instruments is prohibited. The reason of this prohibition, is founded on the written law,—particularly the fourth commandment in the Decalogue, which says: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour and do

* Dr. R. J. Breckinridge.

all thy work, but the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work," &c. Here is the express injunction, "*thou shalt not do any work.*" Hence the question is raised by the Jew, in his strict observance of the Law of Moses; whether the playing of an instrument is regarded *as work* or not? Every thing, not essential to the preservation of life, or health, was strictly prohibited on that day, as work,—consequently, the Jew maintains the proper definition of the word *work*, will show that any thing artificial must be avoided on the Sabbath. The sounds of an instrument are the result of a mechanical force, and is therefore *work*, and the playing of any instrument on that day, is a violation of the fourth commandment. And, in as much as no specific allusions are made, either directly or indirectly that instrumental music formed any part of the actual service of the Temple, the Jew concludes, the introduction of such music into the synagogue must be regarded an innovation, sanctioned not even by the voice of tradition. They may now, as in the days of the Temple, permit the use of instrumental music in the synagogue; but it is only on some special occasions, such as on the night of the 8th day of the feast of Tabernacles, &c., but on no occasion to form any part of the regular service of the synagogue. In as much as the great services of the synagogue occur only on the Sabbath, and feast days, and as every kind of work was strictly forbidden on such days by the law of Moses, the conclusion is, the use of any, and *all* kinds of instrumental music, must be forbidden by the Law: hence, every Jewish community permitting the use of music, as a regular part of their synagogue service, are regarded as violators of God's Law,—and, accordingly, are cut off from the number of the orthodox and faithful. If there had been any thing requiring the use of organs, is it probable the Jew, with his strict regard for the Law of Moses, and the form of worship adopted by his forefathers, would so long and so universally have omitted it? Hence, we cannot but regard the introduction and use of instrumental music as an innovation,—and to be deprecated, as not being for the spirituality and prosperity of Zion. This *is no up-start* notion, or narrow-

mind ed prejudice of ours. For it should be remembered: "During the very sessions of the Westminster Assembly, which composed our standards, in their present form, the Long Parliament passed an act under advice of the leading members of the Westminster Assembly, declaring the use of organs in churches to be a part of idolatrous worship,—and ordering every one to be removed."* It is "the little foxes that destroy the vintage."—"Dead flies cause the precious ointment to send forth a stinking savour." Jonathan tasted but a little honey on the end of his rod, but for that he must die!—When we call to mind the insidious and unsuspecting manner in which errors and troubles have crept into the church,—and how long the wounds thus inflicted have been in healing, we cannot too soon shut down the gates against them,—we cannot be too stringent in walking in "the old paths,"—or in demanding a "thus saith the Lord."

No one, who carefully observes the tendency of things, or the excess to which things have already been carried upon this subject, but will admit it is time the tocsin should be sounded,—yea, that the axe should be laid at the root. It has been said, "The voice is the key which unlocks the heart." Heresies and divisions may creep into the church, through her praise, as well as by her prayers or preaching. Every one may have a psalm, as well as a doctrine. If we may, in one part of our worship, offer God action or sound for devotion, may we not give *attitude* for prayer? "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 and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan under arty visible representation, or any other way, not prescribed in the Holy Scripture. We can readily anticipate that ours will be regarded as an argument against the abuse, rather than the proper and lawful use of organs. If the law is produced in their favour, we have not a word more to say,—our difficulty is the want of a *jus Divinum*: for the abuse of a thing, can be no valid objection against

* Dr. R. J. Breckenridge.

its *lawful* use. Otherwise, we must give up all our physical comforts and Christian privileges. We must stay away from the sanctuary,—and shut our teeth against our daily bread,—for there are many backsliders and gluttons in the world. If you are disposed to set aside the necessity of a Divine appointment, and introduce the organ, merely on the score of *expediency*,—because it pleases the ear,—or will *probably* promote the interests of religion,—or plead its use because of its utility in sustaining and accompanying the voices in large congregations,—the solemn and sublime effect it produces on the feelings,—or should you, as others, regard it to be only a past-time amusement,—an interlude,—a mere superfluity in religious services,—if this is the light in which we are to regard it, and the only rule by which we are to regulate our praises,—this is, at once, throwing open the door for the greatest variety in practice, and the greatest confusion must ensue. For the taste of one congregation may lead them to prefer an organ—another may wish the viol and harp—the third the drum and trumpet—and where will it end?—How many churches are there, whose Sabbath services are now regularly celebrated every Sabbath with *three* or more instruments? At first, we *merely tolerate* a thing,—then, it *may* be done,—and lastly, it *must* be done. Habits grow upon us, and we scarce know how. How many things do we now tolerate, and regard as the *res sacræ* of the sanctuary, at whose introduction our forefathers felt the cause of religion to be greatly scandalized? For example: In the reign of Charles I., Francis Cornwell was imprisoned for refusing to wear the surplice, to kneel at the sacrament, and to use the sign of the cross in baptism. What has custom done its regard to these things? Are there not those who believe this was the apostolic mode? And should a minister appear before them, without his *officials*—without the robes, expressive of the services he is to perform,—they cannot suppress the feeling,—*there is something very important wanting!* —“that man’s religion is vain”! So, many feel in reference to the use of organs. With them, a church without an organ, is little different from a church without a minister. “A little leaven leavens the

whole-lump." We may gaze upon the sun, till every thing about us appears as dark as midnight. Follow not the traditions of men, or the rudiments of the world, but "let praise be with grace in your hearts, making melody unto the Lord." "How is it, brethren? when ye come together every one hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done (not only decently and in order, but) unto edifying." In the church, I had rather speak five words with my understanding, *that by my voice* I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an *unknown* tongue. For, "even things without life giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped?" Our objection, then, to the use of instrumental music, in Christian worship, is not on account of its *abuse*, but because it has no foundation in the Scriptures, particularly the New Testament, which is the standard of our faith and practice. For, if once we depart from this standard, there will be no end to innovations.

We are neither insensible to the charms of sweet and melodious sounds, nor ignorant of the power music is capable of exerting over the feelings and actions of men. It can arouse feelings which may have been dormant for years; and nerve for action the most timid and irresolute. This may be the reason why some would introduce instruments into the service of the sanctuary. But it is to this very fact, we would turn the public mind,—where there is the capacity for such power, so much greater the danger, when improperly or unlawfully used.

Its effects have not only been felt by individuals, and religious assemblies, but has been dreaded upon the tented field.

"Music the fiercest grief can charm,
And fate's severest rage disarm
Music can soften pain and ease,
And make despair and madness please;
Our joys below it can improve,
And antedate the bliss above."

To one, it is the soul of inspiration,—stimulates thought; to others, quickens devotion; while in others,

it excites feelings utterly uncontrollable and desperate. Lord Bacon had music often played in the room adjoining his study, to excite his thoughts. Milton listened to the organ for his solemn inspiration; and it was even necessary to Warburton. Curran's favourite mode of meditation* was, to have his violin in his hand. Who has not heard of the wonderful effect of the Tyrolese song?—the Marseilles Hymn?—or of Hail Columbia?—National airs, or the music of every country has its direct influence on the passions of its inhabitants, than which a stronger instance cannot be adduced than that it was forbidden, under penalty of death, among the Swiss mercenaries employed on foreign service, to sing or play the celebrated "*Rans des Vaches*." Napoleon† forbade this tune, because its melody had such an effect upon his Swiss soldiers that they deserted in dozens,—it excited an unconquerable home sickness by its associations with their native land." The inhabitants of Abydos, (a city in Egypt,) hated mortally the sound of the trumpet, because there was inseparably associated in their minds with it, the horrors of war and bloodshed! So we might refer to "the magical influence the music of Farinelli exercised over Philip V. of Spain, whose singing lured the brain-sick monarch from his chamber, and who, by him, was rewarded by being raised to the highest dignities of the State."‡ So, no less, in the case of "the string of fiddlers introduced by Charles II. into the Chapel Royal,—in allusion to *which* the song of 'Four and twenty Fiddlers all in a row' was written, tended so little to make church music popular, that it only excited feelings of astonishment and dislike, and the music of the people became almost exclusively confined to simple ballad melodies. For such airs they always had an open ear, and ready voice, and the gay strains of Lilliburlers aided powerfully in bringing about the deposition of James II., and the glorious revolution, 1688.—"It made an impression," says Burnet, "on the king's army, that cannot be imagined by those who saw it not. The whole army, and at last the people, both in city and country, were singing it perpetually." Did not David,

*Pope. † British Minstrel, pp. 228 & 115.

‡ British Minstrel, p. 44.

by his harp, dispel the melancholy vapours from the mind of Saul? God's ancient Israel hung their harps upon the willows, and refused to sing the Lord's song in a strange land. Music sometimes has the effect of dispelling sorrow, and soothing sadness and melancholy. Hence "Elisha,* being put into a passion and disturbance at the sight of the king of Israel, called for temple-music, to pacify and allay his discomposed mind." Augustin ascribed his conversion, in part, to the influence of music. He says, he wept when he heard the heavenly singing of the Psalms by the church at Milan. And "it is the only other art (says Luther,) which, like Theology, can calm the agitation of the soul, and put the Devil to flight."

We have indulged ourselves in this digression, that we might cite particular instances, where music has exerted a happy and beneficial effect upon the mind, and also instances where it has been the most injurious. If mere national airs, or secular music, can produce such results on individuals and communities when performed in a natural way, what may not be the results when sacred music is performed by those who regard it only as a past-time amusement, and not as a necessary and divinely appointed part of the solemn worship of God. It is not the scientific skill, nor the sweet and soft modulations of the voice in which praise is sung, that makes it acceptable to God. No, you may have Handel, Hayden, Mozart and Beethoven, for your choir, whose music it is said, "did more than please the ear." Their performance, as to *time*, may equal the most perfect Pestilozzian precision and accuracy, and their effects equal the fabled powers of Orpheus, who played "with such a masterly hand, that even the most rapid rivers ceased to flow, the savage beasts of the forest forgot their wildness, and the mountains moved to listen to his song;" or of Amphion, who by the power of his lyre, made the stones move, and in this way he was said to have built up the walls of Thebes. All this would be a poor and insufficient plea for our introducing them into the house of God, with such instruments, to build up the walls of

* 2 Kings, iii: 14-15.

Zion. We must not join together what God has put asunder.

Is it not the tendency of things—a very common result—that the employment of artificial helps, drives away the natural and proper means to be used? We put the question to any candid and careful observer—Is it not true, of at least *four-fifths* of the congregations where the organ is used, that the opening of its pipes is the stop-cock upon the voices of a large majority of the worshippers? There the praise of God is generally done by proxies,—entrusted in a great measure to the scientific organist and accompanying choir. Is this because there is no taste or fondness for music? No, the very employment of such a choir shows the contrary. But it is because the music is not adapted to the place. Very few persons wish to sing where they cannot hear the sound of their own voice, or where they may not feel able to accompany the music that is played. “Think,” (says Beethoven in his deafness,) “of the anguish of him who cannot hear his own music!” It has been said, a man cannot speak well unless he feels what he says,—no more can he sing well unless he feels what he sings. The sound of an organ may fill us with feelings of admiration, we may be overpowered by its grandeur, but it is all a lovely song, a something that plays upon the ear without improving the heart, it is *vox et præterea nihil*. For, in too many cases, instead of its kindling the fervour of devotional feeling, it serves rather to “freeze the genial current of the soul.” The public mind may not yet be sufficiently corrupt to admit it. How would it sound to hear that a certain congregation had engaged a man to preach for them because of his great oratorical powers, without any regard to his moral fitness, or other qualifications? May not the time come when such things may be done—when the house of God will be more of an opera, or of a place of acting, than of humble and sincere devotion? It is not sound alone that makes the deep and lasting impression upon the heart, but the sentiment that is conveyed with it. You may sound all the notes upon the scale, sound them with the voice of seven thunders, and yet convey no idea of the goodness and mercy of God. If there is no sentiment expressed, how

cold and formal our song! How little to inspire us with either love or praise! "How absurd would it be to celebrate the birth-day of Washington by mere music, without any ode or hymn adapted to the occasion?" "If anything on earth," says Baxter, "be like to Heaven, it is to have our delight in God; and therefore, if anything makes us heavenly it is that which raises us to such delights." And Willison asserts, "I know nothing in the world that more resembles Heaven than a company of God's people harmoniously singing his praises, *with grace in their hearts making melody to the Lord.*" This is the breath, the flame of love that actuates the angelic choir. It is grace that sweetens the voice in God's ear. "*Non vox, sed votum; non musica chordula, sed cor; Non clamans, sed amans psallit in aure Dei.*"

It may be, that our whole argument upon this subject, will be regarded by many as a sacrilegious handling of holy things, an envious assault upon the established usage of the church; but is it not time something should be done when we hear the utterance of such a sentiment as this?—"The deep-toned organ, as it peals through the grained and richly fretted arches of the lofty temple, wafts the soul to Heaven on the wings of melody, and elevates the devotional feeling of the sincere worshipper." How far this feeling may prevail we know not, but is this not the tendency of things, wherever *form* is substituted for *service* or *devotion*? In short, we hesitate not to assert,—To use the organ in place of the voice is to travesty the praise of God. You have a sound, but no sentiment of the soul expressed: The mere rhapsody of a momentary feeling that has nothing in it of what Aristotle stiles "a purification of the passions." Hence we say

"Strike up, my masters!

But touch the chords with a religious softness."

Our motto is—

*"Omnis ergo humilis verbi Dei discipulus, quid ille dicat, bona fide, excipere studens acquiescat."**

As we have, in our argument, seemed to classify organs with choirs, we may by some be regarded as an Ish-

maelike towards them also. Not necessarily. *Per se*, we are not opposed to choirs, but regard a choir of the *proper kind*, highly important in conducting the praises of the sanctuary. But there are choirs which we consider the mere *attachés*, or accompaniments of organs, against which we would enter our most decided and solemn protest. There are doubtless many honourable exceptions. One of the severest acts our Saviour did, while on earth, was to make a scourge of small chords, and drive the money-changers from the Sanctuary. He would not have his Father's house a place of merchandize. We do not forbid that a leader of the choir should be compensated. The labourer is worthy of his hire. "They which minister about holy things, live of the things of the temple." We object to the employment of those who have no higher or holier motive than the "loaves and fishes,"—profane sabbath-breakers,—immoral men,—whose lives are a daily reproach to them,—and who, for the *penny*, will play six nights in the week, at the opera or theatre, and for *the same*, will play or sing the seventh, *just as devoutly*, in the house of God. So far as the morality of the thing is concerned, such men might just as well be paid for the performance of any other manual labour on the Sabbath. Is it any unusual thing to see a *Papist*, or *Infidel*, leading the praises in a Protestant and Christian congregation? In all such performances, there is more *pride* than *piety* displayed,—more man-worship than glory to God. Such music is only designed to please the ear, or excite the imagination. "The performers take the opportunity of showing the audience the extent of their abilities, by the most fantastic and unmeaning extravagance of execution." And, that they may not lose their full meed of praise, they either select new tunes, or those so difficult of performance as virtually to exclude the great congregation from uniting with them. Thus, multitudes are

"Content to bear

(O! wonderful effect of music's power!)

Messiah's eulogy—for Handel's sake."

What is the effect? How must the *praise* of God be regarded by the world, where it has such representatives?

It is putting the new wine into old bottles. Worse, it is "ploughing with the ox and ass." "Nullo delectu sacra profanaque, juxta habet (hæc gens) imo tam prepostero cultu divina curat, ut pios Ecclesiae usus nullis non semper insanientis sæculi ludis pervertat, sordibusque contaminet."* How appropriate the words of Baxter: "I think it unlawful to use such strains of music as are light, or as the congregation cannot easily be brought to understand; much more on purpose to commit the whole work of singing to the choristers, and exclude the congregation. I am not willing to join in such a church, where I shall be shut out of this noble work of praise." What devout feelings would be excited, in our minds, or how *strongly* would we consider ourselves invited to attend upon the services of a particular church, where we saw *all its Sabbath tunes* placard through the streets, on the Saturday previous! Yet, these things are not *so shocking* to the pious sensibilities of "all people that on earth do dwell." It may be seen in the land!—And when the organ has been carried to the same perfection and is managed by the *same spirit*, it may be seen among us. Pervert sacred music to a secular use, or destroy its sense, and it is no longer a devotional exercise; but a mere diversion or festival entertainment. Hence, say Jerome, "Let those who sing in the church, sing not merely with their voice, but with their heart, to the Lord; not like tragedians, physically preparing their throats and mouths, that they may sing after the fashion of the theatre in the church."† "But sing with grace in their hearts." As a choir performs a very important part of the Divine service, they ought to be Christians, or at least sober-minded persons selected from the community in whose midst they worship,—persons of religious principles, so as to be capable of feeling what they sing,—and thus impart the fire of their devotion to the kindling of the same spirit in all around. They should possess sufficient musical knowledge to lead with ease and simplicity,—and sufficient knowledge of the force and power of language, to be capable of adapting

* Bayles' Dictionary, vol. vii: p. 467.

† Bingham, vol. 5: p. 22.

the sound to sentiment. How often is the effect of music completely destroyed, for the want of attention to these things? It is like smoke to the eyes, or vinegar to the teeth, to hear an epicede sung to a marriage hymn, or to have a thanksgiving song so sung as to express the feelings of one who mourns, and fasts. How often is the impression made by a sermon, completely obliterated by the performance of the concluding hymn! When some musical pretender, who understands music, and nothing else,—who has all the terms and technicalities of the art at his tongue's end, without the glimmering of an idea concerning the human passions, with a great flourish of *sounds*, of *rods*, and *nods*, concludes the religious ceremonies with some secular tune, or opera air. Much of the effect of music, depends upon the simplicity of the manner in which it is performed. It is the union of harmonious voices, that produces what Lightfoot calls a joint *κελευσμα*; where one takes mirth, life, and warmth from another; a holy fervour and emulation, as the seraphim,—who are thus described, “each one had six wings,—with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts—the earth is full of his glory,”—thus did they strive to out-vie one another in praising God.

There is in souls a sympathy of sounds—
Some chord in unison with what we hear
Is touched within us, and the heart replies.”

There are extremes on both sides, which we think should be equally avoided,—as neither makes for the edification of the church; viz: the excess and abuses of the present day, which we have ascribed to the introduction and use of instrumental music, and the ignorance (as it may be called) of our forefathers, whose musical knowledge was restricted to a few tunes. These, they held as most sacred. They were supposed to be holy,—“and that as much reverence should be shown to them as to the Psalms themselves.” “It was the custom of the people then,” says Geo. Hood,* “to put off their

* Hood, p. 144.

hats, and put on a great show of devotion and gravity, whenever psalm tunes were sung, though there was not one word of a psalm." We would not wish to be put back into a class with these *patres sancti*, although the evils hence to be apprehended, are less than from the present system of innovation and want of devotional feeling.

But, to bring our argument to a close. We should not under-value any ordinance or service, which God has appointed for the edification of his people, and the promotion of his own glory; and especially one which is to continue, and must subserve so important an end as *praise*. Praise, only, of all the services we perform to God here, goes along with us to Heaven. And, as it is in the church on earth we spend our apprenticeship, and make preparations for Heaven, let us remember—"Qui vult cantare in cœlo, discat cantare in terris." In Heaven, there is no praying, no preaching of sermons, no receiving of sacraments,—nothing but praising, lauding, and celebrating God, and that will be the work of saints and angels to all eternity. What must be the purity and elevation of the heavenly strains? To sing songs which none but angels sing! What a choir? That great multitude which no man can number—*small* and *great*, out of every kindred and tongue, and nation and people,—around the throne of God and the Lamb: Where the theme is love,—their song unceasing praise. There "Love breathes in every lip, burns in every heart, and bursts forth alike from every lyre."

"Ten thousand thousand are their tongues,
But all their *songs* are one."

Oh! glorious vision!—ennobling thought! That such worms of the dust, should hereafter become bright seraphs at the right hand of the Majesty in Heaven. That these stammering lips shall hereafter join in and lead the chorus. When the morning stars shall again sing together, and the sons of God shout for joy. The mountains and little hills shall break forth before him into singing: and the trees of the field shall clap their hands. The floods shall lift up their voice. Every tongue shall proclaim his praise. All shall ignite in swelling the

grand diapason of Heaven. The angels with the four and twenty elders, shall fall down before Him, who sitteth upon the throne, and worship Him, who liveth forever and ever.

Thus, the heavens shall proclaim the song, and earth will echo back the notes till every place shall be full of the praise and glory of God.

“Praise God in his sanctuary; praise him in the firmament of his power. Praise him for his mighty acts; praise him according to his excellent greatness. Let every thing that hath breath praise the Lord. Praise ye the Lord.”

ARTICLE V.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY EITHER THE OFFSPRING OF REASON OR OF PRIMITIVE REVELATION.

No argument, says Bishop Horsley, can be drawn from any resemblance that may be imagined between the Trinity of the Christian Church, and the three principles of the Platonists, that the doctrine of the apostles was not rightly understood by their first converts; unless indeed it could be proved, which is the tacit assumption upon which this objection is founded, that the discoveries of revelation and the investigations of philosophy may never coincide. But why is it supposed that nothing can be a part of an inspired teacher's doctrine, which had been taught before by wise men who were not inspired? Were every iota of the gospel doctrine to be found in the writings of the Greek philosophers, this would not be sufficient to set aside the pretensions of the first preachers of Christianity to a divine commission. The just conclusion from so perfect an agreement would only be, that for the great importance of these doctrines to the manners of mankind, it had pleased God to make discoveries to all men by revelation, to which a few only could obtain by abstract reasoning. The case indeed is far otherwise. It is ever to be remembered, for the mor-

* Horsley Tracts, pp. 45-50.

