

In the times of ancient philosophy, a wise man said: "The truth is open to all; (but) her domain is not yet occupied; and much of it remains to be discovered by the men who are yet to come."\* We are the men who were yet to come; and if we would imitate the modesty of him who looked from the imperfections of his own knowledge on towards the discoveries of the future, we should call back to him in the words of the wise man, who "gave his heart to know wisdom and to know madness and folly:" "Is there anything whereof it may be said, See this is new? It hath been already of old time, which was before us."



### ARTICLE III.

#### THE SCRIPTURAL AND DIVINE RIGHT FOR USING MECHANICAL AS WELL AS VOCAL INSTRUMENTS IN THE WORSHIP OF GOD.

*Part I.*—GENERAL ARGUMENT FROM HISTORY, THE NATURE OF  
DIVINE WORSHIP, CHRISTIAN LIBERTY, AND PRESUMP-  
TIVE PROOF.

It would be well for those who "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," to consider that it is by no means improbable that the mystic words attributed to Jubal (see Gen. iv. 23,) *may be* a penitential song, to which he was led to adapt the pensive tones of the harp and the ORGAN, by the guiding providence of God's redeeming mercy; and that from the beginning, therefore, instrumental music, both mechanical and vocal, has been consecrated to God's worship in the aid of penitence and piety. (See Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, Art. Jubal.) Certain it is, that such instruments as the harp and organ have been always regarded as sacredly associated with God's worship and the praises of his redeemed people, *under*

---

\* Seneca, Ep. 33, 11.

*every economy* of the Church militant, and that they constitute an essential part of the symbolic minstrelsy of heaven.

“Music's language of the blest above;  
 No voice but Music can express  
 The joys that happy souls possess,  
 Nor in just rapture tell the wondrous powers of love.”

And hence, among the attractive representations of heaven, it is written: “The Lord shall count, when he writeth up the people, that this man was born there (that is, in Zion). *As well the singers as the players on instruments shall be there.*” And thus the apostolic seer in his vision “beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain. . . . And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, *having every one of them harps.* . . . And they sung a new song, saying,” etc. “And I saw as it were a sea of glass, and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, stand on the sea of glass, *having the harps of God.* And they sing the song of Moses and the Lamb.” “And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of the great thunder; and I heard the voice of *harpers harping with their harps;* and they sang as it were a new song. . . . and no man could learn that song but the hundred and forty and four thousand which were redeemed from the earth.”

We find, therefore, that among the very first arts given by God to man—when he sent him forth to inhabit and cultivate the earth, and had imparted to him, by divine communication, language and all that knowledge of natural history, science, and art, which was necessary for a state of incipient civilisation, which was undoubtedly the primeval condition of the human family (see Whatley's *Lessons on Worship*, ch. i., *Political Economy*, and elsewhere)—was not only the mechanical knowledge necessary for pastoral life, but also for its social and religious enjoyment. And hence among the few hints given us of this period, it was thought of sufficient importance to record (Gen. iv. 21) of Jubal—who was no more really wicked, though in a

different form, than his apostate parents, Adam and Eve—that “he was the father of all such as handle the harp and the organ.” In connexion with this, it is said, in verse 26, that “*then began men to call on the name of the Lord;*” which cannot mean that, for the first time, they then began to worship God, (of which we have previous record—see chapter iv.,) and must, therefore, imply some more perfect and developed *form* of worship; and this, the context leads us to believe, was the introduction of the harp and the organ as auxiliary helps in God’s worship.

The term here employed to designate the organ has, says Prof. Bush, “the import of loveliness and delight, and the word translated ‘call upon,’ in ch. iv. 26, includes the whole worship of God—prayer and praise,” and necessarily teaches that this worship was then revived, and more perfectly, publicly, and solemnly established. “In the Old Testament, the words, ‘call on the name of the Lord,’ always,” says Prof. Bush, “means an act of solemn worship, and denote all the appropriate acts and exercises of the stated worship of God.” In general confirmation of this interpretation, it is to be observed, as is remarked by Kitto, that *the corruption of the race did not spread till near the time of the flood*, and that when it did become general it contaminated *not only the posterity of Cain*, but the posterity of all the others except Seth. Oriental traditions trace the origin of fire and all the arts, including musical instruments, to the ministration of angels, and the glory of God, as exhibited in the providential introduction of inventions, has given rise to able and most interesting treatises. Du Bartas, as well as Montgomery, has therefore celebrated the praise of God, whose goodness and wisdom were so richly manifested in the invention of musical instruments as first introduced by Jubal. Du Bartas says of Jubal:

“Thereon he harps, and glad and fain some instrument would find  
That in accord all discords might renew.”

James Montgomery, in his “World Before the Flood,” also renders homage to Jubal:

"Jubal, the prince of song, (in youth unknown,)
 Retired to commune with his harp alone,
 For still he nursed it like a secret thought,
 Long cherished and to late perfection wrought;
 And still with cunning hand and curious ear
 Enriched, ennobled, and enlarged its sphere,
 Till he had compassed in that magic round
 A soul of harmony, a heaven of sound.
 Thus music's empire in the soul began
 The first born poet ruled the first born man."

The word *huggab*, here translated *organ*, was derived from a word expressive of the sweetness of tones, and is again spoken of in Job xxi. 12, and probably in Dan. iii. 5, and in Ps. cl. 4, and Ps. lvii. 8. This was undoubtedly a wind instrument, composed of an indefinite number of pipes, from five to twenty-five, and is found in some ancient representations enclosed in a box-form, so as to give the original essential idea of the present perfected organ, which is called THE ORGAN just as the Bible is called THE BIBLE, to indicate that in comparison with all other organs or instruments of music, it is the most perfect, both as it is the most harmonious of all and the most ancient of all, and because it includes within itself the sounds of all other instruments.

"Music, the tender child of rudest times,  
 The gentle native of all lands and climes,  
 Who hymns alike man's cradle and his grave,  
 Lulls the low cot, or peals along the nave."

Let it be borne in mind that God has adapted man to music and music to man

"There is in soul a sympathy with sounds,  
 And as the mind is pitched, the ear is pleased;  
 Some chord in unison with what we hear  
 Is touched within us, and the heart replies."

"Our joys below, music can improve, and antedate the bliss above; and breathing divine, enchanting ravishment, can take the prisoned soul and lap it in elysium." Let it also be borne in mind that as music was thus, by the constitution of man's nature and by God's gracious purposes towards him, made most essentially

ministrant to his greatest happiness, so it is designed by Christ to sanctify this most sweet and powerful instrumentality to the services of redeemed humanity and of his Church militant here upon earth. In accomplishing our salvation, Christ, by his Spirit, works in, by, and through the constituent elements and aptitudes of our nature, so as to bring men into a "*willing* captivity and obedience," that we may find his yoke easy, his burden light, his ways pleasantness, his paths peace, and may feel the worship of God to be our delight. Christ would make his sanctuary "the beauty of holiness, and the very gate of heaven," by which the seraphic tones of its far off minstrelsy may reverberate in thrilling ecstasy through all the winding avenues of the soul; and it must therefore needs be that he will consecrate the tranquil spirit of sweet melodious sounds to exercise their mastery of soft control.

"My spirit hath gone up in yonder cloud  
Of solemn and sweet sound-the many voices  
Peal upon peal, and now  
The choral voice alone.

At door of heav'n, my soul is all unsphered,  
Soaring and soaring on the crystal car  
Of airy sweetness borne,  
And drinks ethereal air."

Plutarch informs us that singing and music, among the ancient Greeks, were employed exclusively in the worship of the gods, and he laments their profanation in later times. This sacred use, however, appears never to have been entirely lost, since we read of some instances of it in the early centuries of the Christian era. Music, poetry, and song, are all daughters of the same divine family, whose birth has ever been traced up, by remote antiquity, to parental deities, and consecrated in vestal purity to their divine service.

We have in these facts a twofold evidence of the original divine authorisation of instrumental music as an auxiliary aid to the expression of acceptable religious worship : first, in the testimony of Scripture and tradition to its most primitive use; and, secondly, in its adaption to the sympathetic, emotional, and

religious nature of man. Man thinks in words, and expresses his emotions in musical intonations, and perfects music by instrumental combinations. When this combination takes place, the result is not merely sensational delight, but moral sensibility and religious aspiration.

“While to each rising thought true wisdom tells  
Of purer heights; whate'er of good desire,  
Of love, or thought serene the bosom swells,  
By these on bodiless wings to heav'n aspire,  
And gain, perchance, a gleam of that diviner fire.”

This trinal unity of poetry with vocal and instrumental music, is as old as the trinal creation, when the morning stars shouted together for joy over man's new created home, and expressed the delight which the Son of God cherished towards the sons of men.

“There's not a voice in Nature but is telling  
(If we will hear that voice aright)  
How much, when human hearts with love are swelling,  
Christ's blessed bosom hath delight  
In our rejoicing lays ;  
Whose love that never slumbers  
Taught man his tuneful numbers.”

The praise of God with voice, and language, and instrumental concert, is therefore found entering as a natural or instituted element into every dispensation of the Church, and into every representation of its christian and celestial economy; and it constitutes, therefore, one evidence of the unity of God's militant Church, in all its various marches through the wilderness of time, and of that Church triumphant in heaven.

"In life we differ, but we join in song;  
Angels and we, assisted by this art,  
May praise together, though we dwell apart;  
While solemn airs improve *our* sacred fire,  
And angels lean from listening heaven to hear."

But we are met here by the great argument of our opponents in this controversy, that the worship of God is a positive institution of God, and that nothing can rightly enter into it but

what can show its distinct divine appointment. "If," it is said, "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 inquiry how or with what we shall praise God." (See *S. Pres. Rev.*, Oct., 1855, p. 227.) Such is the apparently triumphant question of the former reviewer, in his elaborate, article condemnatory of the use of organs or any other instrumental music in the worship of God. Now, the argument here implied is unquestionably fallacious. The argument put into form is this: God is to be worshipped by praise; but God can be praised only in that way and manner which he appoints; and as singing is the only form of praise appointed or authorised by God, therefore singing alone—to the exclusion of all other instrumental music—is acceptable to God as praise or worship. "It is not," says the reviewer, "because praise is a pleasant thing—pleases the air 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.*" In proof of this, he adds two texts: "*Sing ye praises with the spirit and with the understanding also.*" "Let everything that hath breath *praise* the Lord." Now, this argument is, I affirm, inconclusive, and the fallacy is in confounding *singing* with *praise* and *worship*. Singing, which is vocal instrumental music, is, *in itself considered, no more praise or worship of God* than the music of the harp, of the organ, or of the cornet; neither is singing *music*, but only *one kind of music, made by one kind of instrument*, which, in its perfectly cultivated and well-trained form, is as really artificial, external, and instrumental to that heart and spirit which alone constitute true praise and worship of God, as are the harp, the organ, the cornet, etc. *The voice educated by man's artistic science is no more sacred and divine than other instruments, since the whole science and art of music, by which the voice is developed, perfected, and artistically played upon, is no more sacred or holy when applied to the organ of the voice than when applied to that mechanical organ with which that voice is accompanied.*

This is evident from the authorities relied upon by the re-

viewer, in which the fallacy is made self-evident by the clear distinction which they draw between *music as a means or medium*, and *the devout affections of the heart*, which alone constitute *praise or worship of God*, who is a spirit, and can only be rightly worshipped in spirit and in truth. "The design of sacred music," says Andrew Fuller, "is to EXPRESS our devout affections towards God and *make melody in the heart to the Lord*. . . . The intent of *singing* is, by a *musical pronunciation* 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 heart *without the voice*." (See *S. Pres. Rev.*, Oct., 1855, p. 227.) Dr. Gill perceived the fallacy which the reviewer and Dr. Fuller employed, *and averts it only by a bold dogmatic contradiction of the apostle*, (as well as of manifold other scriptures,) who enjoins upon believers, as a christian duty, *two things*—(see Eph. v. 18, 19)—1. The use of *every form of sacred song and MUSIC, both vocal and instrumental*, as we will show; and 2. "*Melody in the heart*. . . to God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ;" or, as the same apostle emphatically states the distinction in "Col. iii. 16, where he says: "Admonish one another by singing PSALMS," (that is, divine songs, *composed with and adapted to instrumental and choral music*,) and secondly "do this with grace in your hearts to the Lord,"—which heart melody there is not a *voice* in nature *or in art* that is not adapted to unite so as to swell the song of praise to God, and that, too, in spirit and in truth. Vocal and instrumental sounds are either profane, artistic, artificial, and sensuous, like those of one "who hath a pleasant voice and plays well upon an instrument;" or, *accompanied with the "melody of the heart" and the "singing of the understanding*," they are united and identified with that spirit of praise and prayer which springs from the heart alone.

No such thing as mental singing, or singing in the heart without the voice! There is just as much of it—neither more nor less—as there is of praying, thinking, reading, hearing, and worshipping without the voice; since, in all these, the aid of language and of sounds are alike necessary and alike instru-

mental in giving form, fluency, and expression to these spiritual exercises. It were a fell and fatal delusion to teach that there is no other praise than that which is in the tongue, for it would also teach that there is no other worship than that which is outward, articulate, and ceremonious ; whereas PRAISE, like

“Prayer—is the soul’s sincere desire,  
 Unuttered or expressed;  
 The motion of a hidden fire  
 That trembles in the breast;  
  
 ——the burden of a sigh,  
 The falling of a tear;  
 The upward glancing of an eye,  
 When none but God is near.”

The doctrine of these writers into which our anti-organ-andinstrumental-music friends are very apt insidiously to fall, is gross Pharisaic formalism and ritualism, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men, and substituting for the acceptable sacrifice of true worship “the calves of their lips.” The true worship of God, so far as it consists in prayer and praise, is the expression of devotional feelings to *God*, and the exhibition of his truth to *the world* in certain forms sanctioned by himself, so as to secure the *strengthening* of right principles in Christians, and the *extension* of them to others. Now, the tendency of man’s corrupt nature is, on the one hand, to discourage such worship by its coldness; or to substitute for it mere formal, ceremonial rites, which impress only the senses, the imagination, and the natural religious sensibilities, and never attain to the deep and hallowed joy of those who “drawn nigh to God with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and their bodies washed with pure water.” That praise, therefore, which is acceptable to God, is the grateful melody of the heart, the understanding, and the affections. As good old Master Herbert says:

“My joy, my life, my crown!  
 My heart was moaning all the day,  
 Somewhat it fain would say,  
 And still it moaneth muttering up and down  
 With only this, ‘*My joy, my life, my crown!*’

“Yet slight not these few words;  
 If truly said, they may take part  
 Among the best in art.  
*The finest which a hymn or psalm affords,  
 Is when the soul unto the lines accords.*

“He who craves *all the mind,  
 And all the soul, and strength, and time,*  
 If the WORDS only rhyme,  
 Justly complains that somewhat is behind  
 To make his verse, or write a hymn in kind.

“Whereas if th’ heart be moved,  
 Although the verse be somewhat scant,  
 God doth supply the want;  
 And when the heart says, sighing to be approved,  
 ‘*Oh, could I love!*’—and stops; *God writeth, ‘Loved.’*”

Let it, therefore, be borne in mind, that from the very constitution of our nature, a melodious succession of single sounds, or a harmonious combination of simultaneous sounds, is fitted to excite pleasurable sensations in the mind, *apart altogether* from any meaning, significancy, or sentiment associated with them; and that all real music, whether in the form of melody or harmony or both combined, is neither in the human voice nor in the instrument, but in the soul, whence it swells out, linking itself with conceptions that are solemn or sublime, and pouring itself forth through the medium of the *articulate* sounds of the human voice, or in conjunction with the *inarticulate* sounds of instruments. Now, if these musical sounds happen to be associated with words of piety and sacredness, which have no real meaning except to regenerate spirits, they who find sensitive regalement in the mere excitation of melodious sounds, without any susceptibility to the real meaning of words which symbolize heavenward thoughts and emotions, are very apt to indulge the fond imagination that they are religious and devout, when, after all, their only delight is in musical harmony and carnal sounds. The piety of such, whether it is *awakened by the voice or other instrument*, is nothing more than the devotion of a voice, or an organ, or a lyre, or trumpet, or murmuring brook, or waterfall; it is the mere excitement of sensitive affections, stirred up by the

play of vibrated matter, and in its essential principles differs in no respect from that of “serpents and cockatrices” referred to in Scripture, whose envenomed rage could be allayed, and themselves rivetted in apparent ecstasy, by the sweet notes of the charmer. Music, whether of the voice or of other instrument or of both combined, is to be considered simply as an *instrumentality* through which the truth may be conveyed with greater potency to the mind, and the ardor of its affections awakened and expressed according to its existing state and condition. It stands, therefore, in the same relation to real spiritual worship that reading, preaching, and praying do—as a means of grace, through which the Holy Spirit, the source of all divine life, operates in helping our natural infirmities, teaching us how to pray, and filling our souls with melody of heart in the high praises of our God. The character of music, therefore, in any church or congregation, depends *comparatively little* upon the manner in which it is conducted, whether by a single leader, or by a choir, or by the combination with the voice of the organ,—but upon the state of the heart as cold, uninterested, and languid, or as animated by lively affections of faith and love, and hope and joy, towards God as a present, living, and adorable Redeemer. Jonathan Edwards therefore tells us—what uniform experience has always confirmed—that the intensity of a revival of pure and undefiled religion in the soul is manifested most conspicuously by the outbursting tones in which the praises of Jehovah are celebrated. And after all, the great practical difficulty—and it is confessedly exceedingly great—in regard to the music of our churches, is, that instead of having our attention and efforts directed to God’s Spirit for the stirring *up of languid affections*, and the inspiration of pure devotional desires in the hearts of all the worshippers, there is a tendency to remedy the evil and remove the intolerable icy chilliness of the too ordinary praises of the sanctuary, either by the removal or introduction of precentor, organ, or choir, which are merely instrumental and auxiliary. I know no theoretical or doctrinal objection against the judicious employment of a precentor, choir, or of the organ, *as auxiliaries to devotion*; but it is a fatal mistake to regard

these, or any one of them, not as auxiliaries, but, as substitutes for the general devotion of the worshippers. To praise God by proxy is just as preposterous and profane provocation as to pray or hear by proxy.

There is a deplorable ignorance and inattention to this subject, both on the part of ministers, officers, and people. The praise of God is considered as a kind of adjunct or interlude, and not, as it really is, a most important and delightful part of the worship of the sanctuary. It is regarded by many as perfectly immaterial or voluntary on their part whether they take any part in this portion of worship; or it is thought that only those who can sing *well* are required by God to glorify him by a heartfelt offering of praise, and that listening would be as acceptable and serviceable as participation. This, however, is a sad and serious mistake; for as the heart is more deeply moved *by hearing* devotional language *sung* than by hearing the same language *read*, so the heart is more deeply moved when a person himself sings than when he simply listens to the singing of others. Instead of indulging admiration and gratifying taste, or on the other hand being displeased, the heart is enlisted in the exercise and the attention absorbed. This will be the case even when the individual is incapable of artistic performance, and simply commits his heart, with all its emotions, to the general wave of melody, and allows himself to be borne with it as it rises to the throne of the Heavenly Grace. Individual personal fellowship in the praise of God is not less essential as *a duty* than it is as a means of spiritual benefit; and when singing in a congregation is—as it undoubtedly ought to be, whether it is conducted with or without the aid of a choir and organ—hearty, intelligent, and fervent, the influence of devout sympathy is universally felt. Each person aids all the rest, and in turn is aided by all the rest; and thus the ends of social worship are most fully gained. It is therefore most important that every person in the congregation should sing, both for his own and the general good. This is the case in our German Protestant churches, and in others where the organ is employed, and is particularly needful in our Presbyterian churches, since this is the only portion of our worship in

which the people generally can take an active and audible part. And if there are, as we deem, objections to alternate readings and audible responses of the people, it is all the more important to provide for that individual vivacity and interest which may and ought to be obtained by a general, hearty, and intelligent congregational singing.

It must therefore be considered as a most serious and fatal mistake where the whole order, arrangement, and control of the musical expression of the praises of our congregations is left so entirely, as it is in many of our congregations, to the choir, or to the corporation, instead of the spiritual government of the church. The relation in which the praises of God stand to the responsible direction and supervision of the spiritual offices of the church is just as direct and essential as that of the prayers, the preaching, and the general order of the services of the house of God. Whether, therefore, the praise of God is to be conducted with or without the auxiliary help of a precentor, choir, and organ, or through the official lead of the minister or some one of the spiritual officers of the church or not, let it be regarded as fundamentally important that this most essential and delightful part of the service of God's sanctuary shall be so ordered as to secure the instruction, and adaptation to it, and participation in it, of all the children as well as adults of the congregation.

“The song of Zion is a tasteless thing,  
Unless, when rising on a joyful wing,  
Each soul can mix with the celestial bands,  
And give the strain the compass it demands.”

Man is by nature carnal, worldly, formal, and ritualistic in his spiritual and tastes, but it is nevertheless a primary obligation and necessity that man shall worship God; and the whole scheme of redemption, the economy of the gospel, and the ordinances of God's Church, and the means of grace, are adapted to man as *fallen*, as redeemed in Christ, and as redeemable personally by the sanctification of the Holy Ghost. The Scripture models of worship, including praise and prayer, are perfect expressions to

VOL. XIX., NO. 4—5.

be adopted by imperfect, sinful men. They are adapted not to our weakness, and ignorance, and sinfulness, but to our duty and privilege; not as of ourselves, in disobedience and unbelief, we *would* pray and praise, but as we *ought*, and as, aided from on high, we *may*. The spiritual blessing may be restrained by our unbelief, self-glorying, and unthankfulness; but prayerless and praiseless hearts cannot hinder us from rising with all God's saints and angels, and with all God's works, in blessing and magnifying the Lord with all our souls in God's divinely instituted form of worship, in which he has provided a perfect method of piety, a true and living way of approach to him, an exact mould for the heart and character, and forms vital with the Spirit, which accompanies them, to prompt the reluctant, to enable the incapable, and to transform the vile.

The question, then, which arises in reference to the subject of the praise of God as part of this public form of worship is: Has God left to his Church any discretion as to the form and order of its exercises and the auxiliary aid with which its services are to be conducted? It must be admitted that God's worship is of positive institution, and that, in regard to all that is essential, that alone can be acceptable to God which was introduced or permitted or approved by him. This being so, it is equally apparent that what God has permitted and approved by his own inspired record of the example and use of believers under different dispensations of his Church, can only be altered by a repeal or restriction as positive and authoritative. And if, therefore, the use of instrumental music can be shown to have existed in religious services from the beginning, the impropriety of its continued use can only be established by a plain and positive enactment of Christ, the great Lawgiver of his Church, prohibiting its further use. *The necessity for proof is not on the part of those who plead for liberty in the use of such instrumental music, vocal and mechanical, but on the part of those who assert that it has been interdicted*, according to the argument of the apostle, that what had existed under divine permission during a previous dispensation could not be annulled by a later. The *silence* of the New Testament, *even were that certain*, would not condemn

the use of instrumental music, any more than it does the law of infant church membership, the observance of the Lord's day as a Sabbath, and similar matters.

It is also a plain and conclusive inference from the positive character of God's worship and service, that if no exercise of a wise Christian expediency is allowed, the same argument which condemns the use of instrumental music, and requires for its use a plain and positive command, will also exclude the use of any thing not formally prescribed, and will thus drive out of the courts of the sanctuary, as profaners thereof, precentors, choirs, tuning forks, music books, and the whole body of artistic tunes, and will extend the besom of its destruction to whatever is comfortable or ornate in the arrangement either of the pulpit or of the pews. Such an absolute rule as that which would require positive institution and authority from Christ for everything admitted into the Christian worship and order, is manifestly a tradition of the elders and a yoke which neither we nor our fathers are able to bear. It must be admitted that here are many things connected with Christian worship which are not objects of such positive divine appointment. This is admitted by Dr. Fuller himself. All, for instance, that relates to particular times, forms, order, and length of the services of worship, and the distribution of reading, singing, prayer, and the frequency of public and week-day assemblies, and the administration of sacraments and their particular order, and all that relates to Sabbath-schools, must be considered as left to the exercise of a wise Christian discretion and expediency. So much, at least, is the evident teaching of the Apostle Paul in 1 Cor. viii., and Rom. xiv., where it is positively declared that there *are* matters pertaining to the worship of God which are in their own nature indifferent—as, for instance, the observance of days and feasts, and the eating or abstaining from certain articles of food and drink; and in the general canon laid down by him, which is in substance that afterwards embodied in the maxim of Augustine: "In things essential, unity; in things not essential, liberty; in all things, charity." (See v. 4 and 17-19.)

The question, therefore, of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of

the use of organs, or melodeons, or bass viols, or tuning forks, and all that pertains to modern tunes, to choirs, to music books, to practising and training, so as to lead the music of the congregation in accordance with artistic taste and propriety, etc., is one which we may well regard as referred to the determination of Christian expediency; guided by the general rule of Scripture—that all things should be done with decorum and to edification. And if, under this divinely inspired canon, given us by apostolic inspiration, the auxiliary aid of whatever will conduce to the greater solemnity and impressiveness of praise as a leading part of God's worship is allowable, then there are many reasons in favor of the organ. As an instrument, the organ, next to the human voice, is most adapted to enkindle and fan the flame of devotion and move the hearts of true worshippers while they contemplate the truths expressed in the words sung, and to afford them the easiest and most perfect vehicle for uttering their devout feelings. And is not the more ardent and intense expression of feeling, in connexion with the truth, the very purpose for which music in any form is introduced as an aid to true worshippers in making melody in their hearts unto the Lord?

“Hark! the organs blow  
 Their swelling notes round the cathedral's dome,  
 And grace the harmonious choir, celestial feast  
 To pious ears, and medicine of the mind!  
 The thrilling trebles and the manly bass  
 Join in accordance meet, and with one voice  
 All to the sacred subject suit their song;  
 While in each breast sweet melancholy reigns,  
 Angelically pensive, till the joy  
 Improves and purifies.”

The organ, while it is the most perfect of all instruments, as comprehending within its compass all others, is essentially and necessarily a sacred instrument, and has always been associated with sacred music. It has therefore been well said to be “worthy of the saint who had listened to the minstrelsy of angels.” And that such is the natural effect of the organ, when properly played, upon every unprejudiced mind, we may testify by the opinion even of the fiercely Puritanic Milton:

“There let the pealing organ blow  
 To the full-voiced choir below,  
 In service high and anthems clear,  
 As may with sweetness through mine ear  
 Dissolve me into ecstasies,  
 And bring all Heaven before mine eyes.”

This instrument was so employed, as we have found, in some one of its essential forms, from the very beginning of the world, and long anterior even to the Abrahamic economy of the Church; and the use of it and other instruments formed a component part of the worship of God in every subsequent dispensation. Inspired by them, the prophets and the holy psalmist spake, sang, and *played*, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and for our example and instruction; and composed their poetical effusions of divine truth and adapted them to the use, *not merely of the human voice*, but also as auxiliary aids to other musical instruments. And as these divine psalms and spiritual songs are best employed in God’s praise when they most perfectly express the mind and spirit of the psalmist, *it follows that this can only be accomplished with the assistance of such instrumental music*. And if these compositions are models and prophecies of the new psalms and hymns and spiritual songs which are to be employed under the New Testament dispensation, (*as they themselves distinctly affirm*, Ps. cxlix. 1, etc.) then they teach us that under this Christian economy other musical instruments, in addition to that of the human voice, would be employed for the more perfect praise of God in the sanctuary.

Now, since this use of instrumental music in the service of God, under all former dispensations of the Church, was either by positive divine appointment or by the divinely permitted exercise of the discretionary wisdom and tastes of men, in either case it was *moral* and proper. It was not ceremonial or political; it was not antediluvian, Noachic, Abrahamic, or Mosaic; and hence it was unaffected by any change of dispensation of the Church of God, *unless God has positively prohibited it*. In order, therefore, to prove that the Church, under its Christian dispensation, is restricted to the sole and alone use of the instru-

mental organ of the voice, and to hymns and spiritual songs adapted exclusively to the voice, *it must be shown that God has forbidden any further use of those ancient psalms, which are unalterably lyrical in their spirit and arrangement, and of those instruments by which alone that spirit can be expressed.*

“Psalms, *then*, are always tuned best,  
 When there is most exprest  
     The holy penman’s heart;  
 All music is but discord where  
 That wants or doth not bear  
     The first and chiefest part.  
 Voices without affection answerable,  
 When *best*, to God are *most abominable*.”

There is therefore no necessity on our part to produce any positive proof for the permitted use, under the Christian economy, of instrumental music in the worship of God. The burden of proof that its authorized use from the beginning hitherto is now condemned must be produced by those who make such affirmation, just as it is imperative upon our Baptist brethren, who declare that it is unchristian to receive children into the membership of the visible Church by the seal of the covenant, to produce the authority of Christ for repealing the hitherto unvariable and immutable law and practice of the Church of God.

This leads us to an observation which is very important and very confirmatory of the conclusion we have reached—that while the supreme and final end of all worship, including praise, is the glory of God, nevertheless it is blessedly true in reference to it, as it is to the whole work of redemption and providence, that God brings glory in the highest to himself by making them all conspire to the production of peace and good will and joy among men. Just as man was not made for the Sabbath, but the Sabbath for man, so it is delightfully true that man was not made for the gospel, nor for the ordinances of worship and praise of God’s sanctuary, but that these were all made conformable to man’s nature and conducive to man’s emotional, social, and intellectual enjoyment, and (by means of this) to his salvation and spiritual edification. The whole economy of redemption—all the

privileges and blessings of the everlasting covenant, the oracles of God, the means of grace, the Sabbath, the sanctuary, the ministry of men, public, social, and family worship, prayer and thanksgiving, the singing of psalms and hymns, with such instrumental accordance as perfect science and taste (which are equally of God) require—are all gracious adaptations to the nature and condition of men, to the occasions of this needy life, and to the impulses, anxieties, and desires of sorrowful and suffering humanity; so that whether we are merry, we may sing psalms; or in prosperity, rejoice; or in adversity and affliction, find in the plaintive and comforting songs of Zion solace and support. The temple, with all its august services; the tabernacle with all its shadowy ordinances; the “*calling upon God*” with formal rites and sacred music, of the holy patriarchs in the grey morning of the world; the timbrel music of Miriam and her choral assistants; the plaintive harpings in the wilderness and by the streams of Babel; the perfected musical arrangements of David and Hezekiah—were each and all adaptations to our weak and suffering and sinful manhood. Nor is it true that this adaptation is less provided for in Christianity; for it too has its rites and ceremonies and its many component parts of worship and service. It is quite illogical to infer that because an exercise of the *spiritual* faculty is *essential to worship*, therefore there is *no other element* in worship than the spiritual faculty; nor is it less illogical to conclude that because the primitive Christians were driven to upper chambers, and to dens and caves and catacombs, and were constrained to worship God in chief part *in silence*, that therefore all that is ornate, or beautiful, or comfortable, or pleasing in the architecture, furniture, and ritual order of Christian churches is anti-Christian. The Philippian jailor heard his first sermon in a gloomy cell, and the first disciples had to live by a common fund; but is it therefore unchristian or unscriptural to worship now in well-built sanctuaries, and to administer the sacraments from silver plates and goblets or from marble fountains? The body and all its tastes and desire of comfortable posture and repose are inseparable elements of our nature, and must have certain external, convenient, and expressive forms.

And then, again, mind and body have reciprocal action upon each other, so that the health and comfort of the body must be cared for, and has been provided for, by him who knows what is in man, in all that is social, artistic, and symbolic in the form, order, and the worship his Church. And the sublime declaration of our Lord that God must be worshipped in spirit and in truth, (which no man is at liberty to interpolate, as many do, by inserting the word “only,” so as to understand Christ as *forbidding all worship save that of the spirit*,) simply means that without the action of the conscience, will, and moral powers, there can be no worship at all, even in the use of those rites and forms which he himself has ordained.\* In regard, therefore, to the use of instrumental music, vocal and mechanical, in the worship of God, the only question is whether it is in accordance with reason and the nature of man, with Scripture, and with the laws of our own Church—in other words, whether there is for it a divine right—in order to gratify, under proper Christian regulation, the intuitive and universal delight which it would naturally impart. This divine right or warrant we assert, and will in the remainder of this article illustrate.

*Part II.*—DIVINE RIGHT ESTABLISHED, AND OBJECTIONS MET.

We will now proceed to establish the divine right for the use of instrumental music in the worship of God, by an appeal to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament.

And first, let us understand what is meant by saying of this or any other matter, that it is of divine right. According to the interpretation of the words—that is, of DIVINE RIGHT—the term right means either that which is *in itself considered justum*, just, right, proper; or *jussum*, that which is *commanded* or *enjoined* by divine warrant or scriptural authority. “That, therefore,” to use the words of the celebrated treatise on “The Divine Right of Church Government,” p. 7, “is of divine right which is divinely commanded by any law of God, or by that which is equivalent to any law of God.” And first, such a law of God,

---

\* See Goulburn’s Sermons.

constituting a divine warrant, is found in the true light of nature—"that light and image of God in man being not totally abolished and utterly erased by the fall. There remain still some relics and fragments, some glimmerings and common principles of light, both touching piety towards God and equity to man." (See do., p. 9, and Ps. xix. 1, 2, etc., and Acts xiv. 17, xvii. 27, 28, and Rom. i. 19, 20.) This is farther proved by the fact that "the Spirit of God and of Christ is pleased often to argue from the light of nature in condemning sin and commending and urging duty, as in 1 Cor. v. 1, xi. 13-15. "That, therefore, which is in accordance with the light of nature is prescribed *jure divine*—that is, by a divine right—and that which is repugnant to it is condemned." Our whole argument thus far, by which the use of instrumental music in the praise of God is shown to be in accordance with the best feelings and most sacred and holy practice of men in all ages from the beginning, demonstrates the divine warrant and authority for its continued use.

The second ground upon which is divine right is established by the writers above quoted, is scripture examples, which are made obligatory by the will and appointment of Jesus Christ, by whose Spirit those examples were recorded in Scripture for the imitation of believers. These being more clear, distinct, and particular than what is proved to be in accordance with the light of nature and the general sentiment of mankind, are still more binding. Many of the most important doctrines and duties of our holy religion are based upon this divine right; as, for instance, the baptism of women; the baptism of individuals under peculiar circumstances, while not members of any particular congregation, as of the eunuch, Lydia, the jailor, etc.; the preaching of the gospel and celebration of the word and sacraments on the first day of the week as the Lord's Sabbath; the ordination of *ministers* by the laying on of hands—on them and on them only (see 1 Tim. iv 1 14, 2 Tim. i. 6, Acts xiii. 3); the government of many congregations by one common Presbytery and by Synod.

Those examples in Scripture, therefore, which the Spirit of Christ, by whom all Scripture was given, commands us to imitate, or *commends and praises*, or *which are in themselves moral*

*and accordant to the light of nature*, are obligatory at all times, and as well under the New Testament as under the Old. And finally those acts which were done *commonly* and *ordinarily*, it is right and proper for us *ordinarily* to imitate.

Now, we have already given examples of the recorded use of instrumental music by “the sons of God,” under the *most ancient* economy. Under the patriarchal dispensation, we find a similar use of instrumental music recorded in connexion with seasons of solemnity, as in reference to the departure of Jacob from the house of Laban, (see Gen. xxxi. 27,) when, we have reason to believe, it was associated with blessings, etc., as in the case of Rebekah. Again, under the same covenant, the Spirit of Christ records the example of “Miriam the prophetess, (see Ex. xv. 20,) *the sister of Aaron*, who took a timbrel in her hand, and all the women went out after her with timbrel and with dances.” Here, then, is a prophetess who said, (Num. xii. 2,) “Hath not the Lord spoken by us,” and of whom the Lord himself says, (Mic. vi. 4,) “I sent before you, Moses, Aaron, and Miriam,”—that is in leading off the song of thanksgiving, triumph, and rejoicing, with timbrel and with dances on occasion of the glorious deliverance of the Israelites and destruction of the Egyptians. It may be objected to this proof, that if it sanctions instrumental music, it will also sanction an accompanying movement of the feet, which is in the English version rendered *dance*; but, as Dr. Clarke remarks, “*many learned men* suppose the original word means some wind instruments of music, etc. . . . pipes or hollow tubes, such as flutes, hautboys, (organs,) and the like, may be intended. *Both the Arabic and Persian understand it as meaning instruments of music.*” The timbrel was an instrument in use in every family of Israel, and regarded with such sacredness as not to be thrown away in the hour of their greatest distress and alarm. In this case, therefore, we have an example recorded by inspiration, sanctioned by God himself, in which God represents himself as being even the leader of the musical choir, and accompanied with the implicit approval of both Aaron and Moses, the great high priest and prophet of the Lord.

We may also recall to mind the coming out of the daughter of Jephthah, (Judges xi. 34,) as is evident from the whole tenor of the history, in the spirit of religious celebration, with timbrels and dances, where, of course, the word may have the same meaning. We would also refer to that remarkable passage in I Sam. x. 5, in which we are informed that Samuel, having by divine appointment anointed Saul, directed him to the hill of God, where he was met by "a company of prophets with a psaltery, and a tabret, and a pipe, and a harp, among whom Saul himself was to become a prophet and to be turned into another man." These prophets are believed to have been devout teachers and instructors of the sons of the prophets, and, as it is believed by all writers, "such instruments were then used by the prophets and other persons, to compose their minds." Musical instruments were therefore employed by holy men of God, under the teaching of the divine Spirit, *as a means of grace* for the conversion of sinners, the sanctification of the unholy, and the edification and inward spiritual revival of believers. And thus we read that "it came to pass, when the evil spirit from God was upon Saul, that David took a harp and played with his hand; so was Saul refreshed, and was well, and the evil spirit departed from him." (1 Sam. xvi. 23.) It will be noted that David at this time was in a state of acceptance with God, "with the spirit of God upon him," anointed to be king, and perhaps the most perfect type of Christ in the Old Testament; and that as such he was "a cunning player on the harp" and "the sweet Psalmist of Israel." "When David was returned from the slaughter of the Philistines, the women came out from all the cities of Israel, singing and dancing, to meet King Saul with tabrets, with joy, and with instruments of music," thus proving the *household* and *domestic*, as well as *public*, use of such instruments on all occasions, whether of festivity or worship. Thus we read that "David and all the house of Israel played *before the Lord* on all manner of instruments made of fir wood, even on harps, and on psalteries, and on timbrels, and on cornets, and on cymbals." (2 Sam. vi. 5; 1 Chron. xiii. 8.)

At the installation of Solomon, "all the people piped with pipes, (in margin, flutes,) and rejoiced with great joy, so that

the earth was rent with the sound of it, and among all the people were Zadok the priest and Nathan the prophet.” Solomon “made harps and psalteries for singers.” (1 Kings, x.12.) Elisha said, “Bring me a minstrel. And it came to pass, *when the minstrel played*, that the hand of the Lord came upon him. And he said, Thus saith the Lord.” (2 Kings, iii. 15, 16.) David “appointed certain of the Levites to minister before the ark of the Lord, and to record, and to praise the Lord God of Israel,” and among them “Asaph the chief, and next to him Zechariah,” etc., “and Jeiel with psalteries and with harps; but Asaph made a sound with cymbals;” “Heman and Jeduthun with trumpets and cymbals for those that should make a sound, and with MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS OF GOD.” (1 Chron. xvi. 4, 5, 42.) And these all “with their sons and their brethren .... stood at the east end of the altar, and *with them an hundred and twenty priests* sounding with trumpets . . . and they lifted up their voice with the trumpets and cymbals and instruments of music, and praised the Lord, saying, For he is good ; for his mercy endureth forever; and the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of the Lord; so that the priests could not stand to minister; for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of God.” (2 Chron. v. 12, 13, 14.) Again, at the conclusion of Solomon’s prayer, when God sent down fire from heaven to consume the burnt offerings and sacrifices, in sight of which “the children of Israel bowed themselves with their faces to the ground,” even at this solemn time “the priests waited on their offices; the Levites with INSTRUMENTS OF MUSIC OF THE LORD, which *David the king*”—not Moses—“had made to praise the Lord.” (2 Chron. vii. 6.)

Take another example of God’s approval of the use of instrumental music in his worship and praise. The covenant of the people under Asa to seek the Lord was made “with a loud voice, and with shouting, and with trumpets and cornets. And God was found of them and gave them rest.” (2 Chron. xv. 12-15.) In the reign of the good King Hezekiah, and the wonderful reformation and revival accomplished through his instrumentality, instrumental music was eminently serviceable, and with manifest divine approbation. 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' seer, and Nathan the prophet; FOR SO WAS THE COMMANDMENT OF THE LORD BY HIS PROPHETS." (2 Chron. xxix.) When the foundation of the second temple was laid, "they set the priests in their apparel with trumpets, and the Levites, the sons of Asaph, with cymbals to praise the Lord after the ordinance of David, king of Israel." Again: "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." (Neh. xii. 27.) "My harp," says Job, "is turned into mourning, and my organ into the voice of them that weep." It is unnecessary to quote at any length from the Psalms in which the praise of God in the public Worship of the sanctuary and on all other occasions, with the assistance of instrumental music, is *preceptively commanded* and *prophetically authorized and enjoined*. Thus in Psalm cxlix.: "Praise ye the Lord. Sing unto the Lord a NEW song" (which, of course, must refer to other songs than those in the book of Psalms, and to the present as well as to the past dispensation). "Let them praise his name in the dance (or, as in the margin, with the pipe); let them sing praises unto him with the timbrel and harp." Thus, also, in Psalm cl.: "Praise ye the Lord. Praise God in his sanctuary . . . . praise him with the sound of the trumpet; praise him with the psaltry and harp. Praise him with the timbrel and dance (or, as in the margin, with the pipe); praise him with stringed instruments and organs." Now, as it is a matter of fundamental faith with *many* that the book of Psalms is the divinely inspired and exclusive book of praise for the Church in all ages, and as all Christians admit that they are intended, though not *exclusively*, for the use and as models of God's praise, it follows necessarily that they are to be sung with the accompaniment of instruments of music, ALL of which are found *combined* in the one sacred instrument, *the organ*. It is admitted also, by all critics, that the Psalms, not only of David, but of all whose divine compositions are preserved, are *by their very con-*

*struction* unadapted to our tunes, but are adapted to chanting and to antiphonal responsive chanting—one class of singers singing one sentence, and another class responding to it. The lines, therefore, are equal, and the sentiment is repeated. We have a representation of what we mean in the vision of Isaiah, where the seraphim are represented as answering one another; and we have another *specimen* of it in the ancient song of Miriam, which is both choral and antiphonal. We can hardly conceive how many of the Psalms—such as the 136th, the 118th, the 119th, the 24th, etc.—were sung, except by one party of singers stating a truth, to which another set of singers give response.

In Isaiah xxx.29, a season of spiritual joy is thus represented: “Ye shall have a song, as in a night *when a holy solemnity is kept*; and gladness of heart, as when one goeth with a pipe to *come into the mountain of the Lord*, to the mighty One of Israel.” When the restoration of Israel is spoken of by the Lord through Jeremiah, (xxx. 4,) it is said—and this, be it remembered, is *spoken figuratively of the Church under its gospel dispensation*—“Again I will build thee, and thou shalt be built, O virgin of Israel; *thou shalt again be adorned with thy tabrets*, and shalt go forth in dances (or with the pipe) of them that make merry.” NOW these instruments are all embodied in the organ, and the term virgin implies that when used by the Church, she should be exalted to her condition of virgin purity and perfection. Tyre is commended as the garden of God and perfect in her ways till iniquity is found in her, when it is said of her (Ezek. xxviii. 13-15): “When the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created. Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth, *and I have set thee so*.” And as a punishment it is said: “I will cause the noise of thy songs to cease; and the sound of thy harps shall be no more heard;” (xxvi. 13.)

The associations of instrumental music with divine worship, as suggested by the light of nature, and followed by the Hebrew exiles within his empire, is strikingly demonstrated by the order of Nebuchadnezzar, that when the people heard the sound of

“the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music,” *they were to fall down and worship* the image |which the king had set up. And to bring these examples to a close, Habakkuk terminates the prayer which concludes his book with the direction, “To the chief singer on MY stringed instruments.” An ampler demonstration of the divine right of the use of instrumental music in the worship of God, as based upon examples recorded in Scripture by divine inspiration, with the divine approbation, accompanied by divine acts and divine precepts, from the very beginning of the Bible history before the flood, and after the flood under every dispensation, through prophets, priests, kings, and people, could scarcely be given.

We come, therefore, to the New Testament and to the Christian Church, as established by our Lord Jesus Christ, *with the fact that in the worship of God under ALL former dispensations of the Church*, instrumental music was employed to aid and give more efficiency to the human voice in the praises of God in the public and private worship of his people. Like the law of infant church-membership, and all other laws, principles and institutions which Christ, as the great Lawgiver and Head of his Church, HAS ASSUMED *as established, and has not by any positive enactment altered, abridged, or forbidden*, we must conclude that they are still authorized and sanctioned. If, therefore, we find nothing in the conduct or teaching of our Lord, or in the more full and perfect teaching of his inspired apostles, countermanding this use, then it must be considered as still permitted. Now, we do find our Saviour present when such instruments were used, not only in the way of festive enjoyment, but also of *religious funeral* ceremony, and speaking of them in such connexions *as to imply his approbation and express sanction*, and to throw the burden of proof upon those who allege Christ’s authority in condemnation of such use, to produce that law of Christ or his apostles by which it is condemned. “When Jesus came into the ruler’s house, and saw the minstrels (that is, players on the pipe, etc.,) making a noise,” (Matt. ix. 23,) he uttered no reproof. He does not hesitate to *liken himself* unto children calling unto their fellows and saying, We have piped unto you,

and ye have not danced; *we have mourned unto you, and ye have not lamented*, (Matt. xi. 16, 17,) where he alludes to the universal employment of instrumental music, both in the way of festival and solemn rite, with implied approval. "I"—he as it were says, "played to you the part that the piper does, and yet ye have received me with neither joy nor solemnity." In his beautiful parable of the prodigal son, our Lord introduces instrumental music as a most proper medium of awakening religious joy and grateful praise to God for a returned prodigal, and as an emblematic representation of the joy of heaven over a repentant sinner. And when he himself had ascended and was seated in the midst of the throne with the redeemed at his feet, they are represented with harps in their hands, singing a new song, mingled with the voice of harpers harping with their harps; (Rev. v. 8, xiv. 1-4;) thus manifestly teaching that what is in accordance with the purity of God's worship in the heavenly sanctuary, cannot be discordant to that worship in his sanctuary on earth.

In the instructions given by Christ on the subject of the praise of God in the Christian Church, the terms employed are so diversified as *necessarily* to *include*, and certainly not to exclude, the use of instrumental music as auxiliary to the human voice. These are found in Eph. v. 19: "Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord;" and in Col. iii. 16: "Teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, *singing* with grace in your hearts to the Lord." "These terms," says Poole, "*include all manner of singing.*" PSALMS are such spiritual songs as were anciently sung with the accompaniment of musical instruments, and must, therefore, to be sung with perfect propriety, be still united with instrumental music, to which they were originally, and as we have seen by the very nature of their composition, adapted. The use of instrumental music as an accompaniment to the singing of the voice in the praise of God in the Christian church is here indicated not only in the word  $\psiαλλόντες$ , but also in the word  $λαλούντες$ , which alludes to a person under the excitement of great joy, who

not only *sings but plays on any instrument* which he is accustomed to use. So Christians are to give expression to the spiritual living joy of their hearts by giving the additional power of instrumental music to vocal in swelling the volume of their adoring praise unto him that loved them and gave himself for them. We have also an implied allusion to the use of instrumental music, with choral and antiphonal arrangement of the parts, in the words "one another"—*inter vos*—in alternation, alternately. (See Poole, Synop. Crit.) "A PSALM means the touching, twang—that is, of a bow-string; of stringed instruments, a playing, music; tone, melody, measure, as played; a song as accompanying stringed instruments in praise of God." And the verb as here used, ψάλλοντες, means to touch or strike any chords—most frequently, to touch the lyre or any stringed instrument; to strike up, to play; in the Septuagint and New Testament, to sing, to chant, *as accompanying stringed instruments*; as is said by Dr. Robinson in Robinson and Duncan's Lexicon, who refer for illustration to James v. 13; Rom. xv. 9; Eph. v. 19; 1 Cor. xiv. 15, etc.

That Christians, in our Saviour's and during the apostolic time, did not use such instrumental music, is sufficiently accounted for by our Saviour's own explanation, that when he, the Bridegroom, should be taken from them, they would not for a season rejoice, but be in heaviness through manifold temptations. "I send you forth as sheep among wolves." Christian churches, be it remembered, were at first in the rooms of private houses, where Christians met in small numbers, dividing into different sections of the same church, through fear of their enemies, and with their doors locked. The answer of Justin Martyr to the Præfect by whom he was examined, "Where do you assemble?" was, "Where each one can and will. You believe, no doubt, that we all meet together in one place; but it is not so, for the God of the Christians is not shut up in a room, but, being invisible, he fills both heaven and earth, and is honored every where by the faithful." And he tells us that when he came to Rome, like the Apostle Paul, he hired his own house, where Christians were in the habit of resorting to unite privately in worship.

VOL. XIX., NO. 4—6.

Under circumstances like these, it was of course impossible for the early Christians to revive and reestablish the forms and order in which the praise of God had hitherto been conducted. But as soon as circumstances permitted, we find those forms to a greater or less extent introduced. Our Saviour, after he had added the Christian to the Jewish sacrament, sang a hymn with his disciples according to the mode in use in the Jewish Church. The very first, greatest, and sublimest act of praise in the Christian Church, in which the Master and Head of that Church joined, was a *chant*. Such, also, must have been the form of praise in the first Christian assemblies. They did not change the Jewish language or deform the Jewish poetry. They had no metrical literature. The old songs continued with an adaptation to that Christian sense which was their fulfillment. And is it not delightfully probable that we have in the Apocalyptic representation of the songs and anthems of the heavenly service specimens of what the first Christians were singing upon earth—a kind of echo, as it were, of what was taking place in the Church? Tacitus says of the Christians that they were accustomed to meet together to sing hymns to Christ as God, and the very words he uses in his statement gives us the idea that in their singing they took alternate parts, all the people taking part in the service.

About the middle of the fourth century, Ambrose introduced this form of service from the church at Antioch into the church at Milan. And such was the effect of this choral chanting service, that Augustine alludes to it in several places. “How many tears,” says he, addressing Ambrose, “during the performance of thy hymns and chants, keenly affected by the notes of thy melodious church! My ears drank up those words, and they distilled into my heart as sacred truths, and overflowed thence in pious emotions, and gushed forth in tears.” “When,” he adds, “I call to mind the tears that I shed when I heard the chants of thy church, and reflect that I was affected not by the mere music, but by the subject brought out as it is by clear voices and appropriate tune, then, in turn, I confess how useful is the practice.”

With the Reformation came in psalms and hymns in regular

measure, suited to the construction of the modern language, and which had great effect in promoting the Protestant Reformation. In the time of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., there was a great deal of psalm singing in connexion with the Reformation, as many as six thousand people collecting at one time about Paul's Cross to unite together in singing the psalms of the recovered faith. Psalms were every where introduced into worship, and the psalter put into verse and the music adapted to the change. The organ, the concentration of all that is solemn and sacred in instrumental music, was silently and almost universally retained, except in Scotland and among the non-conformists. *And it was so because it was not any more Popish than any other part of the service of God*—such as prayer, reading, preaching, and singing. It is altogether unwarrantable to denounce the use of the organ as Popish, since it was never authoritatively introduced or required by that Church; nor to this day is any instrumental music permitted in the Sistine Chapel at Rome, where the Pope himself, with his cardinals, conduct their worship, not in adaptation to popular usage, but exclusively with the use of vocal music, and in accordance with the forms of chant, which, as we have seen, came down through our Lord and his disciples from the Church of God under every dispensation since the beginning of the world. If, therefore, there is any valid ground of objection to the use of instrumental music as auxiliary to the voice in the worship of God's house, because it has been in part used by the Romish Church, and also by the Jewish Church, while as yet our Lord and Saviour and his apostles remained in and recognised that Church, as in all previous times, the objection is equally strong against the use of vocal music, since *instrumental music constitutes no part of the Mosaic economy*, beyond the use of the trumpet and horn, and these for the purposes of signals rather than for worship.

The human voice is itself as certainly a musical instrument, though not of man's invention, as is any other musical instrument. The organ of the voice "is of the flesh flesh,"—earthy, carnal, sensuous, and our most unruly member; set on fire of hell, the instrument of lust and every evil thought that cometh

forth out of the evil heart; the syren voice of the tempter, the handmaid of vice and pollution, the chorister for every bacchanalian revelry and Vanity Fair; by which men curse God and worship the devil, and profane the temple of God, and offer God the incense of abomination, hypocrisy, and self-idolizing display. The exercise of the voice in God's worship, unsanctified and unsweetened, is in God's sight no better than "the calves of the lips and the sacrifice of fools."

The *organ* of the human voice is as truly *an instrument*, and *external to the soul*, as the *organ* of man's construction. It is the combination of manifold *organs* coöperating to the production, variety, and modulation of its sounds; of the lungs, the larynx, and the ligaments of the glottis, which vibrate like the strings of an instrument, and produce various sounds, as they are more or less tense; certain cavities in which tones are produced as in wind instruments; the length of the windpipe, which can be increased or shortened; the magnitude of the lungs in proportion to the width of the glottis; the greater or less length of the canal which extends from the glottis to the opening of the mouth; the influence of the nerves, and of the positive and negative poles as affecting these nerves. According to Gottfried Weber, the organ of the voice as a sounding membrane acts like the tongue-work in the organ. The uvula also has considerable influence in producing tones. Besides these, the finely arched roof of the mouth and the pliability of the lips, enabling us to give a great variety of form to the mouth, are of the greatest importance to the voice.

The human voice, therefore, is, in its nature, construction, and use, a musical instrument from the manufactory of heaven, displaying infinite skill, wisdom, and merciful adaptation to the necessities and comforts of man. The voice, like the organ and other instruments, is capable of indefinite cultivation and of artistic and scientific development. It demands time, patient practice, leaders or preceptors, tuning forks, music books, musical instructors and classes, choirs, and is therefore liable to multiplied abuses and uses; so that if the facts that organs are instruments and are liable to evils and abuses are a sufficient

ground for excluding them from the service of God in the sanctuary, then the human voice must be so excluded, since it is manifestly fallacious to consider *our voices as ourselves*. They are foreign matter. They belong to man, but they are not the man. They are ours, but not ourselves; and their use, except as the instrument of the soul in expressing its heart melody, is no more divine worship than what is called the artificial and mechanical music of the organ. When, therefore, it was argued in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland that the “question is, Is the psalmody of the congregation to be led by an instrument commonly called the pitch-pipe or fork, or by an instrument more complicated, and commonly called an organ?” the real question before that Church was wisely stated. The statement was *wisdom*, and not, as Dr. Candlish fallaciously calls it, “*wit*,” and the answer of Dr. Candlish, through it called for laughter, was not *wisdom*, but merely *wit*, and must have made him “look very foolish” to those who looked beyond *wit* to the *wisdom*. For when Dr. Candlish attempts to make an *argument*, instead of a *diversion*, he says: “To make the parallel fair and the argument hold good, whenever the singing begins, the organ must stop. (Great laughter.) Will that satisfy our ‘organic’ friends? (Cheers and laughter).” Now, this is pure wit without *wisdom*, although coming from so great a philosopher, who is, however, as notorious for his sarcastic wit as for his logic. For, we confidently ask, *by what divine right* is the *tuning fork*, with the *tune board* and the *music books in the pews*, and the *leaders or precentors*, introduced into the sanctuary of God, during and as a part of the actual service and worship of God? Were these instituted by Christ? Do these worship God in spirit and in truth? And is there any essential difference at *what moment* they are introduced, and whether employed during the *whole* time of the singing, or at the beginning of each verse? And as to the singing itself, did not God, by the prophet Ezekiel, denounce the formal hypocrisy of his pretended worshippers, because, while they sat before him and united in his worship as his people do, their vocal service was to him only as the “organic” sounds of “one who has a pleasant voice and playeth well upon

an instrument?" "Oh, but," Dr. Candlish would reply, "we are certainly required to *sing* in praising God in the sanctuary." "Well," we reply, "suppose we are required to sing, where are we enjoined to use *tuning forks*, etc.? And have we not seen that we are just as surely authorised by the Old and New Testaments to associate with singing instrumental music? And have we not seen that while neither the voice (with the aid of tuning forks, etc.) nor instrumental music are in themselves acceptable as heart worship unto God, who must be worshipped in spirit and in truth, nevertheless God has been pleased to provide and permit the use of both vocal and mechanical organs for man's comfort and happiness, and both may be made helpful to his greater spiritual devotion and to God's acceptance and glory?"

Dr. Candlish and his organic friends seem altogether to forget that, upon his own arguments, the use of *the human voice* itself in the worship of God has been seriously controverted, and that all their satirical invectives heaped upon "organic" music, as "performances on musical machinery," and as constituting "Jewish and Romanish public worship," may be and have been as forcibly applied to the *organic music* of the voice, as not one whit less *organic, instrumental, Jewish, and Romanish*, than tuning forks, organs, or any other instrument. Even at an *advanced* period of the Reformation, many objected to singing altogether. They objected that, except as used by converted persons, singing was profanation, both of the Sabbath and of the house and worship of God. This question is learnedly discussed even in one of the Eastcheap lectures delivered in London by eminent and learned men. Mr. Keach, a minister at Mazepond, in England, who wanted to introduce singing into his congregation, had to fight and contend *twenty-two* years for it. The controversy about *singing* was as fierce, (and its controversial pamphlets as thick and many,) as was that about a funeral service and other parts of divine worship in Scotland. At one period of the controversy in Mr. Keach's congregation, we are informed by veritable history, there was a sort of drawn battle between the disputants, when a compromise was agreed upon, that while one part of the congregation was engaged in singing, the other

part should quietly go out and walk about among the graves of the SILENT dead, and then come in again after the singing was over. "We know it is a fact," says Mr. Binney of London, "that in the old church-book of the New Bond Street Church, there is a resolution to the effect that the congregation *might be allowed* in future to sing ONCE in the course of each Sunday." Equally inveterate, and on as strong a ground of alleged scriptural authority and divine right as Dr. Candlish's argument for using *tuning forks*, etc., etc., has been the controversy waged in England, Scotland, and in this country, about singing the Psalms of David, *to the exclusion* of the Psalms of Miriam the prophetess, Job, Hezekiah, Isaiah, etc., etc., and about singing them in a doggerel version (neither good prose, good rhyme, nor good sense) of a certain fierce Erastian member of the Rump Parliament; and about giving out these psalms in one line at a time and in a nasal intonation of voice; or whether they should sing two lines at a time or four lines at a time; or whether, as now, they should give out the whole psalm. And we remember one person who took a change in this respect so much to heart that he left his church and walked a distance of seven miles every Sunday, to go to a church where only one line was given out at a time. And we also remember that when a part of the English version of the Bible was sung as a chant, as Christ sung psalms, one old man said to another, "What do you think they have got to now? They have actually sung part of a chapter." This was traditional feeling, ancestral habit, and inveterate prejudice; and like that still felt against organic music by tuning fork singers, is not only without any scriptural authority whatever, but against everything bearing upon the subject from Genesis to Revelation.

What we plead for, therefore, is not a law making it *imperative* upon a particular church or congregation to introduce the organ or choir, or perfectly scientific and harmonious music, or precentors, or tuning forks; but that every congregation shall be left to the exercise of that liberty in these matters with which Christ has made them free, and not be brought into bondage by the traditions of the fathers, and the prejudices, indifference, and

unmusical taste of either ministers, church courts, or individuals. The one great object of supreme desire is that the praise of God in the sanctuary should be regarded as intrinsically one of the most important and interesting parts of his worship; that to be acceptable, therefore, it must be offered in spirit and in truth, with melody in the heart, and with the understanding also; that it should therefore be as much under the direction and control of those who have spiritual oversight over the congregation as reading, preaching, and praise; that as—like all the other parts of God's worship and the holy Sabbath itself—the praise of God is adapted to man's nature and tastes, and especially to that love of music which is such a universally potent principle in our nature, it should be arranged so as most perfectly to gratify and draw out all the devout feelings of the soul; that to this end fitness and preparation for this part of God's worship should constitute a *necessary* part of home and Sabbath-school and scholastic instruction as included in the teaching of "all things whatsoever Christ has commanded;" that it is plainly the duty of every individual worshipper to be qualified by general and special preparation for uniting in this as well as in the other parts of the divine service of the sanctuary—the duty to praise God being of as individual obligation as that of praying and hearing the word; that the praise of God should therefore be rendered by the whole congregation and by every member of it, and not by any choir or any few; that, in order to secure the end designed in this part of God's worship, it is of paramount obligation to seek those things that will preserve unity, harmony, and peace—none seeking his own things or to please himself, but all seeking what may please all, the strong and the skilful bearing the infirmities of the weak and the unskilful, in love preferring one another, and so fulfilling the law of Christ, that all things should be done decently and in order; and that when a congregation is able to secure an organ or melodeon, and the services of one who playeth well upon an instrument, and a majority are anxious to do so, the minority should study the things that make for peace and comply with their wishes.

It was on this principle the Westminster Assembly acted—

neither condemning nor commending the use of instrumental music, but leaving the whole ordering of the singing to the churches. The use of instrumental music is not included among any of the multiplied specified violations of the first and second commandments in the Larger Catechism, and in the singing of psalms the voice is to be *tunably* and gravely ordered.

In the Church of Scotland, therefore, the use of instrumental music in the worship of God is an open question. It is now reported that an organ is to be introduced into the Cathedral Church at Glasgow. And although the Presbytery of Edinburgh last year refused to grant permission to a congregation to introduce an organ, the deliverance of Presbytery was distinctly based upon the fact, *not that such music was in itself wrong or contrary to the laws of the Church*, but on the fact that the congregation seeking for it was divided on the subject, and was very largely represented by petitions both for and against it. It was decided that “the Assembly remit the case to the Presbytery, with instructions to disallow, *in present circumstances*, any proposal that may be made to them with that purpose.” Very similar was the decision and the discussion upon this subject by the Scottish United Presbyterian Synod. At a late meeting of the English Synod of the United Presbyterian Church, after an earnest debate, occupying a large part of two days, the following resolution was adopted by a vote of 36 to 14: “That, in the opinion of this Synod, the use or non-use of instrumental music as an aid to praise *is not a case for enforced conformity*, and should be made an open question for individual congregations, to be settled by them in accordance with constitutional regulations.”

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States has long since established it as a principle that the use or disuse of the organ or other instrumental music, such as the bass viol, was not a matter upon which it had authority to legislate, it being a part of the liberty of every congregation to determine the question for themselves. (See Baird’s Digest.)

Such also is, we believe, the law upon this subject in the Episcopal churches, in the Methodist Episcopal churches, and in all the other evangelical churches of this country.

In conclusion, let us baptize this whole discussion in the spirit of divine love and charity, by taking a glimpse of the upper sanctuary as gloriously imparted to us by the Apostle John in Patmos. (Rev. xix. 1.) "I heard," says he, "a great voice of much people in heaven, saying, Alleluia; salvation, and glory, and honor, and power, unto the Lord our God . . . AND A VOICE CAME OUT OF THE THRONE, SAYING, Praise our God, all ye his servants, and ye that fear him, both small and great. And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia; for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth."

In this dark and sinful world, amid tumults, conflicts, and manifold tribulations, and even in the visible Church, where there are so many discordant and jarring voices, we cannot look for perfect harmony; but the hour cometh when to every true believer the gate of heaven will be opened, and all discords melt into harmony—all hearts be full of love, and joy, and gratitude, and all voices retuned and restored. Blessed be God, eternity is near, heaven is all around us, and through the opening chinks of dissolving nature the sound of blessed voices uttering praise swells upon our ear, and sounds seraphic ring. We can sometimes, like a late dying believer, weep for joy. "For," said he, "I thought if the singing is so beautiful here, what will it be when angels help in it! I wept for joy that this blessedness is so near." Thus do we walk, as it were, "in the crypt or subterranean chamber of life, whence we can hear from the great cathedral of glory that is above us the pealing of the organ and the chanting of the choir; and ever as a friend goes upward at the bidding of death, and joins that sublime chorus, and waves of richer and louder melody roll down, till our hearts vibrate in unison with eternal praises, occasionally a flash of the heavenly light streams into our spirit and reveals to us fathers, and mothers, and sisters, and brothers, and friends, as harpers with their harps, singing the song of Moses and the Lamb. Occasionally, too, a blessed invitation is heard from the lips of some familiar one, now a chorister before the throne, 'Come up hither, my son, there is a place empty, a seat for thee.' And again we

hear the anthem pealing louder than the loud thunder, ‘Thou art worthy; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation— blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, to him that sitteth on the throne, even the Lamb!’ Let, then, our hearts cherish the bright prospect of entering the company and joining the chants of the blessed, with the harp and the trumpet, and the loud diapason chorus roll.

“Jerusalem, my happy home,  
My soul still pants for thee;  
Then shall my labors have an end,  
When I thy joys shall see.”

Then shall we hear “the harp of David sound a yet nobler music,” and the voices of Isaiah! and Jeremiah no longer tuned to sadness, and the adamant Luther singing in a nobler strain yet nobler victories, and Milton rising to the utterance of songs worthy of Paradise actually regained, and Cowper’s spirit no longer benighted, desolate, and unstrung, and confessors from the catacombs of Rome, and martyrs from their flaming shrouds, and missionaries from distant isles of the ever-sounding sea, and Africa, and Asia, and Europe, and America, presenting the rapturous spectacle of the prophets’ strain upon a world’s lips— a chorus, every chord in which is joy, every heart in which is love, every utterance in which is deep and glorious harmony. We move to that blessed land. Our march is amid the music of the redeemed.

“There trees forevermore bear fruit,  
And evermore do spring;  
There evermore the angels sit,  
And evermore do sing.

“There David stands, with harp in hand,  
As master of the choir;  
Ten thousand times that man were blest  
That might this music hear.

“Te Deum doth St. Ambrose sing—  
St. Austin doth the like;  
Old Simeon and Zachary  
Have not their song to seek.

“There Magdalene hath left her moan,  
 And cheerfully doth sing  
 With blessed saints, whose harmony  
 In every street doth ring.

“Jerusalem, my happy home!  
 Would God I were in thee;  
 Would God my woes were at an end,  
 Thy joys that I might see.”\*

---

ARTICLE IV.

THE GREAT COMMISSION.

An article on Popular Revivals, in a former number of this REVIEW, having met the approbation of many judicious brethren throughout the country, the writer feels encouraged to offer a few additional reflections, growing out of the same or a kindred subject.

In the execution of redemption, three instrumentalities are mainly employed—the preacher, the gospel, and the Holy Ghost. Take either away, and the economy is marred. Before the Saviour’s ascent, he selected and commissioned certain disciples, whose business it should be to preach. The ministry, therefore, is an office of divine appointment. “Go ye therefore,” etc. “And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.” Paul says: “Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and *stewards* of the mysteries of God.” “Who also hath *made* us able ministers of the New Testament.” Once again, it is said: “Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which *the Holy Ghost hath made you* overseers, or bishops, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.” And once more: “I will *give* you pastors according to mine heart’

---

\*From the fine old ballad version.