

Reformed Presbyterian and Covenanters.

VOL. X.

JUNE, 1872.

No. 6.

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN NEW TESTAMENT WORSHIP.

Heb. 13: 15. "The sacrifice of praise—that is, *the fruit of our lips.*"

THIS is a subject growing rapidly in interest to the Christian community of every denomination. Instruments have been long used in many churches; while others, equally efficient in the cause of God and his truth, have pursued the even tenor of their way without them. Aside from the use or disuse of the instruments, there is a question incidentally brought up—one of the highest importance—What do we mean when we sing those psalms which speak of the harp, the organ, the trumpet, the dance, &c.? While many in our day consider the psalms entirely antiquated, and prefer things without life, it is worth our care to inquire *what is the life* symbolized in these mystic expressions. To assist in this inquiry, and to accomplish other purposes, it is proposed in the present article to show why we do not use instruments in praise, to give a brief review of two publications lately issued on this subject, and to suggest what those good things are, of which instrumental music is the shadow and typical representation.

I. The argument. Why do we not use these instruments now, as they were used by Miriam, David, Asaph and Nehemiah?

Because we find no warrant for them in the New Testament. It is freely acknowledged here, that a subject largely handled in the Old Testament is usually passed over in the New, it may be with less attention, or with merely a passing recognition. Now it is just this passing recognition of instrumental music in the worship that is wanting.

(a) There is *no example* of its being used by Paul, by Peter, by James or John, or by the Redeemer himself, in all the details we have of their public and private life. Nor are there any traditional memorials of its use in the early centuries of the Christian churches. With all the varieties of different countries, and all the irregularities introduced from both Jews and pagans, our best historians are unable to produce any example of instrumental music during the first three centuries, to go no farther. We arrive at our first lessons in this kind of worship after the mystery of iniquity had been long working. In

western Europe, the introduction of organs is accredited to the Pope, Vitalian, in the seventh century. A late writer tells us that the Reformers mistook instrumental music for part of the popish system; and he seems to regret that they put it out with the other superstitions. The Reformers did put it out; a fact worth remembering.

(b) We find *no incidental directions* for either making or using instruments, while we have line upon line in relation to all the worship and service of the gospel. There is the more need of directions, when we reflect that those of the former dispensation are lost; and there is not found in any part of the world, a priest, of the sons of Aaron, to tell us their structure or material. True, we have no directions how to *make* psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs; but we can get along admirably for a few chiliads yet, while we have the old ones, and ample directions how to use *them*. The distinction, in this respect, between the psalm-book and the organ, is broad and deep—a great gulf, fixed immovably.

(c) We have *no command* to either make or use, nor anything from which to infer a command. Search has been diligently made, and has signally failed. There is some talk, to be sure, about the commands given in the Psalms themselves, as furnishing a warrant for the organ; but usually the psalms are “put out of the synagogue,” either before the advent of the organ, or soon after. This is enough to spoil the logic, if other considerations were wanting; but they are not wanting. Some who wish to *introduce* the instruments, fancy that they are inferred in the Greek verb *φάλλω*,—“making melody”—used in Eph. 5:19; but it is unhappy for that inference, that the sacrifice of praise is formally explained in Heb. 13:15, “**THAT IS** the fruit of the lips.” We readily, joyfully, grant that the verb implies more than the “talk of the lips (Prov. 14:23); but that is more than things without life can produce. We will come to this again. In the meantime, where there is neither example, direction, nor command, it is very unsafe to proceed in the worship of God.

2. *Instrumental music was never used in the ancient synagogue.* This is important in two aspects—in understanding the language, and ascertaining the practice, of New Testament writers. Language is always modelled by the usages of the time to which it belongs. The synagogue is the model of our Christian congregation. On this we observe,

(a) No hint is given in the Scriptures—Old or New Testament—that instrumental music was ever used in the synagogues of the Jews.

(b) Old-fashioned Jews do not permit the organ, or any instrument, at the present day, while they adhere to all the traditions of the ancients. They sing, too, as well as chant. The Jews of our country are divided into two sects, as of old, though the line of demarcation is not the same. The new sect call themselves Reformers; in both, the forms of ordinary Sabbath worship are exactly like our own, and ever have been. These Reformers, like modern Christians, have **INTRODUCED** instrumental music, within the past half century; and with that, they have any amount of innovations. This is a foil to set off

the customs of the ancient synagogue to better advantage. The old-fashioned Jews, like some of us, have preaching, reading, prayer, and singing, without organ, harp, bugle, cymbal, or anything of the kind. So much for the traditions of *their fathers*.

(c) Archæologists make no mention of instruments of *music* among the furniture of the ancient synagogue, which furniture they describe minutely. A friend of mine has examined Prideaux, Jahn, Calmet, Horne, Townshend and Kitto, and finds no hint of any such instruments. That there was singing of any kind in the ancient synagogue, has been denied, whether for a purpose or not; but a late writer wishes us to believe that he thinks they had instrumental music, but no singing!!! No, we don't believe that he thinks any such thing. The article, SYNAGOGUE, in Smith's Bible Dictionary, under paragraph V., *Worship*, gives us the following: "It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that the worship of the church was identical with that of the synagogue; modified (1) by the new truths, (2) by the new institution of the Lord's Supper, (3) by the Spiritual *Charismata* [gifts]. * * * The synagogue use of psalms, on the plan of selecting those which had a special fitness for special times, answered to that which appears to have prevailed in the church of the first three centuries." This article is written by Dr. Plumtre, of King's College, London, an Episcopalian, of course, trained to a ritual, and yet he finds "psalms," "selected," during "the first three centuries." We can afford to spare succeeding ages. Still this same writer betrays his affinity for the organ, where he tells us from Vitringa, that there was in the ancient synagogue "a chest for trumpets and other musical instruments used at the new year, Sabbath, and other festivals." Now it gives a wrong impression of the facts, to leave the term "musical" without explanation. The impression made by reading this is that these instruments were used in praise. Vitringa knew better; Dr. Plumtre ought to have known better, and ought not to have concealed it, if he did know.

The facts are these: Trumpets, horns, cornets, cymbals, and other loud-sounding instruments, were used in the synagogue, not for music, but to make proclamation; and they were needed—commanded. Num. 10:10; Ps. 81:3-5; Lev. 25:9. "Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubilee to sound, on the tenth day of the seventh month; in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound *throughout all your land*." See also Lev. 23:24, and Num. 29:1. This use of the trumpet was recognized at the temple, over and above its service in the *worship* of that age. Joel 2:1, 15. To take up the bugle-note as it came from Zion, and carry it over all the land, required just such an arrangement, and just such instruments, and just *such music*, as Vitringa and other writers mention. This makes all plain, so far as the new year, the Sabbatical year, the jubilee, the new moon, the set feasts, the solemn days, are concerned; but the Sabbaths—what about the trumpet on the Sabbaths? The reply to this is furnished by Conrad Iken, whose work on Antiquities of the Jews was published at Bremen in 1732, being thirty-six years later than Vitringa's and not so diffuse. Iken tells us that at the commencement of the Sabbath (Friday evening, for so the Jews still commence in the cities of

the United States as well as in other countries), they blew the trumpet six times. At the first blast, they dropped the plow, the spade, and all the implements of husbandry. At the second, they closed all offices, shops, and places of business. At the third, pots were removed from the fire, and culinary work suspended. The other three blowings were to designate the line between common and sacred time. This latter service was done at the temple by the warden going round and admonishing to cease from labor and prepare for *the coming of the spouse*. Ps. 122: 1. That such notices were needful, at least very convenient, will appear on a little reflection. They began this Sabbath at sun-setting. Lev. 23: 32. The evening might be cloudy; and they had neither Connecticut clocks, Waltham watches, nor Ayer's almanac; yet with all these appliances, it is well known how very difficult it was a few years ago to begin the Sabbath at that period in the valley of the Connecticut itself. Trumpets, rams-horns, and other such instruments, are kept by the Jews in Cincinnati and in all our large cities to-day, and are advertised in *The Israelite* every year; though they are now superseded by our bells, clocks, watches, and the like. Under the article *Cornet*, in Smith's Dictionary, we have the following from Rev. Dr. W. Marks, who gives Rosenmüller for his authority: "The cornet, trumpet, (*yubal*,) were used in all the cities of the land, as well as at Jerusalem, in the feast of trumpets. Num. 29: 1. Ps. 81: 3; on the day of atonement, jubilee and such like." All this and more we have in other authors, but not one hint that these or any other instruments were used in the worship, either with or without the psalms. Whether they had any singing in the synagogue at all affects the present argument very little, so long as they had neither harp nor organ. Still it adds a little clearness when we know that they did sing. In addition to what has been said about *selecting* the psalms, we have (2) the following in Jahn's* *Archæology*: "Besides the reading and exhortation, they (the Jews) had two doxologies, and prayers: and they say that the doxologies produced, or excited in their minds the kingdom of God, or of heaven." The same author tells us that in the early church, laymen had liberty to address their brethren, the same as in the synagogues; as also "to sing hymns." (3) The Jews still sing in the synagogue—both the old and the Reformers, with this difference; the Reformers generally sing in modern languages—German or English, the orthodox sing in Hebrew. The writer has heard both sung in the cities of our own land. The ancient synagogue singing consisted chiefly in a sort of chant which we would scarcely call singing, and on this account probably it is that some writers do not mention it. It never rivalled the singing of the Temple; still the *doxologies* were, and are, rendered in the grandest melody of the age. R. H.

* Sometimes written *Hahn's*, but always pronounced *Yahn's*.

THE
Reformed Presbyterian and Covenanters.

VOL. X.

SEPTEMBER, 1872.

No. 9.

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN NEW TESTAMENT WORSHIP.

(Continued from page 164.)

BY REV. R. HUTCHESON.

3. *The instrumental music of the former age was CEREMONIAL.* This is, no doubt, one of the reasons why it has been left out; or to speak more accurately, this is the reason why it was used under the law. It might be granted that these instruments were figurative, like bread, water, wine, light, heat (Ps. 98: 6; Rev. 1: 10, and 8: 13), and yet not be ceremonial. Again, it might be granted that they were typical, like Isaac, Samson, David, and the throne of Solomon (Ex. 19: 16, and 20: 18), and still not ceremonial. That they were figurative, typical AND ceremonial will appear from the following considerations:

(a) *They depended largely on the priesthood.* The trumpets belonged exclusively to the priests. Num. 10: 8, "The sons of Aaron, the priests, shall blow with the trumpets; and they shall be to you for an ordinance forever, throughout your generations." Even when they went to war, the priest must go along, verse 9 and chap. 31: 6, "And Moses sent them to the war,—them and Phinehas the son of Eleazar the priest, to the war, with the holy instruments, and the trumpets to blow in his hand." See also Josh. 6: 4 and 2 Chron. 13: 12, 14. The smaller instruments belonged to the Levites; but the proper business of the Levites was to wait on the priests in every part of the services. 1 Chron. 23: 28 (margin), "Their station was at the hand of the sons of Aaron, for the service of the house of the Lord," &c., &c. 1 Chron. 25: 1-8, we have the Levites set for song, to the number of 288-24x 12; with cymbals, psalteries and harps. Already we have seen the double use of the trumpet—for proclamation, for music. In the music, the song, it is combined with the other instruments, but still retained in the hand of the priest. After David had settled by inspiration the service of praise, the first occasion that called forth the entire orchestra (even in 1 Kings 1: 39, the coronation of Solomon, the priest was engaged,) was the dedication of the temple, 2 Chron. 5. Here we find all the instruments combined; verse 12, "Also the Levites—arrayed in white linen, having cymbals and psalteries and harps,

stood at the east end of the altar, and with them an hundred and twenty priests, sounding with trumpets;" verse 13, we are told that they and the "singers were as one, to make one sound." When David brought up the ark from the house of Obed-edom, there were but seven priests that blew with the trumpets; but there was the same combination, on the same principle, of the priests with trumpets, and Levites with psalteries, harps and cymbals of brass. See 1 Chron. 15. The two classes of instruments were combined over the sacrifices. Passing here Num. 10 : 10, which treats only of trumpets, and Josh. 6, for the same reason, we have the sacrifices in abundance, on the occasion of bringing up the ark from the house of Obed-edom, and the bringing it into Solomon's temple. 1 Chron. 15 : 26, and 2 Chron. 7 : 1. "Now when Solomon had made an end of praying, the fire came down from heaven, and consumed the burnt offering and the sacrifices." The complete combination of priests with trumpets, and Levites with instruments of music, over the sacrifices, can only be seen by studying the whole connection of the dedication. It was wrought into the entire machinery of that which is abolished; and is fully recognized in the psalms, as holding forth good things to come. Ps. 81 : 2, 3, "Take a psalm, and bring hither the timbrel, the pleasant harp, with the psaltery. Blow up the trumpets," &c. Ps. 98 : 5, 6, and 150 : 3-5. In the days of Hezekiah we find the same. 2 Chron. 29 : 24-29. "And when the burnt offering began, the song of the Lord began also, with the trumpets, and with the instruments of David king of Israel," verse 27. So also in chap. 30 : 21; Ezra 3 : 10, 11; Neh. 12 : 27-43. They are thus identified with the system of ceremonies—set feasts, sacrifice, altar, temple, and all its furniture. Each, all of these depended on the priesthood, and fell with it, according to Heb. 7 : 12, "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law."

(b) They belonged to the national worship of the peculiar people, with their anointed king, their one altar, one temple, spirit of prophecy, Urim and Thummim. Ex. 15 : 20. "Miriam the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, took a timbrel," &c. 2 Sam. 6 : 5. "And David and all the house of Israel played before the Lord on all manner of fir-wood, even on harps, and on psalteries, and on timbrels, and on cornets, and on cymbals," ver. 15. "So David and all the house of Israel brought up the ark of the Lord, with shouting, and with the sound of the trumpet." 1 Chron. 18 : 5, 6, 8, and 15 : 3, 28. The point brought out in this connection is, that the whole service in which the instruments were used was a national affair—not exactly a mere civil rejoicing like our 4th of July, but a national worship. The Levites prophesied with the harp in the national worship, 1 Chron. 25 : 1, 3, according to the order of the king, ver. 2. When Elisha called for a minstrel, he prophesied in the interest of Jehoshaphat king of Judah only. 2 Kings 3 : 13-15. Though the transaction occurred in the land of Edom, it was to Judah a national affair. The singers, the players, Ps. 68 : 25, were in the national service. When David used his harp in retirement, he was preparing hymns and tunes for the public service. The "company" that Saul encountered, 1 Sam. 10 : 5,

were prophets coming down from the high place; Saul was now a national character himself; the Spirit of the Lord comes on him; "and when he had made an end of prophesying, he came to the high place." The merest incidental allusion to these instruments connects them with the national worship. Is. 30: 29, "Gladness of heart, as when one goeth with a pipe, to come into the mountain of the Lord." None of all these incidents is separated or separable from the great system of national and symbolical worship belonging to that age.

(c) Even when introduced as symbols in the prophetic language of the book of Revelation, they are grouped with their ordinary ceremonial accompaniments. The trumpets are not in revelation introduced with the *music*, though they are prominent for other uses. Chap. 5: 8, "Having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors." These stand around the Lamb as it had been slain, ver. 6; and are made kings and priests to God, ver. 10. Chap. 14: 2, we have "the voice of harpers harping with their harps." These are with the Lamb on mount Sion, v. 1. Chap. 15: 2, we have the harps of God, associated with the sea of glass, the song of Moses, and the song of the Lamb. All these call up the symbols of the ceremonial dispensation; in the midst of other symbols gathered from earth and air and ocean, sun and moon and stars, and paradise itself. The very songs are symbolical, in these connections.

Certain theologians tell us that instrumental music cannot be abolished with the law of Moses, because it was in use before that law was promulgated. But so was circumcision; but so were sacrifices; distinction of clean and unclean dates back to Noah. Must all of these be restored because they were anterior to Moses? What about unction, incense, Cherubim? The ceremonial institutions were good while they lasted; they still illustrate to us the gospel, much of which is delivered in terms borrowed from their use.

4. *Instrumental music is inconsistent with the directions which we have about praise in the New Testament.*

(a) Heb. 13: 15, "By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name." The exhortation here given is communicated in terms of the Old Testament—compare Ps. 50: 14, 23, and 116: 17, with many other places. The point claiming special attention here is the definition of praise; "*THAT IS the fruit of the lips*" Of course the heart is to be engaged, according to 1 Cor. 14: 15, "I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also;" but this definition of the outward service precludes all idea of using instruments. Even under the law this, whether in prayer or praise, was counted the highest part of the service, Hos. 14: 2, "So will we render the *fruit* of our lips." This is the identical reading of the Septuagint. Ps. 69: 31, "This also shall please the Lord better than an ox or bullock that hath horns and hoofs."

(b) Eph. 5: 19, "Singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord." Much is said about the Greek verb *ψάλλω* (*psallo*), rendered here, "making melody." All scholars are agreed on the literal and figurative uses of the word, including the playing on an instrument, sing-

ing while we play, and singing after the instrument has ceased. The most radical idea is to twang the string of a bow, in archery; next, to touch the cord of an instrument, in tuning or playing; then follow the higher figurative uses. The text here requires something different from singing, and appears to require, certainly admits, the most literal use of the word—*touching the cords in your heart to the Lord*. It is a scholarly word, used with Pauline accuracy, going right to the mark, and severing the catgut like a weaver's thrums. Is. 38 : 12. It leaves no place for an instrument in the hand.

(c) Col. 3 : 16, "Singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." This quotation is only a variation of the preceding, but it is intended to show us that the writer is in earnest. *He means the heart*; he means such touching of strings as can be done only in the heart; where grace, in all its variety, responds to the song, as did the harp of Jeduthun and his sons, when they prophesied in the temple of Solomon.

This brings us fairly to the question, what did these instruments symbolize? What do we mean, rather what should we mean, when we use these ceremonial terms in praise? It is needful, however, before replying to the inquiry, to take

II. A review of two late publications on the subject in hand.

The first of these is by the Rev. R. Johnson, of Kossuth, Iowa, and is against the use of instruments under the gospel.* This is a very thorough argument, yet unanswered, and, as I think, unanswerable; though an attempt has been made to meet the positions assumed. The historical is perhaps the most valuable part of it. It should be carefully studied; the danger is imminent of invasion on this part of Protestant worship. Still in a free discussion, I am free to take exceptions to Mr. Johnson's work like the following:

(a) As an argumentative composition, it is diffuse, exhibiting too many digressions. The history does not come under this remark, that is directly in the way. I refer to the lengthy discussion, for example, of figurative language. This, to many readers, may be very acceptable; to some it may be needful; but it does not help directly the argument, while it occupies the place of a discussion on the *ceremonial*, which is equally needed, and would have been more directly to the point; in fact it is the point requiring most attention. True, our author has not omitted it, but he ought to have given more form and more space: especially when

(b) He has committed himself unhappily by ignoring the divine warrant for instrumental music in the service of the temple. He has thus given an occasion for triumph to an opponent, when the victory is merely over a particular writer, and leaves the *cause* untouched. Not only is David recognized as a prophet himself, but he had the concurrence of other prophets. Hezekiah, in making a great reform, "set the Levites in the house of the Lord with cymbals, with psalteries, and with harps, according to the commandment of David, and of

* A Discourse on Instrumental Music in Public Worship, by Rev. Robert Johnson, A. M., Pastor of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Kossuth, Iowa, and author of a Discourse on the Immaculate Conception. Second edition of three thousand. Burlington, Iowa.

Gad the king's seer, and Nathan the prophet: for so was the commandment of the Lord." 2 Chron. 29 : 25. Compare 1 Chron. 24, 25, 29; 2 Chron. 8 : 14; Ezra 3 : 10; Neh. 12 : 24-47. In fact they are styled "musical instruments of God." 1 Chron. 16 : 42.

(c) In like manner, the argument is weakened by denying the use of instruments in the *ordinary* service of the temple. For (1), if they were there at all, that is enough for their proper purpose, and enough for the use of any caviller about their utility now. (2) Their admission on festal and other *special* occasions, is more than might appear at first sight—three solemn feasts, from three to seven days each, and sometimes fourteen; new moons, twelve in each year, and sometimes thirteen; one of the feasts especially for blowing of trumpets; and what with the new year, coronation of a king, victory over an enemy, and other grand occasions incidental, which, taking all together, would number about forty days in the year—three-fourths as many days as *our* ordinary Sabbaths; and deducting the festal Sabbaths occurring amidst these grand solemnities (John 19 : 31), the specialties would outnumber the ordinary Sabbaths in Jerusalem. (3) There is sufficient evidence that they belonged to the sacrifice—not merely fifty-two times in the year, but morning and evening for three hundred and sixty-five days, and sometimes three hundred and sixty-six. Iken enumerates twelve days in which they made an addition to the number of the instruments, for *special* solemnity. Notwithstanding these defects, Mr. Johnson has made a very valuable book—an argument that cannot be set aside.

2. Our second subject of review, is a reply to the above, by Rev. Alexander Scott.* This writer professes to make a scholarly work. In the Burlington *Hawkeye*, and the *Banner*, of Pittsburgh, the work is highly applauded, and it deserves credit, as a scholarly production—concise, and to the point. There are some readers who would concede to it in point of authorship, priority to Mr. Johnson's. I assure the reader, and the writer of it, that I have no desire to detract from its merits, not even if they were greater yet. It is enough to raise an interest, and be of service in the discussion. The author has certainly read the dictionary and a good many other books. In those points where Mr. Johnson is at fault, he has refuted his positions with vigor, and has made good use of the materials at his command. His difficulty in writing was lack of materials. Both the productions are timely; there is need to look into the matter from both sides.

Mr. Scott's book is calculated to confirm both parties in this controversy. 1st. His own party; by presenting the subject in a very plausible light, to such readers as the *Hawkeye* and the *Banner*, who concede that he has exhausted all that *they* ever knew on the subject. 2d. The party opposing him; so far as they are capable of weighing evidence and argument. This, I suppose, is as it should be. "Doth our law judge any man," &c.? "It is not the manner of the Ro-

* A Discourse on Instrumental Music in Public Worship, preached in the First Presbyterian Church of Kossuth, Iowa, by the pastor, Alexander Scott. Burlington, Iowa, 1871.

mans," &c. Here, then, the inquirer has an accredited advocate of the cause—a scholar, a man in earnest too; and yet his fallacies are as expansive, surprising, and impressive, as his learning.

(a) One class of his arguments is exactly parallel, identical with those once familiar to us, on another question; reverberated from learned linguists, eloquent orators, accurate logicians, and profound theologians: It was practiced under the Old Testament exactly as we have it now. Neither Christ nor his apostles prohibited it. They lived in the midst of it. One of them sent home Onesimus. It did not expire with the law of Moses. That good old slaveholder, Abraham. Very good men have always practiced it. It is needed now as much as ever. The opposition to it is very untimely; wholly out of place, as to matter and manner; distracting our devotions; poisoning our politics; dividing the churches; leading to a civil war. It seems designed by the fanatics to set brother against brother, Methodist against Methodist, Baptist against Baptist, Presbyterian versus Presbyterian. The fact is, it belongs to our neighbors to manage as they please; we have no business with it. The majority have a right to do as they choose. Now all this, and much more such, was good theology and better logic, up to the 4th day of July, 1863; but since Grant took Vicksburg there is an end to it—an entire revolution in logic, rhetoric and theology. Mr. Scott ought to know that it is no profit to allow learning to run to waste in such channels.

(b) Some of his positions are *unpresbyterian*. They manifest an undervaluing of the public profession made in common by himself and his opponents. (1) He selects Luther and the Church of England for our models from among the Reformers. We prefer Calvin, and Knox, and Henderson, and Rutherford, and Gillespie, and Ralph Erskine, who loved his fiddle as well as Luther did his lute, but never brought it out of a Sabbath morning. Did Luther ever bring his instrument into the worship? (2) He sets forth the beauty of the German churches (does he know what a German Sabbath is, *after* worship?), where they use instruments, and where all sing besides. Then he touches off with the following, on p. 27: "In Scotland and Ireland, where the people are more given to the cultivation of metaphysics and hair-splitting, than music [dancing and football on the Sabbath], it has been almost entirely excluded from the Presbyterian churches." Do these terms—"metaphysics and hair-splitting"—mean the doctrines of Presbyterianism? the worship? the discipline? or the Sabbath day? Spirit of McCrie! of Symington! of Dr. Cook! (3) Among Presbyterians, he prefers decidedly those who are making innovations; and through his whole book he is urging on us the advantage of helping to INTRODUCE this kind of worship, because it has always belonged to Presbyterianism. (4) He casts in the shade the English dissenters, though not so far as those of the north of Ireland; while he assumes the right to decree ceremonies, and places the power in a congregation, of accepting or rejecting an institution in the worship of God.

(c) Some of our author's positions are *unevangelical*. (1) He finds fault with the Reformers for putting the instruments out of the churches, mistaking them for things belonging to popish idolatry. (2) His argument, if logically carried out, would lead us back to the

altar and the temple. He says Christ recognized the validity of temple worship. True, he was circumcised, and kept the whole law til his death; but never after that did he touch the ceremonies. Even before his death we find him most frequently engaged about the synagogue. Again, the apostles went up to the temple after Christ's ascension. True, but that had nothing to do with what was peculiar to *temple service*. Mr. Scott is scholar enough to know that the original has two words for temple, which in the English are not distinguished -- *ναός* (*naos*), and *ἱερόν* (*hieron*), the former meaning the house, the latter including the chambers and all the courts, and covering all the space used for purposes of religion. These are never confounded. Now it was the veil of the *ναός* that was rent in two from top to bottom, when the Redeemer expired on the cross. Matthew, writing for the Hebrews, Mark, for the Romans, and Luke, in his classic Greek, all use *ναός* in connection with the veil. We know the peculiarity of service belonging to that house, we know its immediate connection with the altar. Into that house Christ never entered, at any time; not even when he was found among the doctors of the law, much less when he healed the blind and dumb, or when he drove out at one time the sheep and oxen, and at another, them that sold and bought. These incidents took place in the *ἱερόν*. It was in the *ἱερόν* that he taught, even when he occupied Solomon's porch. Thither went the Pharisee and the publican. There were enjoyed private devotion, prayer meeting and synagogue preaching. And to the *ἱερόν*, not the *ναός*, went Peter and John, and thousands of others, at the hour of prayer. Each individual went for his own purpose; some to sell doves, and some to purchase. The resort to the *ἱερόν* to preach and to pray had but distant relation to the service of the *ναός*. It might, or it might not recognize it at all, even before the veil was rent. From that hour the *ναός* was worthless. It was "finished." We ask in all earnestness: Did Christ and his apostles, any or all of them, recognize after that, the "validity" of Levitical worship? Does Mr. Scott recognize it now? WE DO NOT. It was good till the Seed came, but is now "weak and beggarly." We prefer the substance to the shadow. Perhaps it is just here that some good writers, scholarly men, seem beclouded. They tell us that the temple-worship was not abolished at once, but was to be gradually worn away. If they would substitute words equivalent to the thoughts of the original, they would brighten their own ideas, and lead others in a smoother path. The service of the *ναός* was abolished in one minute, once and forever, at the rending of the veil. The assemblies in the courts, in the porches, in the chambers, might have been continued or not, as convenience would suggest. The *ἱερόν* might have been to this day a *house of prayer* for all people. Had the Jews believed in Christ it would have been, in a high sense, *the house of prayer* for all nations, though the trumpet had been forever silent and the altar cold. As well there, as any where, could the gospel be preached, prayer offered, and psalms sung without the cymbals. But whether instantly or gradually, priestly worship with its trumpet, Levitical with its harp, are done, and have been for eighteen hundred years. (3) When the apostle

directs us to make melody in the heart, our author attempts to switch off into a sense which includes the strings in the hand as well; and he seems to think there will be some kind of strings away up.

(d) Mr. Scott presents arguments which have little weight with himself. (1) Positions already stated, he never intends to carry to their logical sequences, we hope at least. (2) He urges on us the arguments of Dr. McMaster, Dr. Pressly, and others, for the psalms; and claims that they are equally applicable and cogent for the instruments. The difference has already been shown. Our concern is with his own estimate of these arguments. He claims that the logic "is *equally* applicable to the use of instrumental music." How does our author use that logic? Simply sets it aside; refuses to adhere to the psalms, though he admits that "they were written especially to be used as a book of praise in the public worship of God—at least many of them, if not all." p. 16. Thus he, in repudiating a part of the psalm book, while he belongs to a church which superseded it long since, has set aside arguments equally applicable to him and to us. They say that consistency is a jewel. "Precisely the same arguments," says Mr. Scott. For cause assigned, we retain the psalms, and refuse to INTRODUCE the instruments; *we* show that the argument does not apply; while he denies that there is any difference, and yet makes one. Jerome, Bishop of Jerusalem, said of the argument in Gal. 3 : 16, that it was very bad logic, but it was good enough for the stupid Galatians. There is a spice of humor in Mr. Scott's book, as well as temper. And I repeat, that he is capable of making a more solid argument, if the cause would afford material of a better quality; but any defence of such worship requires just such fallacies as those which he has used.

[To be continued.]

CONDITIONS OF THE CHURCH'S SUCCESS.*

BY REV. H. H. GEORGE.

Numb. 23 : 30. "Let us go up at once, and possess it; for we are well able to overcome it."

THE children of Israel had come to the borders of Canaan, the land which God had given to them by covenant made with Abraham. The question of occupation was before them, spies had been sent up to search the land, and they had returned, bearing a sample of the fruit that grew there. Their testimony was, that it was a goodly land and desirable, and pointing to the Eshcol grapes they said, "This is the fruit of it."

But there was an obstacle in the way of their possession. The land was already occupied by another people. "Nevertheless the people be strong that dwell in the land, and the cities are walled, and very great: and moreover we saw the children of Anak there." "The land through which we have gone to search it, is a land that eateth up the inhabitants thereof; and all the people that we saw in it are men of a great

* Preached at the opening of Synod, May 29, 1872, and published by its request.

THE

Reformed Presbyterian and Covenanter.

VOL. X.

OCTOBER, 1872.

No. 10.

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN NEW TESTAMENT WORSHIP.

(Continued from page 264.)

BY REV. R. HUTCHESON.

III. We come now to inquire what is the theological use of these ceremonial instruments? As shadows, what do they represent? It would be ill for the church if godly people in their spiritual exercises were as far in the dark on these questions as theologians seem to be in discussing them. The martyr exclamation is well known—"O, for a well tuned harp!" We hear in the social meeting, at the family altar, and in the pulpit, the petition, "Tune our hearts for thy praise." Well that's the whole of it. "My lips shall utter praise when thou hast taught me thy statutes." That these godly people from time immemorial have the scriptural view of the matter, will appear from the following illustrations:

I. In general terms they represent *grace in the heart*. We arrive at this by two separate connections.

(a) The instruments bear the same relation to praise that incense does to prayer. Rev. 5: 8, "Having every one of them harps, and golden cups full of odors, which are the prayers of saints." This establishes the relation of the sign and the thing signified; and receives illustration from other passages. Ps. 141: 2, "Let my prayer be set before thee as incense." We learn how this is done, Rev. 8: 3, "And there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints, upon the golden altar which was before the throne." The incense, like the sacrifice, was burned with fire from heaven; no prayers, but such as come from hearts kindled with like fire, can ascend with his intercession. "I will *pray* with the spirit, and I will *pray* with the understanding." Also, "I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding." As the one so the other; both requiring of necessity the grace of the Spirit.

(b) We have a double record of the gospel rule for singing praise, Eph. 5: 19, and Col. 3: 16; but what is in one of these called "playing on the chords in the heart to the Lord," is in the other, "with grace in your hearts to the Lord." From this we infer that playing on the chords is stirring up the graces that are already there; for,

2. These instruments deal with *the deepest moving of the affections*. In Isa. 15th and 16th chapters we have all the workings of pity, even to hopeless commiseration, winding up with this, "Wherefore my bowels shall sound like an harp for Moab, and thine inward parts for Kir-hareh," chap. 16 : 11. Parallel passages we have in Jer. 4 : 19, "My bowels, my bowels ! I am pained at my very heart ; my heart maketh a noise in me ; I cannot hold my peace, because thou hast heard, O my soul, the sound of the trumpet, the alarm of war." Chapter 48 : 36, "Mine heart shall sound for Moab like pipes, and mine heart shall sound like pipes for the men of Kir-heres." Is. 63 : 15, "The sounding of thy bowels and thy mercies toward me, are they restrained?" Compare verse 9. When Job would set forth the hold he once had in the affections of his people, he says, chapter 17, 5, "Aforetime I was as a tabret." Compare chapter 29. So Jer. 31 : 4, "Thou shalt again be adorned with thy tabrets, and shalt go forth in the dances of them that make merry." In the deep feeling of a whole nation, we have Miriam taking a timbrel, Ex. 15 : 2, with like scenery, if not the same, Ps. 68 : 25, "The singers, the players, the damsels with timbrels." They are associated with feelings both joyful and mournful. They combine the deepest mixture of sorrow and joy. Such would have been Laban's, according to the custom of his country, had he actually sent away Jacob, as he might have done, (Gen. 31 : 27) "with mirth and with songs, with tabret and with harp." Like combination we have in Ezra 3 : 10-13, and Neh. 8 : 9-12. The change of feeling too is sometimes very sudden, as in the case of Jephtha's daughter, who "came out to meet him with timbrels and with dances ; and she was his only child." So likewise, Job 30 : 31, "My harp is turned to mourning, and my organ into the voice of them that weep." This is illustrated in David's first attempt to bring up the ark, 1 Chron. 13 : 8, where they "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." Compare verses 11-13. In one hour is Babylon made desolate, Rev. 18 : 17-23, "the voice of harpers and musicians, and of pipers and trumpeters, shall be heard no more at all in thee." Even the same sound and the same sentiment, will rejoice one, and grieve another at the same time ; as in 1 Sam. 18 : 6, when they came out to meet King Saul, with tabrets, with joy, and with instruments of music. Compare verses 8, 9. Instruments play a large part in that scene of deepest contrasts, the most sublime, as it is the last, that this world shall ever witness ; when every eye shall see Him, and all nations shall wail because of Him. Ps. 96 : 9-13, and 98 : 6-9, "Sing unto the Lord with the harp ; with the harp, and the voice of a psalm ; with trumpets, and sound of cornet ; before the Lord ; for he cometh, for he cometh to judge the earth." In thus dealing with the deepest moving of the affections, they are well adapted to illustrate grace in the heart. Those not acquainted personally with grace in this aspect, should read the treatise of Jonathan Edwards "On the Affections."

3. They happily illustrate the *countless variety* of spiritual experience. The whole man is affected and each emotion with number-

less degrees, and countless imperfections. Paul tells us, 1 Cor. 14: 10, "There are so many kinds of *sounds* in the world, and none of them is without signification." Compare verse 7. Perhaps no sounds are so easily interpreted as those of music. Then to think of their number and variety. And who can count the tones and semi-tones of grace; from Bunyan's Mr. Fearing, always playing on the bass, up through tenor, alto and treble, till we see Paul ready to be offered, and feel that glow from the face of Stephen, when they saw it "as it had been the face of an angel." Look at the mathematics of sounds. There are about 20 instruments named in the Scripture. Suppose we have now but 4 times as many, these added to those make 100; some of ours may identify with theirs, but all are new modeled. Allow 4 degrees of excellence in the manufacture; 5 degrees of dexterity in the players—not one-tenth of the reality; difference in the circumstance of place, 5; of time, 4; of atmosphere, 6; variety in the length of notes, 16; "time" to which they are regulated, 4; pitch, 4; notes in the scale of six octaves, 50; to say nothing of other modulations. These multiplied together make three billions of sounds, capable of combinations and permutations more than sufficient to number all the particles of sand that would balance this globe. How well adapted are these to the variety of the graces, and of their degrees in spiritual experience! The harp of a thousand strings is but approximation.

4. These gracious feelings are generally pleasurable—pleasing and being pleased. It is not needful to dwell on the pleasurable sensation of music, either in nature or in revelation—read the Book of Psalms.

It is true that godly sorrow is *real* sorrow; the harp has a solemn sound—"playing on the bass." The bass is a veritable basis for something higher. The believer too has his griefs, his disappointments, his "songs in the night;" and to all of these the harp will respond in perfection. The power vastly predominating is joy, and in its culmination, joy without mixture—triumph perfect, immeasurable, eternal. In the conflict with the Assyrian, he will not cast away his tabret or his harp, though he fight in battles of shaking, Is. 30: 32. He never, like Babylon, already referred to, or Tyrus, Ezk. 26: 13, loses his harp entirely, though sometimes he is unable to use it. Does he break or burn it in such a case? No, he hangs it on the weeping willow—keeps it still in sight. The poets say there is a joy of grief. We know there is a joy that follows it, "weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning." See, *inter alia*, Hab. 3: 18; Is. 38: 20, and 51: 3, "He will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden (paradise) of the Lord; joy and gladness shall be found therein, thanksgiving and the voice of melody." There they will have the "harp of God." But,

5. They represent all this happy combination of graces in the heart, as *something that has been put there*. Ps. 4: 7, "Thou hast put gladness in my heart." The voice of the lips is our natural instrumentality for praise; Adam perhaps, needed no other, but it is broken; nature is a cracked bell, or something worse, it can not be mended—must be

new-made. "Ye must be born again." The Ethiopian treasurer, when born of water and of the Spirit, went on his way rejoicing; gladness was put into his heart. Spiritual joy is not natural, but artificial, neither is it unnatural; it fits the place, it is supernatural; restoring us to what we were at the beginning, and with this happy advantage, it can never be lost. Is. 35: 10. Ezk. 28: 13, "The workmanship of the tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee, in the day that thou wast created." There is mystery in this whole passage—textual difficulty of no ordinary breadth. Some suppose that Ithobal, the Tyrian monarch, is the personage here described; but he seems to be rather "the prince," of the first ten verses of the chapter, when the scene changes to "the king" of the same territory; true, the prince made high enough pretensions, but they are not conceded to him as they are to the king. Others, from the mention of Eden, would have this to be Adam, but it is difficult to see how he could be king in the city of purple. No doubt *Old Adam* had a good deal to say in its government. Dr. Lowth, quoted by Scott on the passage, says that this is an exact description of the devil in his falling from heaven. We can see a relation here. Satan was king of Tyrus at the time, and has ruled many a state since, as certainly as ever he martialled the "locusts" in Rev. 9: 11. The chapter recognizes a consolidation of the city, its prince, and its king, while it denounces all of them together. We have looked into Tyrus already as a city of music, as well as of commerce. Ezek. 26. Whether these terms apply to Ithobal, to Adam, or to Abaddon, it is about equally pertinent to our purpose; Apollyon suits us rather best—Lucifer, son of the morning. The "morning stars" *once sang together*; the workmanship of his tabrets and his pipes was prepared in him, in the day that he was created. Apply this to the believer, Eph. 2: 10, "We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus." Gal. 6: 15, "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but a new creation." This new creation is unto good works; faith which worketh—worketh by love; thy laws are my song. From that hour they have the harps of God; they sing the song of Moses from the two tables—from both their sides; they sing the song of the Lamb, that no others ever can learn—that they could learn in no other way. All within is turned to harmony by, and with, the musical instruments of God. An English writer—Wm. Arthur, in his "*Tongue of Fire*," illustrating the power of preaching, and pressing home the necessity of a large measure of spirituality, in order to secure efficiency, uses the following simile: "An organ filled with the ordinary degree of air which exists everywhere, is dumb; the touch of the player can elicit but the click of the keys. Throw in, not other air, but an unsteady current of the same, and sweet, but imperfect and uncertain, notes respond to the touch. Increase the current to a full supply, and every pipe swells with music. Such is the soul—and such are the changes which pass upon it, when it receives the Spirit, 'when it is filled with the Holy Ghost.'"

We are now ready to hear Bunyan at length. "Some must pipe, and some must weep. Mr. Fearing was one that played upon the bass; he and his friends sound the sackbut, whose notes are more

doleful than those of other instruments. Some indeed say the bass is the ground of all music, and for my part, I care not for that profession which begins not in heaviness of mind. The first string that the musician usually touches, when he intends to put all in tune, is the bass. God also plays on this string first, when he sets the soul in tune for himself. Only this was the imperfection of Mr. Fearing, he could play no other music but this, *till towards his latter end.*" Ps. 57 : 7, 8, "My heart is prepared,* O God, my heart is prepared; I will sing and give praise. Awake up, my glory (my speech, tongue, Acts 2 : 26) awake psaltery and harp"—natural voice, nature sanctified, and all the gracious affections at once.

6. Lastly. The illusions to those instruments so frequent in the Psalms, is calculated to carry our minds forward, and our hearts upward to *the glory of heaven*—the inheritance of the saints in light. For sublimity, nothing of physical agency will compare with music; and music is only complete when voices and instruments combine, Ezek. 33 : 32. Light has its own kind of sublimity, and is abundantly used in the metaphors of grace; it had its seven lamps in the tabernacle. Light presents its objects at a distance, but music carries us away. I am no enthusiast for music, rather slow in appreciating its interest, yet I may say freely, if I were *inventing* a system of worship, I would probably put in the band for a part of the play. Who does not love the human voice in a well-trained congregation, whether in a cathedral, or on the "hill side," as I have heard it more than once. I love to hear the band on the 4th of July, or the 12th. I have never been to the theatre, but I have heard the musicians on St. John's day, and that is bad enough. The union of voice and instrument together, will break in on my studies any hour of the day. I would have it in the worship if I were master of the ceremonies, but as the case stands, serving another master, the very Singer of Israel, who knows our whole "frame;" I would be Hiel, the Beth-elite, and rebuild Jericho; Saul, the Benjamite, and offer sacrifice; Uzziah, the presumptuous, and burn incense; anything short of Iscariot, rather than lead the church backward to that which is abolished; back from the simple, effective, unostentatious services of that altar whereof they have no right to eat, who serve the tabernacle; and where the sacrifice of praise to God continually is **THE FRUIT OF THE LIPS**, giving thanks to his name.

There is a point yet to be discussed—the *philosophy* of instruments in worship. What are the disadvantages attending them? Had they the same disadvantage of old? If so, why were they ever allowed? This is not essential to the argument, but is worth consideration. I would, as I presume many readers would, be glad to have something on these questions, from some one better acquainted with the practical working of the machinery, than the writer.

* Margin.—By the way, this verse is worth reading in the Septuagint. "I will sing, and ψάλω (*psalo*)" future tense. The same term in the present participle occurs in Eph. 5 : 19.