

truth in course of illustration; for we find that the use of a liturgy, read prayers, with genuflections, and standing during praise, are either in actual practice or in active agitation among several of those congregations that are in favour of the Organ.

We are told that the use of the Organ in singing has a solemnizing and elevating effect upon the worshippers, and that there is nothing in God's Word forbidding it. I entertain no such opinion; for if we admit the first part of the proposition, we must, as a natural consequence, admit its corollary—that musicians are the holiest of mundane creatures, and that there must be a larger amount of spiritual-mindedness, of earnest piety, in the Roman Catholic and Episcopal Churches, than in any other. I am not prepared to admit this, for I believe that in no portion of the Christian Church has there, at any time, been a larger measure of faith, of real practical holiness of heart and life, than was among the Puritan Fathers of England and the followers of John Knox in Scotland, among whom instrumental music, as a part of public worship, was unknown.

What reason have we to be dissatisfied with the pure and simple form of our present mode of public worship? We know of none which combines so fully the spiritual and intellectual. It excludes, and I trust will continue to exclude, the merely sensuous, which, in other Churches, overlays more or less, and, in some, all but chokes every vestige of spiritual life.

Jewish ritualism has been quoted as an authority in favour of Organs. It is true, music was much cultivated among the Jews, and both David and Solomon had their singing and dancing men and women in great numbers; they had also the blare of the trumpet, the beating of timbrels, besides the playing of stringed instruments in Temple worship. Now if one part of this form of worship is right at the present day, another cannot be wrong. But, in truth, the whole machinery of this merely ceremonial worship perished with the Old Dispensation, and there is not a shred of authority in the New Testament, or in the history of the primitive Church, in support of either its principles or practice in our Churches.

It may be said that this is one of the non-essentials—it is not necessarily an article of faith, and may be safely left to the taste and wishes of our people. I reply, that it is calculated to destroy uniformity of worship, to introduce confusion, to weaken discipline, and undermine the very spirit of Presbyterianism. It is the beginning of further dangerous innovations, which may end no one knows where, but which have led the Church of England as far as Puseyism, and have left Christianity little more than an imposing ceremonial in the Church of Rome.

I trust and believe that the great body of Presbyterians, both in Scotland and the Co-

lonies, are altogether adverse to this Organ movement, and are convinced that its general success would be one of the greatest calamities that ever happened to our Church, inasmuch as it would alienate from it forever the great heart of our people. For my own part, I should prefer, a thousand times, to join a Church in which instrumental music has at least the authority of some centuries in its favour, rather than accept a hybrid worship which, while it would not be Presbyterianism, neither would it be anything else. And above all, I do not think that the House of God is the place to which people should desire to flock merely because they hope to enjoy there the gratification of hearing fine music. I know that in some Churches this is largely the case, and the fruit is not all that might be desired.

I am, dear sir,

Yours, respectfully,

JOHN COSTLEY.

Pictou, Feb. 14, 1865.

THE ORGAN IN PARISH CHURCHES.

To the Editor of the Glasgow Herald:

SIR,—A circular was sent to me last week respecting the erection of an organ at the New Church of Ayr. I do not know who are members of the committee from which the circular came, but I take leave to state that, in my opinion, they, and others in different parts of the country, who are pursuing a course similar to theirs, are acting at variance with the fundamental principles of our Presbyterian Church. In an Independent or Congregationalist Church, a minister and his congregation may make what arrangements they think right or expedient for the management of their affairs, or the conducting of public worship. But it is not so with us. We are a collective body, with a system or order of worship prescribed to us. Each particular Church, with its minister and session, is under the superintendence and control of the Presbytery of the bounds, and each Presbytery, in like manner, is under the control of the superior Church Courts. It does not belong, therefore, to a particular minister, even with his kirk-session and his people, to make alterations on the established worship of God, however suitable or desirable he and they may consider these alterations to be. Changes can be made only by competent authority. Ministers, at their ordination, come under solemn obligation "to assert, maintain, and defend . . . the purity of worship, as presently practised in the National Church, and asserted in Act 15, Assembly 1707, entitled 'Act against Innovations in the Worship of God;' and further, to submit themselves willingly and humbly in the spirit of meekness to the admonitions of the brethren, . . . and to follow no deviate courses from the present established doctrine, worship, discipline and government in this Church."

I am aware that the terms in which the last General Assembly expressed its deliverance on the report, anent Innovations, have been urged as authorising the attempt which is now being made for having an organ employed in the worship of God; that deliverance seeming to imply that such innovations as do not interrupt the harmony of particular congregations, will not be objected to. But this appears to me to be an entire misapprehension of the General Assembly's