

British American Presbyterian.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AT
TORONTO, CANADA.TERMS: \$1 a year, in advance.
Postage by mail, \$1.00 per year, payable at the
office of delivery.Clergical and Post Office notices should be drawn
in favor of the Publisher.Club Rates and List of Freeholders furnished on
application. All who are desirous to aid in extend-
ing the circulation of the PRESBYTERIAN should
send for the List of Freeholders at once, as now is
the time to secure new names.Address
O. BLACKETT ROBINSON,
P.O. Drawer 2484 Publisher and Proprietor."Sabbath School Presbyterian,"
PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
AT 103 BAY STREET, TORONTO.

TERMS: 20 cents per annum, in quantities.

Subscriptions may commence at any time,
and are payable strictly in advance.The numbers for March and April are
now before us, and wear a neat and attractive ap-
pearance, especially the April issue. A comparison
of these two shows decided progress, the article in
the latter being shorter, plainer, and more readable
for children than in the former. The paper is clean,
and both printing and illustrations are well ex-
ecuted.—*The Liberator*, 6th April.The paper is good, and supplies a great desider-
atum among the young. It should certainly meet
with a wide circulation.—*Rev. Wm. Ross, Kirkcaldy*.

Specimen copies will be sent to any address.

O. BLACKETT ROBINSON,
P.O. Drawer 2484, Toronto, Ont.

British American Presbyterian.

FRIDAY, APRIL 16, 1875.

RITUALISM AND INSTRUMENTAL
MUSIC.

The lecture delivered by the Rev. Pro-
fessor McLaren at the close of Knox Col-
lege, was devoted mainly to a discussion of
Ritualism and the lawfulness of Instru-
mental Music in the worship of God. We do
not propose to give a full account of the
lecture as our readers have ample oppor-
tunity of reading it, and many who have
perused it have doubtless already formed
their opinions concerning the positions
taken by the Professor.

That the questions discussed are promi-
nent at the present time all will acknow-
ledge. The latter in the Presbyterian
Churches may now be regarded as decided,
so far at least as the permission to use
organs when there is harmony in the congre-
gation is concerned. There still remains,
however, in many places the prospects of
discussion and even of something worse,
as soon as the proposal is made to intro-
duce the innovation. The principles so
clearly laid down by Mr. McLaren may be
useful in the removal of prejudice, and in
producing intelligent conviction on the sub-
ject, as well as Christian tolerations of
brethren who differ in a matter not essen-
tial, but circumstantial to the worship of
God. The number of organs in the church
is increasing every year, and although
many of our congregations have not yet
had the matter even mooted, no one can
tell how soon in our remoter districts the
question may come up. It is a noticeable
fact, that while in Toronto not a congrega-
tion of the Canada Presbyterian Church,
though they now number eight, has an or-
gan, the only one of four in Hamilton
without it is McNab Street, and in Lon-
don, Kingston, Montreal, Ottawa, and the
towns, opinion is much divided. In the
branch of the church connected with the
Church of Scotland, the use of organs is
even more common. If this movement is
wrong, and instrumental music is a viola-
tion of the second commandment, this
should be clearly shown, and the church
should at all hazards root out the sin. If,
on the other hand it is not unlawful, but
allowable on Scriptural grounds, it is well
that this be clearly set forth, so that the in-
troductions and use of organs may not do
violence to the conscience of the Church.

In the lecture to which we refer, the
learned Professor contends for the distin-
guishing tenet of Reformed Churches, viz.,
that nothing is to be used in the worship of
God which cannot be shown to have the
sanctions of Scripture. At the same time,
he holds that we do not require to produce
a divine warrant for every *entail* of wor-
ship, but that "there are some circum-
stances concerning the worship of God . . .
common to human actions and so-
cieties, which are to be ordered by the
light of nature and Christian prejudice ac-
cording to the general rules of the word,
which are always to be observed." On this
ground "the use of an organ in public wor-
ship" is to be regarded "as only a *circum-
stantial variation* in the manner of singing
God's praises in the sanctuary."

With all due respect for those who differ
from this opinion, we think it is the right
one. Worship can be predicated only of
intelligent beings. Organs do not worship.
Man may worship God with heart praise,
without words or music, with verbal praise,

without song or melody, with verbal praise
in melodious song, with one voice or in
choir, or with heart, words and song, ac-
companied by instruments. The worship
is the act of intelligence, the words, the
melody, the instruments, are only *circum-
stances* of worship, which are, and must be,
ordered by a variety of considerations in
the light of nature and Christian prejudice.
While the argument is defective that infers
the lawfulness of instrumental music in the
New Testament Church from its having
been sanctioned under the Old Testament,
in as much as many other things now con-
sidered absolute, such as sacrifice, would
thus be lawful. Still, it is equally faulty to
say that instrumental music is absolute,
because it was part of the Mosaic ritual.
Instrumental music was used in God's wor-
ship before the time of Moses, and approved
of by God; it was not appointed by Moses
as part of the ritual, and the singing and
playing of a later time were not of Moses
and Sinai, but of David and the temple.
An organ is not "a separate item or thing
in the service of the sanctuary, a substan-
tial addition to what God has commanded,"
it is merely one of many circumstances con-
nected with a divinely appointed act of
worship, the service of praise.

In Scripture instrumental music is not
spoken of "as something distinct from the
singing of God's praise, but merely as a
mode in which that service is rendered."
No one objects to change of mode in other
respects, for example, to the change from
the Jewish chanting of a whole psalm with
mere melody, to our modern singing of a
part of a psalm with four parts in harmony;
why then object to change in the respect in
question? It is to be observed that this
argument in no way countenances the
abuse of organs, where *unmeaning* volun-
taries and fine pieces are performed,
whether under the plea of attracting an au-
dience and pleasing their musical taste, or
rendering homage to God by making sweet
sounds apart from heart praise.

Of the expediency of introducing organs
into Presbyterian Churches, the Professor
said:—

"We had not felt called upon to discuss
the expediency of employing such aids as
instruments of music in the services of
praise. All things that are lawful are not
expedient. And while I have not hesitated
to express a very definite opinion that
their use is lawful, I do not envy the spirit
of the man who for such an unessential aid
will distract the peace of a congregation or
of the Church at large. We should never
use our liberty as a cloak of maliciousness.
And we do not hesitate to express the con-
viction that where the human voice is pro-
perly trained and heartily employed in the
praise of God, no other aids are required.
I have listened, I trust not without some
measure of appreciation, to the majestic
and solemn swell of noble organs pealing
through the resounding aisles of cathedrals,
but I have never heard any music which
had such power over my heart and mind
as that which rose from a whole congrega-
tion under the fresh baptism of the Spirit,
when they lifted up their voices in one
burst of praise which flowed from lips
touched as with a live coal from the altar."

We have left ourselves little room to
speak of ritualism as treated of in the Lec-
ture. The principle of the Reformed
Church already referred to is direct opposi-
tion to that which is found in the 20th
Article of the church of England: "the
Church hath power to decree rites and
ceremonies, and authority in controversies
of faith."

This latter principle lies at the root of
ritualism, and so long as it is held, it will
be impossible to shut the door against the
inroads of Popish superstitions. That it is
unprotestant in its character is evident
from the following facts:—

"This clause was not in the Article as
drawn up by the reforming divines of 1562.
It is well known that it did not express
their sentiments. 'It occurs neither in the
first printed edition of the Articles, nor
in the draft of them which was passed by
Convocation, which is still in existence with
the autograph signature of the members.'
It is not found in two editions published by
Bishop Jewel in 1571. It is now regarded
as almost certain that this clause was
forced into the articles of religion by Eliza-
beth herself, or by her direction. And it
is well known that Elizabeth's Protestan-
tism was much more political than religi-
ous."

The ritualistic movement is essentially
Popish. The zeal of that party and its
increasing popularity and boldness are in-
timately connected with the doctrines
which are held in them in common with
the Church of Rome, and the revival of Ul-
tramontanism at the present time. "All
their Romish displays and ceremonies are
the natural and necessary outgrowth of the
doctrinal system they have embraced. This
system, which they delight to call Catholi-
cism, but which the world recognizes as Ro-
manism under a gauze veil, has animated
them with an intense hatred to Protestan-
tism which they now no longer conceal."

"These may to many Christians appear
to be matters of small moment, and the
power claimed by the Church, to 'decree
votes and ceremonies,' when these are
thought to be edifying on account of their
symbolic import may appear a small mat-
ter, nevertheless to adopt that principle, is
to open the switch that puts the church on the
wrong track, and with corrupt human na-
ture as the moving power, and the God of

this world as the inspiring guide, there is
no doubt whether that track will lead—
down to the abysses of slavish superstition
and bondage to wicked men. To shun
these dangers we must eschew ritualism
with its practices and doctrines. And "the
only real safeguard against Ritualism is the
principle recognized by our standards as
taught in this commandment, that God is
not to be worshipped in any way not ap-
pointed in His Word. The simple principle
that nothing in doctrine, worship, disci-
pline, or government is to be introduced
for which a Divine warrant cannot be
found in the Holy Scripture, brings the
Church back at once to the purity and
simplicity of Primitive Christianity. It
drives out of the Church of the living God,
all rite, ceremonies, vestments, and holy
days of man's invention, as Christ drove
the cattle dealers out of the temple of the
Lord, and it not only drives them out but
keeps them out by fastening upon the con-
science of the Church, the simplicity of
New Testament worship and order as of
divine authority."

IS GOD KING AMONG MEN?

Strange question, it may seem, to ask in
a Christian country, yet one which current
events are forcing upon us, and upon the
practical answer to which will depend, in a
large measure, the future weal or woe of
both European and American nations. Will
kings be wise and kiss the Son, and serve
Jehovah; or breaking their bands asunder,
and casting their cords from them, will they
rage, imagine a vain thing, bring down
God's wrath, and feel the crushing power
of the King who is anointed and set on Zion
hill; whose rod of iron shall break and
dash His enemies in pieces as a potter's
shred? This is the question now pending
as between the God of Heaven and men.
A false science is setting aside God's law by
denying a God who can interfere with men,
or make known His will. A false philoso-
phy is setting up expediency and utilitari-
anism as the only standard of right, and
thus setting aside the moral law. A false
Church is clothing a man at Rome with
the power and attributes of God, and mak-
ing his will supersede the revealed will of
God. A false political economy is making
the people God, and putting the plebeian
above the higher law, declaring for democ-
racy, and denying the monarchy of Jeho-
vah. A false theology is magnifying God's
fatherhood, so as to obscure and virtually
do away with the rectoral or kingly majesty
of God.

The range of the question is wide; it
touches men in every relation of life. More
than ever it becomes Christians not to be
ashamed, but to proclaim their faith in the
Bible as the revealed will of God—the au-
thoritative code of laws, which bind men in
every relation of life to obedience, and
which presents the only safeguard against
lawlessness and tyranny of men. "The
Lord is our judge, the Lord is our law-
giver, the Lord is our King; He will save
us."

Is God our King? Or is that idea of
God's monarchy an exploded one; an idea
which belonged to an age of despotism, but
is incongruous with the nineteenth century
idea of liberty? Can man be free and yet
own God as King; or must he refuse sub-
mission to God as well as man, in order to
be truly free? It is easy to answer that
question by Scripture, "Ye are bought with
a price, be not ye the servants of men." Christ
makes us free from men, only, how-
ever, to make us his *servants*. Christ is a
King, and has a king's law, a law, a govern-
ment—properly so called—which does not
rest on the choice of 'e subject, but was
given Him by God, "and He shall reign
until all His enemies are put under His
feet." New Testament, as well as Old
Testament Scripture, is clear on this point;
and it is only by asserting that the New
Testament has been superseded, as well the
Old, that our theologians of the democratic
school come to the conclusion that, now
the only Government is "Government by
the people and for the people, even as be-
fore His Maker, man has rights. . . .
We honour God more in saying that He,
too, conforms to eternal justice and right,
than in putting Him outside of them. The
figure of a King represents Him far less
worthily than that of a Father."

We are just old-fashioned enough to be-
lieve that all things are for God, and that
man's chief end is God's glory, even before
his own enjoyment; that, although no
despot, arbitrarily, capriciously, tyranni-
cally, and heartlessly doing His will—God
is our *despot*, who, for His own best rea-
son, wisely, lovingly, and justly does
His will in heaven and in earth, and rules
over man according to the counsel of His
own will, without waiting to know whether
man consents or not. God is supreme, and
he is sovereign, the King eternal, immor-
tal and invisible.

Gradually Christianity has done its work
of enfranchisement. Before its require-
ments of love and elevating forces, slavery
disappeared in Rome, Greece, Northern Eu-
rope, America, and men became free. The
despotism of the earlier ages gradually be-
came impossible, both in State and Church.

Fundamental has given place to all but univer-
sal suffrage; and enlightened opinion has
thrown off the spiritual slavery of Rome.
These things are the necessary results of
Scripture teaching, the consequences of men
obeying the law of God; these are the com-
ing of the Kingdom of God. How absurd,
then, to suppose that Christianity can de-
pose her King, or continue to exist and
bless mankind by rejecting the very author-
ity that has made her what she is. A Dem-
ocracy that refuses to bow to Christ as
King, and acknowledges no law but that
which human reason and the assent of
man's moral nature declare to be law, and
which the people approve, without regard
to God's revealed will, has in its very fun-
damental principles the elements of dissolu-
tion, and will end inevitably in revolution
and anarchy. God's law alone can save
the nations and conserve His Church.

Is God our King? Then we have a code
of laws before which the Church must bow.
The Church of Rome holds to the monarch-
ical idea. She is no Democrat, although
at the present time willing to make Democ-
racy her tool in once more grasping at
universal dominion. But the Kingdom of
God, in the Ultramontane sense, is of this
world. It has a visible king—the Pope;
temporal possessions—a metropolis, Peter's
patrimony, and the Holy City; a Curia, and
political representatives—in fact, every-
thing that a kingdom of this world possesses.
And according to Dr. Newman, the nations
of the earth ought to recognize the exist-
ence of this visible kingdom, and the rights
of this king to universal submission. The
Roman Catholic Church claims to be God's
representative on earth, and to be the
Kingdom of Christ, to which other king-
doms must submit. If, then, the Pope is
King, God and Christ are not. But if
Christ is King, the Bible is above the Pope.
Our only hope, in view of the arrogant
claims of Rome, is to contend to the death
for the supremacy of God, by His Word
ruling among men. It is well to be pre-
pared. In the coming conflict, the true
issue will be ignored by many, and denied
by more. The question at bottom, as be-
tween Rome and Protestant Christendom is,
who is King? Is it God, or the Pope?
Shall the Pope be authoritatively judged by
God's Word; or shall God's Word be with-
held from mankind, interpreted, wrested,
changed, or added to, as the exigencies of
Popery require? Shall men obey the God
of Heaven, speaking in His Word; or a
man at Rome, speaking by rescripts and
Bulls? Let the question be plainly stated,
and the answer is easy. God has not abdi-
cated His throne in favour of Pius IX., or
given up to him His sceptre.

Once more—Is God King? Yes. Then
the Kingdom is a present reality. Not-
withstanding that hundreds of millions are
in rebellion, God reigns. *Even now* He
reigns, and "must reign till He hath put
all enemies under His feet." Instead, then,
of waiting for some fresh manifestation of
power and visible enthronement of the Ro-
deemer in Jerusalem, we are to labour as
willing, loyal subjects for the advancement
of the Kingdom that is "among us" to la-
bour to have God as our King acknowledged
by Church and State, in theology,
science and philosophy. In individual con-
duct, and in the united assemblies of men,
God is King—no matter who denies it.

BOOK REVIEWS.

"WHAT IS THE SCRIPTURAL MODE OF
BAPTISM? By the Rev. John McTavish,
Woodstock.

We have pleasure in calling attention to
this tract of eight pages by an esteemed
minister of our Church. Mr. McTavish
takes the true ground when he says that
"to know the Scriptural mode of Baptism,
we must examine not human writings, hea-
then or Christian, but the Word of God.
Thence follows an examination of the prin-
ciple terms and passages which go to deter-
mine the mode of administering baptism.
It is shown that the proposition 'eis' and
'ek' do not necessarily mean *into* and *out-
of*, but quite frequently to or towards and
from; and hence that no argument for im-
mersion can be drawn from their employ-
ment in connection with cases of baptism
recorded in the New Testament. The
terms *baptism* and *baptize* are then enquir-
ed into, and it is found that in several in-
stances in which they are used, *immersion*
is out of the question. Mr. McTavish says,
and we think correctly, that the typical
meaning of baptism is not so distinctly seen
in putting the whole body under water, as
in sprinkling or affusion; and whilst no ar-
gument of this kind would avail in opposi-
tion to the plain teachings of Scripture, it is
entitled to much weight in view of what has
been already established regarding the lan-
guage which the Scriptures employ. We
are glad that Mr. McTavish has seen fit to
lift his vigorous pen upon this subject,
and we hope that he may find time to
fill up and complete the sketch which is
here given. Our Baptist friends surely ex-
aggerate the importance to be attached to
the mode of baptism; nevertheless it is
altogether right that on this, as on all other
matters to be determined by Scripture, our
people should be intelligently satisfied re-
garding the grounds of their belief and
practice.—W. O.

Dr. JOHN HENRY NEWMAN'S LETTER TO MR.
GLADSTONE'S PARLIAMENT. Price 20 cents.
Toronto: A. S. Irving & Co., publishers.
1875.

We thank Messrs. Irving & Co. for this
Canadian edition of what Mr. Gladstone
considers the most important reply that has
appeared to the original Expostulation.
The pamphlet is worthy of the great leader
in the Tractarian movement of thirty years
ago, and will repay careful perusal. We
see the sincere seeker for safety for the
Church of Christ, who in his historical re-
searches, was forced by conviction to find
in the Church of Rome the only Church,
and in the Pope its legitimate Head, throw-
ing his whole brilliant powers into her de-
fence against the assault made on her by
England's first living statesman. One can-
not but admire the honesty of the man and
the subtlety of the logician, while one is
pained by the evasiveness of the argument,
and keenly feels the abjectness of a great
mind prostrating itself before a fallible man
as if he were the vicar of God. To Dr.
Newman it is simply duty to renounce all
private opinion when the Pope speaks *ex
cathedra*. His only subterfuges are that
certain sayings may not have been thus
spoken; or may admit of exceptions; or
may be hereafter expienced by the *Schola
Theologicum* not to mean what they evi-
dently now mean, in the mouth alike of
private persons, theologians, and ecclesiast-
ical dignitaries. No better argument or
justification of Mr. Gladstone's Expostula-
tion can be afforded than the humiliating
admissions, evasions, and abjectness of the
prince of Anglo-Roman controversialists.

VATICANISM—AN ANSWER TO REPROOF AND
REPLIES. By the Right Hon. W. E.
Gladstone, M. P. Price 15 cents. Tor-
onto, published by A. S. Irving & Co.
1875.

No fewer than twenty-one principal re-
plies to his Expostulation have been care-
fully read by the author, and this pamphlet
is an answer to everything of consequence
contained in these—and it is an answer.
Mr. Gladstone shows triumphantly that not
only was he justified in issuing his former
tract, but that all the charges against the
Ultramontane system, or Vaticanism, can
be sustained; nay, that the truth is even
more damning than the first statement.
Carefully guarding himself from the imputa-
tion of hostility to Roman Catholics as
men or fellow-citizens, he speaks of them
generously and kindly, but at the same time
with unsparing hand lays bare the deep
plots and evil designs of Popery. It is
made appear clear as day, that if a Roman
Catholic is loyal at present, he is so through
fear, and not from conscience; that the
civil allegiance due to princes, is only to
legitimate princes, which Protestants can-
not be; that the deposing power is claimed
as belonging to the Pope by Divine gift,
and may be put in exercise, even with
violence; and that under the Jesuit influence
of the Curia efforts are being made in all
countries to bring about such a combina-
tion as will secure the restoration of the
temporal power to the Pope, even though
revolution and bloodshed be required for
this end. Every Protestant who feels an
interest in the coming conflict between
Rome and Protestant nations will do well
carefully to peruse this pamphlet.

THE POLAR AND TROPICAL WORLDS. By
Dr. G. Hartwig. Guelph, W. J. Lyon.

This is an exceedingly interesting and
useful book, which we can heartily re-
commend to our readers. Every parent
should subscribe for a copy. Placed in the
hands of the young, it will help to create
and foster a taste for a better class of
reading, than is to be found in too many
of the books and periodicals of the present
day. The type, paper, and illustrations,
are all that could be desired. The book
is only sold by subscription; and Messrs.
Ballantyne and Campbell are now canvass-
ing the city.

The Malcolm Fund.

EDITOR BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.
DEAR SIR,—In re "The Malcolm Fund,"
I beg to inform the subscribers to this
fund, that in terms of my circular the
monies have this day been invested by the
six trustees named therein, through J. E. in
Huron and Erie Savings and Loan Society
Stock, in name of Mrs. Malcolm, "in trust
for herself and children." Twenty-four
shares at thirty per cent. premium
cost \$1560. I had received in addition to
what has been already acknowledged in
your columns, a few small sums, and the
following: from Wolland Port, per Rev. J.
Rennie, \$25; per Rev. Dr. Stewart, Emul-
skillen, \$22; Stanley Street Congregation,
Ayr, \$18.65; friends in Cooke's Church,
Toronto, per R. J. Hunter, \$5; bringing
up the fund with interest to \$1593.44, the
balance of which (\$38.44) I have this day
paid over to Mrs. Malcolm in cash, and
witnessed a declaration (drawn out by me,
addressed to the six trustees of the fund)
that she holds herself only entitled to draw
the dividends on the stock purchased dur-
ing her life, and that the principal is held
equally among the surviving
children of the Rev. James Malcolm at her
death. The stock will yield probably 7 1/2
per cent., if not more, and I congratulate
myself at all friends that as suitable an
investment has been made as possible in
present circumstances. Mrs. Malcolm, who
has found a home in Norwich, joins me
in thanks to all friends who have raised an
income of about \$130 annually for her.
Her trustees and I myself, are now hono-
rably discharged from all further responsi-
bility. I am, Sir, Your obedient servant,
London, Ont., 6th April, 1875. J. BORN.