

British American Presbyterianian.

VOL 1.

TORONTO, CANADA, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1872.

No. 46.

Contributors & Correspondents.

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC.

BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

Dear Sir,—I have a few words to say in reply to the Letters of my friend "Mr. B." and one "J. S." which appeared in your last issue.

Mr. "B." in endeavouring to explain the passage quoted in my last letter viz: Rev. 14, 2, 8, says it proves too much, and asks me to read the passage as if the words *et cetera* were interpolated, arguing I presume that it follows the same reading as in the prior part of the verse where the expression is used "as the voice of a great thunder," and laying down the doctrine that it is not said that either thunder or harps were used.

Now I have read over the passage very carefully and fail to see how Mr. "B." can ask anyone to coincide with him in the views he enunciates, and cannot see why that antithesis he asks for the interpolation I have just mentioned. Were he to carry out his argument what would he make out of the words immediately following "and they sang as it were a new song before the throne." If his argument is worth anything at all and his deductions are correct it would prove that it is not said a new song was sung or even that they sang at all. I still would read the passage as it is. "And I heard a voice from (out of) Heaven as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder (as is the voice of Himself) Chap. 1, 16, such also is the voice of his people) and I heard the voice of Harp's harping on their harps, and they sang as it were a new song before the throne. Now nothing I think can be more simple than this. The Apostle John did hear a noise like many waters, a noise like thunder, he heard the voice of a multitude that no man could number a union of voices of such magnitude and power coming out of Heaven, that to his mind could only be brought within human thought by the analogy he here uses. When, however he comes to speak of the Harp's and their harps, these he feels as home, the sound of these instruments he would be well acquainted with in the temple service, and as their melody sounds riveted in his ear he feels them as one. But not only did St. John hear the harp, he also informs us of the new them. Turn to Rev. 15, 2, and I saw as there was a sea of glass mingled with fire, and them that had gotten the victory over the Beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass having the harp of God, and they sing the song of Moses and the Lamb." I find on looking at Scott's Commentaries on the above passages the following explanation. "The multitude were singing a new song before the throne with a voice loud as that of mighty rushing waters, as that of thunder, yet exquisitely harmonious and accompanied with the music of harps of consummate skill; and the Rev. A. K. Tweiss in one of the latest commentaries published says in reference to the last verse quoted. "The harps are in the hands of those heavenly Virgins (chap. 14, 4) infinitely surpassing the Umbrel of Miriam and the Israelites."

I had expected to hear some explanation of the above passages from such a learned theological writer as "J. S.," but I have been disappointed. Beyond an attempted spiritual smartness, his introductory remarks showed a very flippant style of dealing with such a subject, and a fanciful knowledge which I trust but few presume to think they have obtained. My friend states positively that there will be no harps in heaven. For my part I heard no opinion, but follow my estimate and look to the word of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy Him." I find in the Bible that our Creator introduced Instrumental Music into His own service in the Mosaic dispensation; that this music formed an essential part of every Jewish ceremony, and that in the New Testament in the vision vouchsafed to the Apostle John, each music formed part of the praises of the church triumphant. I find in any typical or figurative symbols in the same, and I would cordially invite my friend J. S. to let us know what it was the type of, or what it represents. Milton very beautifully expresses the idea contained in the above quotation from the Book of Revelation when he says:—

He never had the Almighty seated but
The melody of it with a dome
Loud as from numbers with no number sound
As from ten thousand harps, Heaven rung
With jubilee and loud uttering Alleluia,
The eternal hymn.

This hall serves at all the same purposes of a Library, a Lecture-room, a room for general meetings of the students, and a Public Hall. You see imagine how well it is adapted for these purposes, when I say

that it is just the size and shape of an ordinary-sized drawing-room with folding-doors.

The Library is simply a disagree to the church. There are plenty of old books that nobody reads but the antiquarian, and altogether wanting. There do not appear to have been any books added since this great book-making age began.

There is a Museum. There are some very valuable relics, a good collection of shells, and an inordinate amount of dust.

There is no proper accommodation for reading rooms and all other necessary appliances for a College. There is one room which appears to be comfortable.

The Boarding-house is in a fit place for habitation. The drainage holds its arena clear through every part of the building. It is a great wonder that there is no Typhoid Fever. The rooms are dark and gloomy; and many of them have a stifling smell about them that seems to be the general characteristic of the place.

The connection of every part of the building with the culinary department is so direct that the students are able to decide, beyond a doubt, quite early in the day, whether they are to have *oxtails* or *cabbage* for dinner.

The necessary *eff* of living in such a place for a period of six winters must be very injurious indeed, a life upon the physical, the moral, the aesthetic, and the spiritual condition of the inmates. I do not see how a student can ever come through such a training with any good taste or keen sensitivities to what is elevating or degrading to the nature left in him.

And yet we look to the College as the place where the fire is to be put into our young men, where they are to be made enthusiastic preachers of the Gospel of Christ, and brought into keen sympathy with everything that will elevate mankind. You might just as well thrust them up in a stable.

We want a memorial for John Knox. A memorial College is just the thing. This has been hinted at before. It is a splendid idea. Let us on right at it, and set tasks five or ten years to think over it, as we are accustomed to do with plans for reform generally.

SOLICITOR.

PRESBYTERIAN WRONGS.

Number 2.

DEAR SIR,—There are so many things all astray, that in this second letter I have a difficulty in deciding what is most pressing in its call for rectification. As the College may be looked to as, in a very important sense, the centre of the church's life, I shall decide upon Knox College as my second wrong. There is so much need, however, for ventilation before the public mind of the whole collegiate community, that I shall for the present confine myself to the "College Building."

On this subject I have been very ably furnished by "Es-Colligan." I could willingly rest the whole question of the "Building" on his exposition of it; but there is nothing like a general agreement of sentiment for working reforms wherever they are needed.

"Es-Colligan" recommends "every Presbyterian who visits Toronto to go and take a look at the College." I have taken my look at it; and I feel sure that if every Presbyterian would do the same thing, that building would be summarily dedicated to the purposes of a *box-fir*.

When you visit the places you find a building which looks more like a dilapidated Penitentiary than anything else I can think of. There is no front door. You go around through the back yard, and then find what was intended apparently to be the front door of a building facing to the rear. But, overlooking this anomaly, you go within.

You first enter "Divinity Hall." The thing that meets you there is a smell which you might imagine to come from the carcasses of slaughtered systems of Theology which have been for a century in a state of decay. I am serious. There is such a gloomy, musty atmosphere in the place that the feelings at once rebel against the idea of being shut within it for an hour, I care not how interesting the lectures. Besides I understand that there is no means of ever having it comfortably warm on a cold day. And as for that, you can write your name anywhere with your finger.

This hall serves at all the same purposes of a Library, a Lecture-room, a room for general meetings of the students, and a Public Hall. You see imagine how well it is adapted for these purposes, when I say

that it is just the size and shape of an ordinary-sized drawing-room with folding-doors.

The Library is simply a disagree to the church. There are plenty of old books that nobody reads but the antiquarian, and altogether wanting. There do not appear to have been any books added since this great book-making age began.

There is a Museum. There are some very valuable relics, a good collection of shells, and an inordinate amount of dust.

There is no proper accommodation for reading rooms and all other necessary appliances for a College. There is one room which appears to be comfortable.

The Boarding-house is in a fit place for habitation. The drainage holds its arena clear through every part of the building. It is a great wonder that there is no Typhoid Fever. The rooms are dark and gloomy; and many of them have a stifling smell about them that seems to be the general characteristic of the place.

The connection of every part of the building with the culinary department is so direct that the students are able to decide, beyond a doubt, quite early in the day, whether they are to have *oxtails* or *cabbage* for dinner.

The necessary *eff* of living in such a place for a period of six winters must be very injurious indeed, a life upon the physical, the moral, the aesthetic, and the spiritual condition of the inmates. I do not see how a student can ever come through such a training with any good taste or keen sensitivities to what is elevating or degrading to the nature left in him.

And yet we look to the College as the place where the fire is to be put into our young men, where they are to be made enthusiastic preachers of the Gospel of Christ, and brought into keen sympathy with everything that will elevate mankind. You might just as well thrust them up in a stable.

We want a memorial for John Knox. A memorial College is just the thing. This has been hinted at before. It is a splendid idea. Let us on right at it, and set tasks five or ten years to think over it, as we are accustomed to do with plans for reform generally.

QUESTIONS.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

Sir,—There is nothing like eating the flesh on the feast day. This organ question seems to be a subject that demands a large space in your paper. I know nothing possessing a wider range, than taking a rampage through the Bible to prove this custom, and disprove that. I wish a word from your own enlightened Christian reason. Will any all-ignorant brother be so kind as to answer the following questions:

Do we believe that all that we speak, think and act, is either in the service of God or of the devil? If not, who is the third party?

If the answer is—yes. What does it prevent us from putting a law-harp or a rattle in the hand of the child?

Is the service of God or of the devil to make or buy an instrument for music? Close grips brother. If the services of the wicked one, why are such persons allowed in the church?

If you serve God at home during six days of the week, with bag-pipes, &c. does that not become sin on the Sabbath? Is amusements the service of the devil? Why are such persons allowed in the church?

Don't throw in my teeth that work is right during the week, and wrong on the Sabbath. For that there is a positive command.

Is there a more ungodly thing than an ungodly preacher, praising God with his mouth and his heart far from Him. Let the history of Presbyterian Preachers be written. The majority of them—good fellows at drunken parties.

The Edinburgh Glasgow, &c. Inverness if you will, for these three cities; and there is all you can say of that procedure, with few exceptions. I wait for a reply. A believer that instrumental music is no part of anti-Christ.

QUART.

"COMMON-SENSE," &c.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

Sir,—There are two words that have lately been to me a subject of meditation. "Common-sense" and "Common-places." You find them in common use. It is respect, praise to any of your persons—he is a man of common-sense. On the contrary, it is anything but a compliment to say, a man is common-places.

Whatever difficulties there may be in the

way of exact definitions of these words, there can be no doubt, but refer to the great public. There is a judgment belonging to the great public which is sound, and a faculty denied some very clever men. Hence the sharp criticism. "It is all knowledge, but the right kind of knowledge, and all sense but common-sense." So long that we give so much credit to the public, what is there in the name of man to bring out from their character the common-sense expression—common-places? My musings on this point are as follows.—The common people have a good rock foundation. Instead of building a large far building thereon—they put their grandfather's tent. Common-places men do little thinking—save an ingenious patching and mending. He never has any desire to exercise his own judgment. If he is a writer or a speaker, he adheres rigidly to some writer or speaker of a past age. If this is the characteristic of the common people, am I wrong in saying it is the fact of Christian congregations? Nothing new for them. All, all is to be old. The question further arises does a profound belief in Christ prevent a man from using anything new in order to advance his cause? What is the meaning of these words of our Lord—bringing out things "new and old"? I am well aware of the truth and beauty of the hymn—"Tell me the old, old story of Jesus and his love,"—of the saying of John Clowe, "the grand ancient revealed truth which toils to, and is the reason of the godly life." I am well aware of the lack of common-sense, when a man endeavors to make everything *en* *en* *en*—new. Yet believing that Christianity is a life—abundance of life, do I err in believing that every true Christian is not common-place. He has life and must possess his own individuality. In fine, are our Presbyterian preachers and writers common-places? Are the people resolved to leave them so? Spiritual torpor is moral death, as political torpor is social or national death.

Mr. Editor, in sober earnest, I believe that we have a whole host of common-place Presbyterians in this Council of ours,—and at least those that don't take your paper. They may and do look very grand. Tories are always so. I know a freak of human nature—in a single place, a noted company of infants are mostly Tories, of the most ardent order: What if you find many of our readers of this religious order? I should not tell you that some of your greatest assemblies are men of this stamp.

Close stated, proud common-place men. The only faculty they have cultivated is memory—sheer memory.

OLD AND NEW.

On Wednesday evening, the 18th inst., the Anniversary of the Woodville Sabbath School, was held in the lecture room, and the Secretary read the Annual Report; and the school was much larger than in former years. The Missionary Box contained \$25, which was voted to the Red River Mission.

THE POINTE AUX TREMBLES CHURCH CASE.

ACQUITTAL OF REV. C. TAMMER.

On Wednesday 18th Dec., at 10 a.m., the proceedings in the case of the *10* of the Rev. C. Tamm, for disturbance in the Roman Catholic church, were resumed before Messrs. Dr. Perrault, Beaudry, Galtier and Lennie, J.P.

Mr. Oulmet, Beaudry and Delanger, appeared for the prosecution, and Messrs. Gonsalve Doure and Edward Holton for the defence.

The action was brought under Chap. 22 C. S. L. C. as an offence of disturbance of order in and about church, and during public services. Of the evidence the following is a brief summary.

Mr. Lamoureux, testified to being married; he knew of Mr. Tamm's presence in the church, and that he had seen him; he took his seat in the gallery to watch Mr. Tamm. At the commencement of the mass went to Mr. Tamm and ordered him to kneel, which Mr. Tamm refused to do, saying, "I do not believe in that." He then ordered him to conform or leave the church. He replied, he had permission to sit in that pew. This was at the commencement of the mass, but at the invitation of the Host, witness repeated his order, to kneel or depart, which he neglected to do. When the sermon commenced, Mr. Tamm produced papers and pen to write. Witness said to him, "I forbid you to write, this is not an office." During the sermon Mr. Tamm distracted himself by his hat, opening it, and wearing a look of disdain and mockery.

In cross-examination, witness admitted that he had taken his place in the gallery to watch Mr. Tamm. Could not swear that every one else in the church except

Mr. Tamm was kneeling. Generally all present knew; could not swear that on the ground he did so. It was in the church that Mr. Tamm said, "I do not believe him," and not in the street. He spoke much louder than witness. Went for the constable of the church, and to make him conform. When witness called Mr. Tamm not to write, the Church called out, "Let him write, the law will regulate that."

F. X. Galtier corroborated the evidence of Lamoureux. He said by a testimony he was attracted to the presence by Lamoureux ordering him to kneel.

Another witness gave similar testimony. L. Demers, who testified to having called Mr. Tamm to the church, who said, "I do not believe him," and not in the street. He spoke much louder than witness. Went for the constable of the church, and to make him conform. When witness called Mr. Tamm not to write, the Church called out, "Let him write, the law will regulate that."

Father Case, cura of Pointe-aux-Trembles, testified to having received a letter from Mr. Tamm, telling him that Mr. Tamm was to be present in the church, and before the mass, sent for Lamoureux, and instructed him to watch Mr. Tamm during the service, and make him conform like a Catholic. Lamoureux went to the gallery that day. On being asked whether he knew that it was against Tamm's belief to conform, he answered, "I do not know, but whether he approved of Dr. Perrault's permission to defendant to occupy his pew, is not answered. Might have called Tamm a heretic, and have had the word 'filthy'" in his connection with Protestants. He admitted mentioning Mr. Tamm's name when reading Perrault's letter from the altar, and that Mr. Tamm's intention was to mock and insult the Catholic church, and the object of insulting him, and observing his "ministry" in the matter which was discussed previously, admitted that in his sermon, and in speaking of Calvin, Luther and others, he had charged them with being traitors of the church, and leaving the church for the purpose of marrying. He also admitted having said, "I do not believe him," and "I do not believe in that."

Mr. Oulmet and Doure then addressed the Court for their respective clients.

Dr. Perrault, in giving judgment, strongly condemned the conduct of the one in reading a paper, and the other in conforming to the Catholic church. He said that if the Catholic church were to be respected, they must use politeness towards strangers, and not exhibit contempt for them in public. He strongly condemned the conduct of the one in reading a paper, and the other in conforming towards Rev. Mr. Tamm, and he cordially disapproved the action without costs—*Justly Witness*.

THE JOHN KNOX ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF COMMUNION.

The London Correspondent of the Dundee Advertiser says:—As one of the phenomena of the celebration of the tercentenary of the birth of John Knox, it may be mentioned that in a lecture on this subject given by the Rev. Professor Lorimer, D.D., considerable prominence was given to the discovery of three documents hitherto unknown in modern times, and which shed light upon the influence of Knox on the theological and ecclesiastical questions of his time. The lecturer asserted that Knox so early as 1549 and 1560 had written a treatise on the communion in both kinds, and that it had been created and not kneeling. A special discovery made by Professor Lorimer in the papers of the late Daniel Williams, D.D., which he presented to the British Museum, was that he had brought documentary evidence of this fact in the shape of an epistle to the congregation at Berwick, in which the writer stated objections to the practice of kneeling at the Holy Communion, and that being convenient on account of the countenance it seemed to give to the dogma of transubstantiation. Sitting was therefore advocated as the safer "knee" for the reception of the Lord's Supper, as thereby offering a protest against the possible abuse and superstitions of an attitude of adoration. By a series of minute proofs Dr. Lorimer established the influence which the Scottish Reformer brought to bear on the Reformation in England. He was one of the six chaplains of Edward VI., and in this capacity there were submitted to him the articles of the English Church. The report sent up to the Lords of the Council by the royal chaplains on these articles was in Latin, and the Latin text is now well known, and indeed what had been forgotten until Professor Lorimer divulged it this evening, is the fact of the existence of a supplementary report on the subject, which reference particularly to the 8th and 9th articles of the 28th article. The supplementary report was directed against the practice of kneeling at the Holy Communion, and its probable date is October 1552, 1552, says that it is a protest of the royal chaplain, and from internal and external evidence he is inclined to believe that it was written, against the submission of the King and Council issued a ruler decree ratifying of the true rationale of the kneeling posture and freeing it from the imputation of idolatry or superstition. At the accession of Elizabeth this rubric was removed, but was restored again on the restoration of Charles II. Dr. Lorimer characterized this rubric as the most precious piece of Protestantism in the entire book of Common Prayer.

Jesus will never tarry in a divided heart. He must be all or nothing.