

Temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart.

It is entirely false and misleading, therefore, to urge any such argument as that of the custom of Christ and his apostles either for or against any mode of worship in the present day. We are not here speaking of doctrines, which are a very different matter. If in modes of worship we were to act according to their example, and return to their "simplicity," we should not only have to discard organs, but pews and pulpits, and written sermons, and many things beside, and adopt some others which we should not regard as simple at all. We remember once when an individual, in his horror of a clergyman's gown, which he looked upon as a remnant of Popery, indignantly demanded to know if ever St. Paul preached in a black silk gown? he was quietly answered by another question, viz.:—whether St. Paul ever preached in a swallow-tail black broadcloth coat?

The climax of the anti-organ argument was reached by still another speaker, who said. "It strikes me we are bordering on a tremendous heresy. If we live to see another year, hymns will be introduced, [It must be understood here that the Psalms of David, not according to the authorised version, but according to the authorised versification, constitute their standard ritual for singing,] and as sin is progressive, in a third or fourth year we shall have an altar and image in our church if the present innovation be countenanced. What would our worthy fathers say? What would John Knox say?" What with the fear of John Knox in the past, *we* say, and the Pope in the future, it is evident that this good Protestant's Protestant right of private judgment is a considerably straitened