

5. But the strongest proof of the correctness of the opinion is the fact that God himself chose this combination of the instrumental and vocal to be the style of music in his holy temple.

VII. The history of the Christian Church shows that, from the beginning, there have been two parties in connexion with this question. Fathers, schoolmen and Reformers, who differ among themselves on this subject, cannot be our guides, however much we may respect them for their personal worth.

Some of them do not even agree with themselves. For example, the pious and philosophical Clement of Alexandria, who flourished about the year of our Lord 200, first denounces all instruments of music, especially the pipe and flute, as being "more suitable for beasts than men, and the more irrational portion of mankind." He then gives the most fanciful spiritual meanings to the instruments used in the Jewish temple. The "psaltery" means our tongue; "the lyre" is the mouth; "the timbrel and dance" is the resurrection of the dead; "the organ" is the body; "the strings or chords" are the nerves. All this spiritualizing and denouncing of instrumental music is followed by what seems a permission to use it; for he says, "if you wish to sing and play to the harp and lyre, there is no blame. Thou shalt imitate the righteous Hebrew king in his thanksgiving to God."

Where great men differ thus with themselves and among themselves, we are left necessarily in the position of judges—to judge for ourselves; and we are left with the only safe rule to guide our judgment—"the word of God; and the light of nature and Christian prudence ordered by the general principles of the word."

Mr. Editor,—I see that I am a little more lengthy on this side than the other. For this I am scarcely responsible; because the advocates on this side are themselves more lengthy and expect, in justice, to be reported accordingly. It is not the *quantity* but the *quality* of the wares of each party that we are to judge of.

In conclusion, judging from the past history of the Church, and from what we see in the Scriptures, it is scarcely to be expected that we shall all be of the same opinion concerning this question. We shall therefore require great patience, forbearance, and charity. Schism would be, doubtless, a far greater evil than either having an organ or being without one. We require time to think; to think calmly, prayerfully, and without prejudice.

McK.

Baltimore, Nov. 1867.

[While not admitting the force of all the arguments stated by our correspondent on this side of the question, we readily admit the fair and moderate manner in which he has stated them, and we heartily agree with him in his closing remarks. Schism in the Church would be an evil greater than any advantage that the warmest friends of organs could expect to result from their introduction. EDITOR.]

THE ORGAN CASE.

MR. EDITOR,—I noticed in the September number of the *Record*, "Reasons and grounds of dissent, carried at a Congregational meeting" of Knox's Church, Montreal, "held on Wednesday, 17th July, 1867," at which I am greatly surprised. Were it not that these reasons are groundless, incorrect, and tend to mislead the minds of the readers of the *Record*; that they characterize the whole church as "*cruel, partial, and unvarnishedly severe*;" and, that with all these objections, they have appeared in the authorized organ of the Church; I would not feel myself called upon