with the whole worship of the ancient Church. I do not see on what proof this assertion can be supposed to rest. I think it is very far from being correct. But, admitting it to be well grounded, it would not constitute an obligation on the Christian Church to adopt the same mode of worship. In that case, it would be a sufficient answer that the dispensation under which such a mode of worship was practised had passed away, and with it, that the Mosaic ritual ceased. The fact being admitted that the ritual ceased with the passing away of the dispensation under which it was established, in order to prove the continued existence of any one particular part of that ritual, it must be shewn that that particular has the sanction of the other dispensation which succeeded. In other words, we must shew, from the New Testament, a clear warrant or sanction for whatever part of the Jewish ritual, the existence of which we contend for in the Christian Church. While maintaining this, we will not plead guilty to the charge of treating the law of Moses, and the prescriptions of the ancient Church, with neglect. We would treat them with deep reverence, and we can see many important benefits to be derived from them, while we maintain that the Mosaic ritual was not intended for the Christian Church. And whoever insists upon it that any particular of it is still binding, we refer him to the New dispensation, and we have the right to demand that from it there be produced authority, either expressed or *clearly implied*, to sanction the rite or the observance in question. Otherwise, we maintain it is not binding. The term, "the law of Moses," has, I think, in the discussion, been used in a sense too indefinite. That term may be employed to express the moral, the judicial, or the ceremonial law of the Jews, or it may—as it sometimes is—be employed to denote the whole. In reference to the moral law, and every precept of it, we believe it is, and will continue to be, binding always. But regarding the judicial or civil law, and the ceremonial, the authority of both, *as laws*, ceased with the termination of the Jewish Commonwealth. Such parts of the Jewish civil or judicial law as are suited to our altered circumstances, our legislators were bound to retain and embody in our laws; and we believe this has been done. In order to know, then, what part of the Jewish civil law is binding upon us and can be pleaded in our courts, we must ascertain from our statute book. What enables us to plead it in court is the fact that it has been embodied in our laws, and forms now a part of it. So it is with the authority of the ritual, or ceremonial law. In order to know if any part or particular of it is still binding, we must consult, not the old economy, which has passed away, but our Christian Statute Book. If embodied into it, its obligation is undoubted. If we cannot find it there, we must conclude it to be among those things which grow old and decay, and are no more. To say, that as instrumental music was not typical, it did not pass away, is only so much waste of words. Why, if that position could be held, we should have a whole host of Jewish obligations fastened upon us. If nothing ceased with the Jewish Commonwealth but what was typical, then we must have our religious dancing, the payment of tithes (to which, practically, I would not object), our stoning of disobedient children, our capital punishment of Sabbath breakers and blasphemers, &c. The fact is—and every intelligent reader of his Bible must know it—the whole Mosaic economy was preparatory to another state of things. The whole ritual was one large typical body, and when its end was accomplished, not only did what was strictly the body itself fall, but all its appendages, and all really connected with and necessary to its maintenance. The garments with which the human body is clad, are not a part of the body; they are merely necessary appendages; but when the body falls, they fall with it. Or, consider that economy as the scaffolding necessary in the erection of the glorious building intended by God. On the erection of that building, the scaffolding was removed, and in that removal was involved all that rested on that scaffolding, or was connected with it. Nor does the argument fare better which is derived from the assumed fact that instrumental music was employed before the Mosaic economy was established. To compare its obligation with that of the holy Sabbath, can only be done in forgetfulness of the fact that for the Sabbath there was a divine command given to man in Paradise, and repeated again and again under the most solemn sanctions. But where is the command for instrumental music in the sanctuary? If instrumental music was thus used prior to the Mosaic institutions, it was, so far as the Bible shews, without a command from God. On the supposition, then, that it was so used, it holds not the position of the Sabbath, but precisely that of polygamy. That practise certainly existed in the days of the patriarchs; it was received into the Mosaic economy; but while permitted there, it never had the sanction of a divine command. Allowing that instrumental music was then employed in the worship of God, as we now understand the term worship, then, in the absence of any command, there is no escape from the admission that it stood side by side with polygamy: and any argument resting on that position, if it tends to shew that the one is still binding, proves no less clearly that the other is also. Good old John Milton, on this ground, maintained the lawfulness of polygamy under the Christian economy, and his arguments were perhaps fully as plausible as those which the advocates of instrumental music can derive from the same source. He found abundant evidence for its existence under the old economy, and he