

where the smitten heart gives expression to its griefs, there is no allusion to instrumental music. The reader may examine this for himself. The captives could not employ the harp. It hung on the willows beside them. Why? Because it was not to them a season of gladness. But was their grief more intense and bitter than his who mourns for his sins? Was not David's grief, when he wrote the 51st Psalm, and several of the others, as heavy, at least, as that of the exiles by the streams of Babel? But if so, he could not employ his harp, much as he loved it; and if, among the multitudes who worshipped at the temple, there were many who felt the burden of their sins and mourned over it, it is certain the sounds of the harp would not accord with their feelings. We read, in Ezra, when the returned captives laid the foundation of the temple, that those who had not seen the first temple, in its glory, shouted, and played on musical instruments, for they were very joyful; but the aged, who remembered the former temple, were sad and in grief at the contrast, and how did they act? Did they take part in the rejoicings, and did they seem to enjoy the sounds of the cymbal and the harp? No. They wept with a loud voice. The noise of the weeping was so loud, that the shouts of joy and the music could not be heard. From all this, it is evident that musical instruments were adapted only for certain occasions, and certain states of mind; and, need I say that these occasions and states of mind are not those which constitute the ordinary condition of the Church, in this world of sin and sorrow. The children of God, while here, are better acquainted with grief than with rejoicing and triumph; and as the case is now, I believe it was then and always. I stated in my last, that after the return from Babylon, we find no mention of instrumental music subsequent to the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem, in the days of Nehemiah. This statement is met by the fact that the Old Testament history ends there. It is true the Old Testament history ends, but the Jewish history does not end there. We have a history which, although not an inspired record, is allowed by all to be, for the most part, authentic and worthy of credit, and it gives a very circumstantial account of the Jews, and of their condition and doings; and we have, besides that, in the New Testament, the same history resumed, and extended over from between thirty and forty years. The service of the temple is spoken of repeatedly there, but we do not find one solitary allusion to instruments of music. The little children lifted their praises in the temple, and the fact is recorded by the Spirit of Inspiration. The reason given in my former letter for this silence, is, I think, correct. For a similar reason, the captives in Babylon could not handle the harp. Now, it is difficult for me to believe that a mode of worship suitable only for certain occasions, and these occasions

very rare in the experience of God's people, whether under the old or new dispensation, was at any time that mode by which the contrite and pious heart was directed to give utterance to its feelings. It might do for those who were joyful and merry, but we see that the mourners in Zion could not take part in it. Musical instruments had no connection with what at all resembled our sanctuary worship, until the erection of the first temple, and the cases mentioned, during that period, form no exception to what we find was their use from the days of Miriam; but whatever the service which employed them during the first temple, at the fall of that temple the service ended, and was not, so far as known to us, resumed again. But the service of praise, I believe, existed from the beginning. To praise God is a moral duty, and that praise was ever rendered by His people. It is as natural for the renewed heart to praise, as it is to pray to God. Alike, they are the breathings of the living soul. I believe that Abel, and every saint from his day, rendered praise; and whatever was the mode, it must have been by divine direction. But, in the worship of these eminent patriarchs, there never mingled the sound of an instrument. The Church existed and praised God for a thousand years, if not more, before Jubal invented the harp. The father, Lamech, was the first polygamist, and the son Jubal was the father of all that handle the harp and the organ, and both were the children of the first man accursed from the earth. The origin of the thing is certainly not much to be proud of. I mention this merely to shew that not only is it certain the Church previously had no knowledge of instruments in worship, but that owing to the fact that the invention belonged to the godless family of Cain, it is equally certain that, in the subsequent period, during the days of the patriarchs, it could not have been introduced. What are, then, the facts regarding the ancient Church, including under that term the Church from its first establishment? Instead of instrumental worship being the rule, we can scarcely find for it the place of an exception. But very little indeed can be found to countenance the organ. For the first sixteen hundred years, it is certain the Church had none. For the next eight hundred years, and until the days of Miriam, there is no allusion to any thing of the kind. During the subsequent five hundred years to the building of the temple, we find musical instruments mentioned, but it is, in every case, in connection with joyous and great events. For only four hundred and twelve years,—that is, during the existence of Solomon's temple,—do we read of musical instruments in religious service, and that that service can be taken as a model for our simple Christian and spiritual worship, is more than the advocates of the organ can ever prove. From the fall of that temple to the close of the Jewish commonwealth, a pe-