

tion and were peculiar to it. I need not enquire to what extent the statement may be received which asserts that a large part of the Mosaic law is still binding upon us. Allowing the statement to its fullest extent, it would not in the least affect the argument. If a large part is still binding, it is so binding *not because* it was Jewish, *nor because* it existed under and was sanctioned by the Jewish dispensation, *but because* it has been embodied in and recognized by the New Testament. I need not explain that this has no reference to the moral law, which is unchangeable in its nature, and ever binding. However important musical instruments may be, no one would attempt to draw their sanction from that law, or place the obligation to employ them in the list of moral duties; but it does not therefore follow that the use of them would be *immoral*. There were, and are still, such things as positive enactments and the obligations arising from them.

The position which I have thus laid down does not in the least endanger the validity of the Sabbath, Infant Baptism, or the duty of rendering praise to God. These obligations rest on an entirely different foundation from that which can be claimed for instrumental music. In reference to the Sabbath, I think that has already been abundantly shewn. Long prior to the days of Moses, the Sabbath was established by divine sanction. The argument for the Sabbath and for instrumental worship are not "*like*," but most *unlike*. The one rests on the firm basis of eternal truth; the other somewhere in space. There can be no dispute about the fact that before the Mosaic times, instrumental music in religious worship had, so far as we read, no more of a divine sanction than polygamy. This illustration has been objected to; but in the sense in which I used it, I do not see where the objection lies. I was not considering the merits or demerits of either, but simply the divine sanction; and in reference to that, the case cited is in point, and will hold good. Regarding Infant Baptism, the argument for the Sabbath is equally applicable. The Church membership of infants, and its seal, were established prior to the Mosaic economy, and rested on the unchangeable foundation of the covenant made with Abraham. And the same Church membership and its new seal are clearly ratified under the Christian dispensation. So entirely and widely different is the position of instruments in divine worship, that we can find no sanction for such, either prior to or in the Mosaic economy; and in the records of the new dispensation, the search for such a sanction is utterly in vain. In my last communication, I think I succeeded in shewing that the occasions on which we find instrumental music employed among the Jews, were very different from the position occupied by the Christian assembly when met in the sacred courts of God's own house. Down to the building of the first

temple, the case admits of no dispute. When the temple was erected, there were men appointed for its service, with musical instruments. This, we are expressly told. But, whether that service was similar to our sanctuary worship, may be seriously questioned. The information given regarding it is very limited and very obscure, and the only way, so far as I can see, that we can form an idea of what that service was, and when and how these musicians employed their instruments, is, by ascertaining, from subsequent periods, how such instruments were used, and on what occasions. Now, so far as I know, there is not one case specified, in which instruments were employed, that bears much resemblance to our sanctuary worship. Without one exception, they were occasions of rejoicing and gladness, and had reference to some deliverance or victory, or some great national event. I never meant to say that the few cases specified were the only ones in which instruments of music were used, nor that so many individuals were appointed for a few solitary cases; but I did mean to say that we might reasonably infer from the cases, the particulars of which are given, and these extending over 600 years, how the instruments were used in the cases which are not specified. From Miriam to David, the harp and the timbrel were heard only in seasons of rejoicing and triumph, and every case specified in the days of David, Solomon, and down to the last sounds of the harp, in the days of Nehemiah, the occasions were of a similar nature. If employed otherwise, it is a fact which the Bible does not reveal. According to this view, we can find a good deal of work for the musicians. There were the three great national feasts, at which the tribes assembled to Jerusalem, and where they remained for several days. These were seasons of great rejoicing. There were, besides, several other feasts—the feast of the new moon, and others. All these were seasons of gladness; and, in addition to this, there were the celebrations of victories and anniversaries. To what extent these things might occupy the musicians, we cannot pretend to say; but, that a considerable part of the service was of this character, there can be no doubt. There are two facts which we do know. One is, that, in all seasons of rejoicing, the Jews employed instrumental music, and generally dancing, as an accompaniment. The other fact is, that, in seasons of calamity and grief, they did not employ either the tabret or the harp. The captives, in Babylon, left their harps on the willows. Then, it was a time of sorrow. The same thing is confirmed when we turn to the Psalms. Those in which reference is made to the harp or the organ, are odes of triumph, to celebrate some great deliverance, or in anticipation of such deliverance, or when, in exulting strains, as in the last two, all created things are invited to praise the Divine King. In the penitential Psalms,