

his zeal for purity of worship. After the captivity, when Ezra reformed the Church for the third time, this ancient method of conducting the praises of the thousands of Israel was re-established.

It has been observed that many of the titles of the Psalms, as well as their matter, declare that they were composed for, and intended to be used with, an instrumental accompaniment. In many cases, the particular kind of instruments is specified. Some of the terms are considered untranslatable, but Hebrew scholars seem to agree that the terms, *mahalah*, *neginoth*, *nehiloth*, *sheminith* and *shushan* must be understood to refer to particular instruments for which the Psalm was adapted. Gesenius is of opinion that the word *selah*, which occurs so often in the Psalms, indicates a pause, during which the instruments performed a symphony.

Three series of courses were appointed by David to conduct the service of the Jewish sanctuary—the courses of the *priests*, the *singers* and the *porters*. The appointment of the second of these will be found in the 25th chapter of 1st Chronicles. That these courses were observed in the time of our Lord, may be inferred from the statement of Luke concerning Zechariah, that he executed the priest's office before God, in the order of his course. It is natural to infer from this that the courses of singers were also at this time in existence. No evidence, however, of the continued use of instrumental aid in public worship, during the time of our Lord and His Apostles, is required, as, while the temple worship was solemnized, it must have been conducted according to the method prescribed by God.

What objections might be urged against the foregoing exposition of the statements of the Word of God upon this subject, it is difficult for me to conceive. As, however, truth does present itself in different lights to different minds, every facility should be afforded the readers of this periodical for bringing forward views and objections, and thus securing ample consideration of a question, at present of some interest. At this moment, I can only conceive of two objections to the general conclusions arrived at, which may be considered.

It might be argued that, as the temple has been demolished, and the ancient rites and ceremonies of the Jewish Church have been abolished, the arrangements for public praise, made under the Old Testament, are no longer obligatory, but part of those shadows of good things to come, which have passed away. To this, it may be replied, that instruments were used by Miriam, before the institutions of Moses. The argument here resembles that employed to sustain the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath. An appointment, which does not owe its existence to the Mosaic law, cannot perish with it, so that the abolition of the one should carry with it the abolition of the other. The order for praise was instituted by the inspired prophet and sweet singer of Israel, and does not form part of the Mosaic law. Moses, indeed, instituted the trumpets and established the principle of the use of such aids, but they were principally used in the calling of assemblies. The temple service of song, as such, was the work of David. Though the *whole* of the Mosaic law were abrogated (which it certainly is not), this would not affect the institution of sacred song, established by the prophets of God, and perpetuated throughout a thousand years. The Psalms, be it also remembered, are not a part of the Mosaic law. They constitute the hymn book of the Church for every age, and in them we are *commanded* to praise God in the manner alluded to. While such an extensive and perfect system as the ancient Jewish order of praise is no longer possible in any one Chris-

tian congregation, because the whole Jewish nation worshipped at the solemn feast, and a choir of great power was required, yet the principle remains valid for our guidance.

Should it be said that the praise of the Jewish sanctuary was typical, and, like all types, should pass away, it may be replied that praise has not passed away, and *never will* pass away, in the Church, whether militant or triumphant. It may also be urged: why retain the service of praise and drop the mode?—the authority that perpetuates the one should also perpetuate the other. Again, of what was ancient praise a type? The brazen serpent, the burning bush, the cities of refuge, &c., were types of Christ and His Church, but what does the Levitical choir of singers and players foreshadow? The disposition manifested by many to treat the law of Moses and the prescriptions of the ancient Church with neglect, ought to be discouraged. These parts of the Word of God are replete with important lessons for men in their public, social, domestic and private life, as citizens and Churchmen, and will remain, throughout all time, beautiful models of a social condition framed by the hand of God.

The other objection that might be urged is the absence of any prescription in the New Testament. Very little is instituted in the New Testament. During the period comprised in the history of the Acts of the Apostles, there could hardly be said to have been any public worship. Christianity was not tolerated, and Christians worshipped in secret. The objection, however, is infelicitous for the cause of him who presses it. It is a weapon which recoils upon him who wields it. The advocate of instrumental aid may reply to the objectors: "Since you allege that the New Testament is silent upon this point, and that *therefore* there is no authority for the use of instrumental aid in public worship, where is the authority for the arrangements you have made? Where is the authority for choirs? Mention chapter and verse, if you please. Where is the authority for a preceptor? Where is the authority for our tunes with their four parts? The case presents no difficulty to me, because I believe that the practice of the ancient Church, instituted by David, remains valid; but you do not: and where is your authority for our present practice? And how do you account for the silence of the New Testament on a duty of permanent obligation? as all agree that we ought to praise God according to *some* method. By praising God, and by conducting it by means of a choir, you acknowledge the authority of the Old Testament, but you only adopt one-half. You appropriate the vocal, and reject the instrumental." The silence of the New Testament presents a difficulty to him who refuses to acknowledge the validity of the arrangements made by the sweet singer of Israel, and pursued for a thousand years. He must hold that the Church has been left without any divine direction in the discharge of a duty frequently enjoined, and to be continued in time and eternity. He must also hold that our present system is a matter of opinion, and liable to be changed or maintained as any Church may think proper,—a latitude neither desirable nor scriptural. Such a one lands in a latitudinarianism far larger than that to which he is very prone to consign his opponent.

It is right to mention, that, while the allusions in the New Testament, before referred to, do not assume the form of institutions, they are undesignated coincidences, serving beautifully to confirm the validity of the ancient method of praising God. It is also unaccountable, that, while the apostles speak of the abolition of so much of the Jewish law, they should never make mention of this part of the ancient service having passed