

A
CONDENSED ARGUMENT

FOR THE

Exclusive Use

OF AN

Inspired Psalmody.

BY REV. R. J. DODDS, D. D.,
Late R. P. Missionary to Syria.

(FROM "REPLY TO MORTON ON PSALMODY.")

DAYTON,

ARMSTRONG CO., PA.

DAVID LOYE, PRINTER.

1881.

CATECHISMS, TRACTS, &c.

THE following Tracts, &c., have been published by DAVID LOVE, Dayton, Armstrong Co., Pa., and will be mailed to any address at the prices annexed:—

"The Shorter Catechism," 48 pp., 5 c. each; 38 c. per doz.

"The Shorter Catechism Analyzed," by Dr. Gilbert McMaster; 68 pages; 10 c. each; 75 c. per doz.

"A Condensed Argument for the Exclusive Use of an Inspired Psalmody," by Rev. R. J. DODDS; 39 pages; 8 c. each; 60 c. per doz.

"Sabbath, or Sunday?" 4 pp., 2 c. each; 10 c. per doz.

"The Two Partings." A Temperance Tract. 4 pp. 2 c. each; 10 c. per doz.

"Choice Poetry." 5 c. each.

DAVID LOVE,
DAYTON,
ARMSTRONG CO., PA.

A
CONDENSED ARGUMENT

FOR THE

Exclusive Use

OF AN

Inspired Psalmody.

By REV. R. J. DODDS, D. D.,

Late R. P. Missionary to Syria.

(FROM "REPLY TO MORTON ON PSALMODY.")

DAYTON,
ARMSTRONG CO., PA.

DAVID LOVE, PRINTER.

1881.

2. The question is not respecting the *lawfulness* of using the Book of Psalms in singing God's praise—may the Psalms be lawfully sung in divine worship?—for here there is no dispute: but respecting our obligation to exclude from the worship of God, all songs not contained in the Book of Psalms—should the songs contained in the Book of Psalms be sung in divine worship, to the exclusion of all other songs?

3. The question, so far as this or that collection of uninspired hymns is concerned, is not respecting the purity of its sentiments—is the subject matter of its songs agreeable to the word of God? or respecting the application of the songs which it contains, to secular uses—is it lawful to sing them for the purpose of learning music, &c. &c. but respecting the lawfulness of singing these songs in divine worship—is it lawful to sing them as songs of praise to God?

These things being premised, we are prepared to state our position; and it is as follows:—*The Book of Psalms ought to be used in singing God's praise, to the entire exclusion of all other songs.*

We proceed
 141. To offer a few arguments in support of the position laid down; and

I. Songs, to be suitable for the celebration of God's praise, must be descriptive, not of any thing human, but of the divine glory; for this belongs to the very nature of the ordinance of praise. "Oh that men would praise the Lord for his goodness, and for his wonderful works to the children of men!" Ps. 107: 15. "Praise him for his mighty acts: praise him according

to his excellent greatness." Ps. 150: 2. Now men, however gifted, learned, and godly, can never prepare songs conveying any adequate description of the divine glory; "for what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." 1 Cor. 2: 11. Therefore no song composed by man can be fit for the celebration of Jehovah's praise. The Psalms of the Bible, on the other hand, being prepared by God's Omniscient Spirit, furnish a correct and full description of the divine glory. Some of these Psalms, it is true, are full of complaints and supplications, and many of them make large reference to the experience of God's people; but all these complaints, supplications, &c., are introduced as illustrative of the glory of God's compassion, of Christ's sufferings, and of the Spirit's work in the believer's heart. The Psalms of inspiration are all descriptive of the glory of the Eternal; and the description of his glory, which they present, can be relied on with infallible certainty, as being so full and true, that we can never, by offering these songs in the ordinance of praise, insult the Majesty of the heavens. It is certain, on the other hand, that any description of the divine glory, which can be given in any song or collection of songs, prepared by man, must, on account of the limited knowledge which men have of the deep things of God, be so meagre, lame, and defective, as to render these songs unfit to be sung as an expression of Jehovah's praise.

2. All songs of praise composed by men have errors; and must have defects; since a

are fallible; but the Psalms of the Bible can have neither the one nor the other, because their divine author cannot err. The latter should, then, be used in the ordinance of praise, to the exclusion of the former. For it is sinful to offer to God that which is, or may (for aught that we know) be imperfect, when we can as easily present that which we are sure is perfect. "But cursed be the deceiver, which hath in his flock a male, and voweth and sacrificeth unto the Lord a corrupt thing." Mal. 1: 14. And it is wrong to incur a danger which can as easily be avoided. "Jesus saith unto him, 'It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.'" Matt. 4: 7.

3. The use of human psalmody is found to be favorable to the propagation of error, and should therefore be avoided. In support of the premises, it is only necessary to refer to the alarming prevalence of Socinianism in New England; ever since the introduction of Watts' Psalms and Hymns into the New England churches; and to the great numbers brought up in those branches of the Presbyterian Church in which human psalmody is used, who go off into more corrupt churches, or into the world; and to the notorious fact, that when new sects of heretics spring up, these are composed, not of those who sing the psalms of inspiration, but of those who sing in divine worship the effusions of the human mind. "Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit." Matt. 7: 17.

4. The use of uninspired psalmody is a sectarian practice. In this age of the world, it is impos-

sible that all who profess Christianity should agree in their views of divine truth; and if they set about preparing systems of psalmody for themselves, they must be expected to disagree in this as in other things. Accordingly, we find an endless variety of hymn-books among those who use human psalmody: an O. S. Presbyterian hymn-book, a N. S. Presbyterian hymn-book, a Methodist Episcopal hymn-book, a Wesleyan hymn-book, a Lutheran hymn-book, a Universalist hymn-book, &c. Now all this might easily be avoided, by all denominations confining themselves to the psalmody of the Bible; a psalmody with which no Bible believer can find fault. The celebration of the praise of God is the employment of the inhabitants of heaven; it is, therefore, peculiarly desirable, that in this part of God's worship, there should be a uniformity in the practice of the church upon earth. And in this matter uniformity might be obtained without any compromise of principle. The use of the Book of Psalms, in praising God, is common ground, on which we may all unite. No other ground can be common; and therefore those who love the peace of Zion, and desire to promote the visible unity of the church of Christ, should not occupy any other. "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them." Rom. 16: 17.

5. The pursuit of those churches which use human composition in singing God's praise, are perpetually changing their systems of psalmody. This shows, 1st, That the attempt to provide

“So the service of the house of the LORD was set in order.”* v. 35.

There are other songs interspersed throughout the inspired volume; some of which were sung to God, upon the occurrence of some extraordinary event or other, to which they relate. But these songs are presented to us, only in connection with the record of the historical events to which they have reference, to complete and illustrate the narrative,—were omitted by the inspired compiler of the Book of Psalms,—and were, in the days of inspiration, excluded from the Temple worship. There is, therefore, no divine appointment authorizing the church to embody them in her psalmody.† Besides, there are some songs in the Book of Psalms, which are also found elsewhere in the Bible; and no good reason can be assigned why they should be inserted in the Book of Psalms, unless this was done in order to complete, for the use of the church, a system of praise.‡ There is, therefore, no divine appointment authorizing us to sing in divine worship any song contained in the scriptures, except those comprised in the book of psalms. Much less are we authorized by any divine appointment, to use in this way any song not contained in the Bible. And that cannot innocently be made a part of God’s worship, which is not made so by divine appointment, revealed in the word of God. “In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.” Matt. 15: 9.

Since, then, the Bible shows divine appoint-

* See Appendix, Note B. † Note C. ‡ Note A.

ment for the use of the book of Psalms in singing God’s praise, and does not show any divine appointment for a similar use of songs not contained in the book of Psalms, the conclusion is unavoidable, that the book of Psalms is given to the church to constitute her whole psalmody. It remains

IV. To answer some of the most prominent objections to this doctrine. It is objected—

1. “That the singing of uninspired composition, in divine worship, is not forbidden in the word of God.”

Answer.—Neither are we forbidden to observe seven sacraments. In determining whether or not this or that particular service should be made a part of God’s worship, the absence of divine appointment amounts, in all cases, to a prohibition.

2. “That good men have composed hymns to be used in divine worship, and sing hymns of human composure.”

Answer.—1. The best of men are liable to do things which will dishonor God, and injure the church. 2. There are many good men who would not dare, either to compose a song to be sung in divine worship, or to offer to God a song composed by man.

3. “That those who use human psalmody, are more numerous than those who use only the book of Psalms in singing God’s praise.”

Answer.—1. It was not always so; and the time may yet come, when it will cease to be so. 2. The multitude *are not always*—nor have they hitherto *commonly been right*, in matters of faith and religious practice.

4. "That we are allowed to compose our own prayers, and, by parity of reason, ought to be allowed to compose our own songs of praise.

Answer.—1. Right or wrong, it is a matter of fact, that most worshippers neither do nor can compose their own songs of praise. 2. God has given us, in the Bible, a book of Psalms, but no book of Prayers; and promised to the church a Spirit of prayer, but not a Spirit of psalmody. 3. In prayer we express our own wants; in praise we declare God's glory. If we can frame a form of words, suitable for the former purpose, it by no means follows that we are equally competent to compose a form of words for the latter purpose. 4. The ordinances of prayer and praise differ in this,—that in the former, the thoughts suggest the words; and we should therefore use the words which they do suggest; whereas, in the latter the words are designed to suggest the thoughts, and therefore we should use words, if such we can obtain, which can suggest none but appropriate thoughts. 5. Our wants are always changing; and, therefore, our prayers should vary: but the glory of God is ever the same; and therefore the same collection of songs will serve for the expression of his praise, from age to age.*

5. "That there is, in the New Testament, authority for singing songs composed by men."

First: we are referred to the fact that Christ and his disciples sang a hymn. Matt. 26: 30.

Answer.—1. Let it be proved that the hymn sung by our Saviour and the disciples, was not

one or more of the Psalms of David. It is supposed by the best commentators, to have been the *great hallel*, consisting of the Psalm from the 113th to the 118th inclusive. 2. Our Saviour was better qualified, and had a better right to compose hymns than Dr. Watts, John Wesley, Philip Doddridge, &c.

Second: It is argued that Paul enjoins the use of uninspired psalmody when he says, Col. 3: 16, "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." Some argue from the first clause of the verse, "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom;" explaining the phrase, "the word of Christ," to mean either the whole Bible, or the New Testament; and alleging that the apostle enjoins the use of songs drawn from the whole word of God, or from the New Testament in particular. *Answer.*—1. Let it be proved that this expression means either the whole Bible, or the New Testament, and not simply, the principles of the gospel. 2. Let it be proved that the Apostle enjoins upon the church, to compose songs, drawing the matter of them from what he denominates "the word of Christ."

Others reason from the use of the three terms, "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs;" in the latter clause of the verse. *Answer.*—1. No good reason can be assigned, why any one of the psalms of inspiration might not, in reference to different aspects under which it may be viewed, be denominated a "psalm, hymn, and spiritual

* See Appendix, Note D.

song." Such a use of language is not uncommon. God says, Ex. 34: 7, "forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." 2. If these three terms designate three distinct kinds of devotional poetry, let it be proved that the Book of Psalms does not comprise songs of these three different kinds. 3. The Jews applied the terms psalms, hymns, and songs, indiscriminately to the Book of Psalms.—See Josephus, Philo, &c.; and the same may have been done by Paul and the primitive christians. 4. In the Septuagint, which was the translation of the Old Testament in use in the days of Paul, some of the psalms are, in their titles, designated *psalmos*—a psalm; others, *ode*—a song; and others, *alleluia*; which last is a word borrowed from the Hebrew, and when used as a noun in the Greek language, is equivalent to *hymnos*—a hymn. Why may we not suppose the Apostle has allusion, in this verse, to these three terms used in the Septuagint version, as titles of different psalms? *

Third: It is inferred from 1 Cor. 14: 26, that the Corinthians brought to their assemblies psalms composed by themselves, under a supernatural impulse of the Spirit, and of course, not contained in the book of Psalms. *Answer.*—Let it be proved that the Psalms, by the unseasonable utterance of which they disturbed their assemblies, were composed by themselves under an impulse of the Spirit, and not selected from the Book of Psalms. †

6. "That the Book of Psalms is hard to understand."

Answer.—1. If there are some passages in the Psalms hard to understand, so are there in the other scriptures.—2 Pet. 3: 16. 2. It is no harder to understand the Psalms when we sing them than when we read them. 3. The more we use them, the better we will understand them. 4. We have a better opportunity of understanding them than Old Testament worshippers had; and we are sure the Book of Psalms was their psalmody. 5. If we are unable to understand the Psalms, much less are we able to compose songs which will supply their place. 6. If any man does not understand the Psalms, let him, under the direction of their divine Author, endeavor to ascertain their meaning. 7. The Psalms are not, in general, hard to understand. There is, indeed, an unfathomable depth of meaning in them; but no man finds fault with a well on account of its depth, if the water rises to the surface. There can be more divine truth, and true devotional sentiment found on the very face of the inspired Psalms, than can be obtained from those which are uninspired, when they are worn threadbare.

7. "That the Psalms are not adapted to New Testament worship."

Answer.—1. God never changes, and of course his praise is always the same.* 2. The Spirit of God was better able, in the days of David, to prepare songs suited to New Testament worship, than men are now.* 3. The Psalms everywhere speak most clearly of Christ and his Mediatorial work, kingdom, and glory; and are, by

* See Appendix, Note E.

† Note E.

the Apostles, copiously quoted in illustration of the way of salvation.* 4. They make less reference to the peculiarities of the old dispensation, than some books of the New Testament do. †

5. We have no Book of Psalms in the New Testament, and no command to prepare one. †

8. "That the Psalms contain sentiments adverse to the spirit of the Gospel; abounding with sharp invectives against personal enemies, and being, in many instances, expressive of revenge, &c."

Answer.—It is blasphemy.

9. "That the Psalms are not sufficiently copious to furnish a complete system of psalmody."

Answer.—1. God is no more glorious now than he was in Old Testament times; and if the Psalms were sufficient then for the expression of his praise, they are still sufficient. § 2. It is too much for any man to take upon himself to decide how copious a system of psalmody ought to be. ¶ 3. The Book of Psalms, actually contains an incomparably greater abundance and variety of matter than all the hymns which were ever composed by men. ¶

10. "That we have no good metrical translation of the Psalms."

Answer.—1. Let those who think we have no good metrical translation of the Psalms, improve some of the versions in use, or make a better one. It is surely easier to make a good translation of God's Psalms, than to compose songs better than those which He has made. 2. It is

* See Appendix, Note H.

† Note K.

‡ See Notes G. & L. § Note G. ¶ Note N.

better to sing in divine worship, an imperfect translation of those songs which God has composed, than to sing the best songs which men can make. 3. We have a good metrical translation of the Psalms. There are, in the Scottish version of the Psalms, it is true, some blemishes. It contains some uncouth forms of expression, and some words which are now obsolete; and its versification in many instances is far from being smooth. . . . But, for the most part, both the phraseology and the versification are very good; and it must be allowed by those who have examined it, that its fidelity to the original Hebrew is not much, if at all, inferior to that of the prose translation of the Psalms in our English Bible.*

These few observations are submitted to the judgment of the candid and intelligent reader. Though they may not be blessed as a means of reclaiming any from the practice of using human psalmody, yet if they serve to establish some in their attachment to the Psalms of inspiration, the writer will not consider his labor lost. Christian worshippers will one day see eye to eye, on this, as on all other important points. In the mean time, all the fearers of God can, with confidence, commit the interests of Christ's truth, so far as they are involved in this controversy, to the management of Him who brings order out of confusion, and light out of darkness; and praying, "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven," rest assured that very soon, in songs appointed by Jehovah's own

* See Appendix, Note M.

high authority, the devout worshipper will everywhere "give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name."*

"Praise ye the Lord: unto him sing
a new song, and his praise
In the assembly of his saints,
in sweet Psalms do ye raise.

Let Israel in his Maker joy,
and to Him praises sing:

Let all that Zion's children are,
be joyful in their King,

* See Appendix, Note N.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A.—PAGES 9 and 10.

The author, in his "Reply to Morton," pp. 103, 104, remarks on this point as follows:—

"More than 50 of these songs are, in their titles inscribed 'To the Chief Musician,' and many of them begin and end with the word *hallelujah*,—'praise ye the Lord.' David is, on account of his having been the chief instrument, used by the Spirit, in the preparation of these songs, called 'the sweet psalmist of Israel,' 2 Sam. 23. And these psalms were, during the times of inspiration, used in the stated services of the Temple, in the singing of Jehovah's praise. Some of these songs are found elsewhere in the Bible; and their insertion in the Book of Psalms cannot be rationally accounted for, except on the supposition that this book was designed as a complete system of psalmody for the church; and that these songs were, by the Spirit, judged necessary to such a system.

These facts are demonstrative proof, that the Book of Psalms was given for the specific end of being sung in God's stated worship."

NOTE B.—PAGE 10.

On this point we find the following in "Reply to Morton," p. 106:—

"If any thing is wanting to show that the Book of Psalms was given for the specific end of being employed in singing God's praise, it may be found in the command given by Hezekiah to the Levites, 2 Chron. 29: 30. 'Moreover Hezekiah the king and the princes commanded the Levites to sing praise unto the Lord with the words of David, and of Asaph the Seer.' The phrase, 'the words of David and of Asaph the Seer,' in this passage, evidently means the same thing which is commonly understood, in modern

times, by the Psalms of David, viz.: the Book of Psalms. And that the use of the Book of Psalms in singing God's praise was a permanent part of that reformation, is plain from the fact that it is added, v. 35, 'So the service of the house of the Lord was set in order.'

Of line 8 above - 7

NOTE C - PAGE 10

On page 104 of the "Reply to Morton" will be found the following on this point:—

We have no evidence that these songs (i.e. those found elsewhere in the Bible but not introduced into the Book of Psalms) were like those contained in the Book of Psalms, given for the purpose of being used in the stated worship of God. And as far as it regards the introducing of any thing into the worship of God the absence of divine appointment is equal to a prohibition.

NOTE D - PAGE 10

This point is more fully discussed by the author on page 166 of his "Reply to Morton" as follows:—

"It will, doubtless, strike the reader as an important fact, that, to most christians, it is an utter impossibility to 'sing God's praises in their own words,' since they are unable to compose poetry; and that, for this reason, when congregations or families wish to sing psalms, hymns, or spiritual songs, they are under the necessity of selecting from among those already prepared. Accordingly, the performance of an impossibility or leave them at the mercy of men who, in composing hymns for the use of the church, might imbue them with the poison of error, thus himself furnished his people with a copious and sufficient system of psalmody. On the other hand, all christians are capable of composing prayers; and accordingly, God has in the Bible furnished us with a collection of prayers.

It is true, there are in the Bible, many prayers, and more fragments of prayers; but while the Book of Psalms, as has already been shown, bears indubitable marks of having been designed as a system of psalmody for the church, the prayers and fragments of prayers contained in the word of God, do not bear the same, or any other, marks of having been designed as a system of prayer, to be used by God's people in expressing their wants; they have not even been collected into a separate book, as the psalms have, but are interspersed throughout the sacred volume, and found only in connection with the record of historical facts to which they have reference.

Besides, our prayers are descriptive of ourselves, our own sins, necessities, and desires; while our praises are, or ought to be, descriptive of God,—his perfections, purposes, and works. Now, if we are able to give some description of ourselves, it does not follow that we are equally competent to describe 'the invisible God;' or, in other words, that if we are capable of framing good prayers, we are equally capable of composing suitable songs of praise. It is true, we are to adore God, when we approach him in prayer; but this adoration is only secondary, incidental, and auxiliary to the duty of prayer, which consists in describing to God our needy condition, and expressing to him our desires. And if a man, while bowed at the throne of grace, were to spend the whole time in adoration, he would not have prayed at all. Besides, this adoration with which our prayers should be accompanied, is altogether distinct from the ordinance of praise. It is true, also, that there are many prayers and complaints in the Book of Psalms; but if we would sing these passages of the Psalms aright, we must view the most of them as prayers and complaints of the Lord Jesus Christ, and sing them in praise of his humiliation; and those which are not to be viewed as the language of our suffering Saviour, we must sing to the praise of Jehovah, as the hearer of prayer, and God of all consolation. And when, in singing the psalms, we can appropriate to ourselves the language of confession, complaint, and supplication, which they contain, as descriptive of our own experience,—the expressing of this, our experience, is secondary, incidental, and auxiliary to the duty of praise, which consists in the describing of God's

glory; and in this case, in the showing forth of the glory of his mercy, compassion, and bounty.

Again, our condition,—which we are to describe in prayer,—is always changing; and, therefore, one set of prayers would not always express our necessities: but God is always the same; and therefore the same songs are always descriptive of his glory, and suitable for his praise.

Whether the above considerations do not argue such a dissimilarity and disparity, between the ordinances of praise and prayer, as to make it unreasonable to infer the lawfulness of using uninspired composition in singing God's praise, from the allowed lawfulness of framing our own prayers, I leave to the judgment of the reflecting reader."

NOTE E.—PAGE 14.

The argument, derived from this passage, (Col. 3: 16,) for the use of a human psalmody, is answered more fully by the author, on p. 102 of the "Reply, &c.," where the following language is used:—

"Dr. Adam Clarke * * alters the punctuation of this verse, so as to make it read thus:—'Let the word of Christ dwell in you rightly; in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another; in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord.' And if this be the true reading of the text, it subverts at once, all the arguments for the use of an uninspired psalmody, founded upon any particular explanation of the phrase, 'the word of Christ.'

For my own part, I see no necessity for adopting Dr. Clarke's suggestion. There is a parallel passage, Eph. 5: 18, 19, 'be filled with the spirit; speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord.' The text, in dispute, Col. 3: 16, is 'Let the word of Christ dwell in you rightly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord.' The same duty

seems to be enjoined in both places. Our Saviour says, John 6: 63, 'the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit.' There is no difficulty, then, in supposing that the 'spirit,' spoken of, Eph. 5: 18, is the same thing with the 'word of Christ,' mentioned Col. 3: 16. By each of these expressions is evidently meant the *gospel*;—not in its letter, but in its spirit; the principles of the gospel in their living and life-giving energy. 'Be filled with the spirit' in the former passage, and 'let the word of Christ dwell in you,' in the latter, evidently mean 'be under the influence of the principles of the gospel.'

Again: the word translated 'one another,' in the latter passage, is the same which is translated 'yourselves,' in the former; and it is believed that no good reason can be assigned why it should not be so rendered here; thus, 'teaching and admonishing yourselves,' &c. Now, teaching and admonishing ourselves, in the psalms and hymns and spiritual songs contained in the Book of Psalms, may very well be enjoined as a means of bringing our hearts more and more under the power of the gospel; and also as an evidence of our having done so. If these observations be well founded, the plain import of the Apostolic injunction is this:—Cherish in your hearts the principles of the gospel, and as a means of obtaining this end, and at the same time as an evidence that you have this object before you, be much employed in singing God's praise, in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs; always performing this duty in such a manner as to teach and admonish yourselves, i. e., promote your own growth in knowledge and holiness; singing, not with the voice only, but also with the heart; and making melody not only to man, but to the Lord.

And if this be the Apostle's meaning, his injunction can certainly be as well obeyed in the use of the psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs contained in the Bible; as in the use of those composed by men."

Also on pp. 97—99, we have the following remarks on the same passage:—

"Strange as it may seem to the reader, some have argued for a human psalmody, from the three terms here used by the Apostle—psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs.

I notice this argument, . . . because it is a popular one, and one very likely to have weight with those who are guided by sound rather than sense.

It is no uncommon thing to apply to one thing two or three different names; for example, Ex. 34: 7, 'forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin.' There is, then, no reason, so far as the mere use of the terms is concerned, why any one of the Psalms of David may not, under different aspects, be viewed as a psalm, a hymn, and a spiritual song.

Again: if it were certain that these three terms are used by the Apostle to point out three several kinds of sacred songs, possessing, respectively, their distinctive properties, it remains to be proved that songs of these three different kinds are not contained in the Book of Psalms. And, in this connection, it may be remarked, that in the Hebrew Bible, the Book of Psalms is entitled *tehillim*, which, according to the best authorities, signifies hymns; some of the psalms are in their titles called *mizmor*—a psalm, while others are styled *shir*—a song. In the Greek translation used by the Apostles, some of the psalms bear the title of *psalmos*—a psalm; others, *ode*—a song; and others, which for the most part have no title in the Hebrew, have in this translation the title *alleluia*, which is a Hebrew word of the same derivation with *tehillim*, and is nearly, if not precisely equivalent to the Greek word *hymnos*—a hymn. To the word *songs* in the text before us, is prefixed the epithet *spiritual*, to distinguish the songs referred to from such songs as were profane, licentious, or even secular. The other two terms, *psalm* and *hymn*, did not need to be so qualified, since the terms themselves were not commonly understood by Jew, Christian, or Pagan, in a sense so comprehensive as to include any but songs used in religious worship.

Farther: when we consider that the first converts to Christianity were from among the Jews; that most of the preachers of Paul's time had been brought up in the Jewish religion; and that in order to bring even Pagans to embrace the gospel, it was necessary to make large reference to Jewish history, worship, and customs; we will be forced to conclude that Paul, in writing to the Colossians; respecting the Book of Psalms; would be well understood, in the use of Jewish phraseology. Now, we know that the Psalms

of David are called hymns by Philo the Jew, (De Mutat. Nom. p. 1062 et al.): that Josephus calls them songs and hymns, (Ant. Lib. 7, Cap. 12, sec. 3.): and that they are styled songs by the Son of Sirach, (Ecclus. 47: 8.) And we are sure that both Jews and Christians then, as now, called them *psalms*.

The reader, taking all these things into consideration, will decide for himself whether or not the use of the three terms, psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, in this apostolic injunction, authorizes the use of an uninspired psalmody."

NOTE F.—PAGE 14.

On this passage, (1 Cor. 14: 26,) the author remarks ("Reply, &c.," p. 109,) thus:—

"The disorder here reproved was, similar to that which is so common in some assemblies, in certain churches, in modern times, where you may hear one or two exhorting, three or four praying, half a dozen singing, and no inconsiderable number shouting,—all at the same time! For my own part, I acknowledge my utter inability to see why the persons, to whom Paul addressed this reproof, would not be as likely to break in upon the good order of their public meetings, by the unseasonable utterance of a psalm taken from the Old Testament collection, as by untimely reciting one, under a supernatural impulse of the Spirit."

NOTE G.—PAGES 15 and 16.

On page 116 of the "Reply," the author remarks:—

"It is too obvious to require any argument, that a collection of songs, which, in Old Testament times, was adequate to the expression of the praise of God, cannot now be defective as a system of psalmody; since the glory of Jehovah is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. Let it be remembered, too, that, since the completion of the Book of Psalms, God has neither prepared for us, nor hidden us prepare for ourselves, additional songs of praise."

NOTE H.—PAGE 16.

On page 115 he remarks:—

"Is not the Christ of whom we sing in the Book of Psalms, the same of whom we read in the New Testament, as having come in the flesh? Indeed the Psalms are much better adapted to the singing of God's praise, since the advent of Christ, than before that time." Take, as an example, Ps. 68: 18—

"Thou hast, O Lord, most glorious,

ascended up on high;

And in triumph victorious led

captive captivity;

Thou hast received gifts for men, &c."

NOTE K.—PAGE 16.

"On this point he remarks as follows ("Reply, &c.," pp. 112, 113.)

"After all that has been said" (by the advocates of human psalmody) "about typical allusions in the Book of Psalms, the attentive reader of the Bible will be surprised to find how few of the types of the Old Testament dispensation are mentioned in the Psalms at all; how seldom any of them are mentioned, and how often, in comparison; many of them are brought to notice in the New Testament. And now, that the light of the New Testament is shed upon the psalms, every worshipper, (if he has read the Bible at all,) can see Christ in every one of those sacred songs, as easily as in any part of the New Testament.

And it may be observed, in passing, that modern hymn-books are far from being free from typical allusions; and it is not easy to conceive why such allusions cannot be understood as well in the inspired psalms, as in uninspired hymns. Why should

On Jordan's stormy banks I stand, &c."

be easier of comprehension than

Do thou with hyssop sprinkle me, &c."

NOTE L.—PAGE 16.

"On pp. 107 and 108 of the "Reply" the following remarks occur:—

"The doctrine that there have been two churches, the Jewish and the Christian, has not the shadow of a foundation in the word of God. The establishment of the order of God's house, under the New Testament dispensation, is represented, Am. 9: 11, and Acts 15: 16, as the restoration, or rebuilding of the tabernacle of David which is fallen down,—not as the building of a new tabernacle for David. The one church is represented Eph. 2: 20, as being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets; Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. And Christ declares, Song 6: 9, 'My dove, my undefiled is but one.'—The church of Christ, then, retains her identity as a moral person, from the time of her organization in the Garden of Eden, till the remotest eternity; Hence, divine institutions, given to the church in one age, bind her in all successive ages, unless limited to a certain period in the terms of the appointment, divinely countermanded, or abrogated by the advent and sufferings of Christ. And even in these cases, whatever moral principle was involved in the institution, continues to bind the church continually.

Now, the terms of the appointment authorizing the use of the Book of Psalms in God's worship, do not limit to a definite period, the obligation which they impose. Or in other words, those circumstances which show so unequivocally that God gave the Book of Psalms to be used in the celebration of his praise, do not show that it was to be applied to that use only for a definite period of time. Nor has the appointment making the psalms of inspiration the psalmody of the church been countermanded. I defy any man to show me the verse or chapter in the New Testament, where this is done, either expressly, or by just and necessary inference. No more has this divine institution been abrogated by the coming of Christ. The advent of our Lord, and his fulfilling of the law, did away only those typical ordinances which were but shadows of good things to come. But such was not the use of the Book of Psalms in the celebration of God's praise; for this was not

shadowy but substantial,—not a carnal ordinance, but a constituent element of God's spiritual worship. And whatever effect time may have upon human things, it can never wear out the binding authority of the commands and appointments of the Lord Jehovah."

NOTE M.—PAGE 17.

On the Scotch Metrical version of the Psalms, he remarks as follows ("Reply," pp. 88, 89.) :—

"It may be asserted without fear of successful contradiction, that, take it all in all, it retains the meaning, spirit, life, energy, majesty, and sublimity of the Hebrew Psalms, as little impaired as does the prose translation. And even if the singing of the Psalms in divine worship, were left out of view, it would be difficult to tell whether the world would sustain more injury, in the loss of the Scotch Metrical version, or in the loss of the prose translation. Indeed, if the former were treated according to its merits, it would be inserted side by side with the latter, in every English Bible. It is freely granted that the Scotch version of the Psalms is not *perfect*, but the same thing is true of our most admirable English translation of the Bible: both may be corrected and amended and even superseded by translations still more excellent.

But no argument is needed to prove that the Book of Psalms, in Rouse's version, is the word of God; it presents to every reader the same internal evidence of its divine origin, as the Bible does in the common English translation; any man of sound mind can see it, and it would not be too much to assert that any man, who has any grace at all, will, upon inspection of the Psalms of David in Metre, discern them to be the language of the Holy Ghost, as readily and as certainly as a man of healthy palate will ascertain by tasting an apple whether it be sweet or sour.

After all, this whole dispute about Rouse's version of the Psalms, has nothing to do with the great question in dispute, for the question is not—should we sing Rouse's version? but should we sing only the Book of Psalms? If we have no good metrical version of the Psalms composed

by the Spirit, or no version of them at all, that is no reason why we should sing Psalms composed by men. Let those who think that Rouse, as they often contemptuously style the Scotch Metrical version, is no translation of the Psalms, prepare a translation of them; if they think it is a *bad* translation, let them improve it, or make a better one.

NOTE N.—PAGE 16.

On p. 115 of the "Reply, &c.," the following remarks will be found:—

"Having considered attentively all the arguments against the sufficiency of the inspired psalms, as a system of psalmody, I must be allowed to express my opinion that the Book of Psalms contains a much greater abundance and variety of matter than all the hymn-books that men have ever made. They describe the glory of God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; they lead us to the contemplation of the divine glory, as it is unfolded in the works of creation, providence, and redemption; they present to our view, the glory of the person, offices, and works of Christ Jesus, the great Mediator; they express the praises of our Redeemer's humiliation and exaltation, of his sacrifice and his merits, of his grace and his vengeance, of his conflicts and his triumphs; and they shew us the divine glory from almost every possible point of view. At one time we behold it from the closet, at another from the sanctuary; at one time from the sphere of our worldly occupations, at another from the confines of Jehovah's altar; at one time from the depths of humiliation, sorrow, and distress, at another from the heights of spiritual enjoyment, triumph, and gladness."

"Necessity compels to the use of a liturgy of psalms: the Lord does not distribute gifts for inditing extempore psalms: He hath given us *spiritual songs*, of divine inspiration: *hymns*; from the book of *Psalms*, were used in social worship, by the Head of the Church: doctrinal and experimental religion are with infallible accuracy blended together in the Psalms: they are wisely adapted to the state of the Church, and of each individual in all possible circumstances—the pious Jews sung them, the disciples used them in Christ's own presence—they were used in the apostolic churches: God has remarkably blessed the use of the book of Psalms, for the support of vital godliness in every succeeding period: it is to be used in public and private worship, until the end of time."—*Dr. McLeod's "Eccles. Catechism,"* Q. 150.

"Singing of psalms was enjoined under the Old Testament as a part of the ordinary worship of God, and it is distinguished from ceremonial worship, Ps. 69: 30, 31. It is not abrogated under the New Testament, but rather confirmed, Eph. 5: 19; Col. 3: 16. It is sanctioned by the example of Christ and his apostles; Matt. 26: 30; Acts 16: 25. The psalms of David were especially intended by God for the use of the church in the exercise of public praise under the former dispensation; and they are equally adapted to the use of the church under the present dispensation. Although the apostles insist much upon the abolition of ritual institutions, they give no intimation that the psalms of David are unsuitable for gospel-worship; and had it been intended that they should be set aside in New Testament times, there is reason to think that another psalmody would have been provided in their room. In the book of Psalms there are various passages which seem to indicate that they were intended by the Spirit for the use of the church in all ages. 'I will extol thee, my God, O King,' says David, 'and I will bless thy name for ever and ever,' Ps. 145: 1. 'This intimates,' as the excellent Henry remarks, 'that the psalms which David penned should be made use of in praising God by the church to the end of time.'"—*Dr. Shaw's "Exposition of the Confession of Faith,"* Chap. XXI. Sect. V.