

THE

# EVANGELICAL GUARDIAN.

---

VOL. II.

MARCH, 1845.

No 10

---

*For the Evangelical Guardian.*

[CONCLUDED]

## UNITY AND INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

But the whole history of the Roman Church is at war with her claims to unity and infallibility. She is not only not agreed as to the seat of her infallibility, and consequently as to what shall constitute her Supreme infallible head; but she has also been rent into divisions by rival claimants to the Papacy, and by opposing Councils; and such facts militate against her claims either to unity or infallibility. A few prominent incidents will suffice to illustrate.

In the year 1130, the College of Cardinals elected two successors to Honorius II. deceased, to fill the chair of Peter,—one party elected Gregory, a Cardinal deacon of St. Angelo, known in the papal list as Innocent II; the other party elected Peter, the Son of Leo, a Roman prince, who took the name of Anacletus II. Anacletus was supported by the Roman Church in Italy, and Innocent was sustained by the body of the Church out of Italy; the former had his residence in Rome; the latter in France. Again in the year 1159, after the death of Adrian IV, the Cardinals were divided into two factions, and one faction chose Rowland, Bishop of Sienna to the Pontificate, who assumed the title of Alexander III, and the other faction selected Octavian, Cardinal of St. Cecilia, known as Victor IV. Frederic I. surnamed Barbarossa, who had quarrelled with Adrian, espoused the cause of Victor, and summoned a Council at Pavia 1160, which decided that Victor was the true Bishop of Rome. Victor was acknowledged to be the supreme head of the Church in Germany and Italy; and Alexander, who was the choice of the majority of the electing conclave had his Papal jurisdiction principally confined to France, where he

VOL. II:—SIG. 23

is achieved and done, as his joy, in which we are permitted to share. With such a work before us, and such results as our ultimate reward and portion, he calls us to take part in the work, with the assurance that every one shall receive a reward according to his own labor. With our eye fixed on the future joy, he allows us to deny ourselves, to labor, to make sacrifices, and bear his cross, just in proportion to our faith and love; all proceeding spontaneously from our ardent affection for him, and his cause, and the souls of men. In this blessed enterprise, he lays out before us, not only this world, which is the field in which he works and employs us, but heaven and hell, with their eternal realities. Heaven, the dwelling of all who become holy and happy, on the one hand; and hell, with the wicked and the lost, on the other, God reveals to us as the final destination of every soul of man. It is not, then, a mere estimate of our doing a certain amount of labor, or giving a certain amount of contribution, or bearing a certain weight of sorrow and affliction, that is to regulate our action, or our suffering; but it is the worth of the soul, the bliss of heaven, the pains of hell, the example of God, angels and good men, that are to be always before us. Such are the themes of thought, the expanding, ennobling, and invigorating realities, which are to move before us. And, with these in view, God allows us to judge and determine how great shall be the amount that we shall consecrate to this noble, angelic, god-like enterprise. The purpose and the act are to be our own in the sight of God, with the glory and joy that are set before us.

Such is the divine method.---*Rev. Dr. Yale.*

---

*From the Charleston Observer.*

LETTER VI.

**PSALMODY---DIVINE AUTHORITY FOR THE EXCLUSIVE USE  
OF DAVID'S PSALMS IN THE WORSHIP OF GOD UNDER  
THE NEW TESTAMENT DISPENSATION.**

*My Christian Friends.*---In my last letter I closed the argument for the exclusive use of David's Psalms under the Old Testament dispensation, and proved upon Mr C's own principles, as well as by various other arguments, that the Psalms of David were used exclusively in Divine worship, under the old dispensation. We expect to en-

ter, on this letter, on the argument for the exclusive use of these Psalms under the Gospel dispensation. Before proceeding, however, with the discussion, it may be proper to take a note of what my brother has said touching the use of instrumental music under the old economy.

He remarks, (No. 3.) "This Divine appointment (2 Chron. 29: 25,) has never been abrogated," and he asks how can we cast stones at our less guilty brethren, if we live in open violation of this Divine appointment? As this matter is not necessarily connected with the point in dispute, I will not discuss it at present, but will give two or three quotations from the "Organ Cause," to show that the "appointment" relative to the use of instrumental music has been abrogated, and that consequently, in refusing to employ musical instruments in worship, we are not more "guilty" than those who refuse to use David's Psalms, the appointment respecting which, we hope to shew, has not been annulled. The Glasgow Presbytery of Scotland, in which the subject of Instrumental Music in Divine worship was fully investigated in 1808, concludes that "circumcision, sacrifice, instrumental music, and the Temple---the whole of these institutions must stand or fall together." Organ Cause, page 92. Again, "it seems to be acknowledged by all descriptions of Christians, that among the Hebrews, instrumental music, in the public worship of God, was essentially connected with sacrifice." page 93. Again, "instrumental music belonged to the Temple service, and was never employed in the Synagogue." page 98. If the above opinions are correct, (and Mr C. may prove them false if he can, at his leisure,)---if instrumental music was essentially connected with sacrifice, then it follows that when the law of sacrifice was annulled at the death of Christ, the Divine appointment respecting musical instruments in worship was likewise abrogated. Our Christian friends then who reject entirely the use of David's Psalms, or those who use only a portion of them badly imitated, are not "less guilty" in this matter, than we are, touching the use of musical instruments in worship. I may therefore proceed to "cast stones"---a thankless office, but not without its benefits.

Let me here observe that my friend has fallen into the habit of saying that such and such a thing is so, "as we have seen," leaving the careless and inattentive reader to suppose that he had previously and indubitably established the position to which he refers with so much confidence, when such is not the case. For example, near the commencement of No. 5, he says that the Psalms of David were used by

the Apostles in their attendance upon the Synagogue service; and very soon after, in the same number, he observes, "we cannot imagine how an occasional attendance upon the Synagogue service, in which the Psalms of David were used, but not exclusively, *as had been seen*, could prove," &c. Now where had it been seen or shewn that the Psalms of David were not used exclusively in the Synagogue service? Certainly not in any thing that Mr C. had previously advanced, and I query if it would not puzzle him to see it or shew it any where else. In Robinson's Calmet, Fried. Connections, Godwyn's Moses and Aaron, and in the Comprehensive Commentary, vol. 6 page 146 in all of which there is a particular account given of the services of the Synagogue, singing Psalms of any kind is not given as a part of these services, much less is it said that David's Psalms were not used exclusively. I do not say that singing praise was no part of the Synagogue service, but sure I am that Mr C. has neither seen nor shewn in this discussion that David's Collection was not used exclusively in that service.

Again, with reference to the hymn Christ sang on the Mount, or previous to his departure for the Mount of Olives, Mr C. (No. 5.) after a process of very inconclusive reasoning, comes to this strong conclusion---"beyond all doubt, therefore, *as we think*, Christ bid his disciples to sing some hymn---some new song---appropriate to this first beginning of the Gospel economy." And he informs us that "such a hymn has been preserved among the Apocryphal writings and attributed to this occasion." Well, it may be so, but is his "*as we think*," and his "Apocryphal hymn," proof that Christ did not sing one of David's Psalms, while he is said to have "sung an hymn?"---To be sure they are; for a little farther on in the same number, (No 5) he says, "the Church of God, *as we have seen*, never was confined exclusively to the Psalms of David in the praise of God;" and of the same connection, and under the same "*as we have seen*," he informs us that it was repeatedly foretold that the New Testament Church should employ *new songs* in God's worship---and that "Christ, in the very opening of this new dispensation, gave to his disciples an illustration of the fulfilment of these prophecies." It is such proof and such reasoning that helps him to the conclusion that what I had said respecting this "hymn," sung by Christ and his disciples, "is beyond controversy wrong!"

He demands of us "positive proof," and "proof as strong as holy writ," for the exclusive use of David's Psalms under the New dispensation; and when we had furnished an "indubitable example" of

the fact, he gives us "we think," and "we have seen," and his "Apocryphal hymn," and what Grotius thought, as his proof against the example. Mr C. must excuse his readers if they cannot "see" his proofs as clearly as he appears to have seen them; for

"His optics must be good I ween,  
To see a thing that can't be seen."

Permit me here to present two or three *admissions* which my friend makes respecting the use of David's Psalms as we may find it convenient to call them up occasionally in our progress. He makes some important admissions in his third and fourth negative particulars respecting these Psalms, (No. 2) which we pass at present. In No. 3 he says, "that these Psalms, (David's,) were *inspired for the use of the Church in all ages*, we certainly do believe." Of course he does not mean *exclusive use*. A little farther on in the same number he observes. "doubtless from David's time the Psalms came into *general use*, but they were not compiled into this collection *by inspired authority* until the time mentioned;" that is, until Ezra's time. While my brother makes these and other important admissions respecting the use of David's Psalms, I make not a particle of admission relative to the use of human hymns in the worship of God, but repudiate the whole system of human Psalmody--in this we claim some vantage-ground.

Let us now proceed to the argument in favor of the exclusive use of the Psalms of David under the New Testament dispensation.

1. In the first place, I remark that these Psalms are to be used *exclusively* in Divine worship in the New Testament Church, from the fact that they were so used in the Old Testament Church, and no change has been ordered, or can be shown to have taken place, by Divine authority, at the commencement of the New economy.

The Old Testament Church was confined *exclusively*, "as we have seen," and as we have demonstrated too, to the use of David's Psalms in the regular instituted worship of God. We do not deny that other inspired Psalms or songs were sometimes sung by individuals, or by a collection of individuals on particular occasions, such as the songs of Moses, Deborah, and Hannah, already alluded to, but we do deny that such songs were ever sung in God's instituted worship after the Psalms of David were composed and compiled into a "Book," whether that was in David's, Hezekiah's, or Ezra's time.

Nor would we object at all to individuals or congregations at this day singing newly composed hymns, *provided they were inspired*, but

even then we would protest against their introducing such *inspired songs of praise* into the Psalter, or as a part of the standing praise of the Church, unless they had Divine authority, as Ezra had, for so doing; and much more do we protest against the introduction of human compositions as the Church's standing praise, without such Divine permission. For example, should God inspire any one now living, say Dr. Miller of Princeton, to compose a hymn on some special occasion, it would surely be his duty to sing it, but after it was sung by him and those interested in the occasion, it would then require *Divine permission* for him, or the Presbyterian Church, of which he is one of the most distinguished members, to introduce his inspired hymn as a part of the standing praise of the Church; for if one man was allowed to introduce his *inspired* hymns as a part of God's praise without Divine permission, how many would claim the right of obtruding their *uninspired* effusions? Or if they did not claim the right themselves, others would claim it for them. How many? We know not but the Presbyterian Hymn-book now before us is made up of psalms and hymns from more than *fifty* individuals, some from Wesley, and some from Toplady! and some from almost every quarter, except *Rouse!*

Psalms and hymns then, should not only be composed by inspiration, but also admitted by the same authority into the Psalmody of the Church. God required this under the Old dispensation---He also requires the same now; and as there is no book of praises in existence which has been composed by the Spirit, and collected by "inspired authority," but the Psalms of David, the consequence is that the New Testament Church is to be confined exclusively to this authorized collection, as the Old Testament Church was. Admitting, for the sake of illustration, that the Apostles and others at the commencement of the Christian dispensation, composed new hymns under the Spirit's inspiration, yet as these hymns have not been incorporated, *by Divine authority*, with the Psalms of David, which Mr. C. admits "were inspired for the use of the Church in all ages"---as they have not been collected into a separate book, and authorized to be sung---and as, in fact, no such hymns, either collected or scattered, are to be found, the conclusion is inevitable that the matter of Psalmody stands now just as it did at the close of the Old dispensation. As the people of God were to be confined then to the use of David's Psalms in Divine worship, so are they now; and we now demand from our friends the same that they have asked at our hands, viz "plain precept," "positive proof---plainly, clearly, and undeniably expressed,"

for the *change* they have thought fit to make in the matter of Psalmody. It may be said, however, that this argument rests upon the supposition that the former argument on which it is based is conclusive. Admitted. We have proved, "as we think," not by the Apocrypha, nor by the opinion of Grotius, or any learned author, but by the Bible, and by fair and logical reasoning from the Bible, and also upon the principles of our opponent, that the Psalms of David were divinely authorised to be used exclusively in Divine worship under the Old dispensation, and the matter stands proved until it can be disproved; and if it cannot be disproved, then the argument now advanced is good and conclusive in favor of the exclusive system.

The Old Testament Church was confined exclusively to the use of David's Psalms in her worship---Christ and his disciples, who were members of that Church, and who conformed to her ritual, made no change, as we shall see, on the subject of Psalmody; and from this we maintain that the Gospel Church is to be confined exclusively to the inspired Psalter. And here let me ask, *by what authority* have the Churches of Christ set aside these Divine songs *entirely*, as some have done, or for an imitation of them, as others, or for mere scraps of them in metre, as we find to be the case in the Episcopal book of common Prayer? Is not God saying to the Churches by the present general agitation of this subject, "Who hath required this (change) at your hands?" Who? Echo answers "who?"---for all else are silent.

My health, which has not been good for several months, is now too delicate to allow me to pursue the subject further in this letter.---Should Providence grant health and help I will attempt to continue the discussion next week; but if not allowed to resume it, enough has already been said to show that the advocates for the exclusive use of David's Psalms in Divine worship, are right---that they have Divine authority, and "indubitable example," for the exclusive use of these Psalms---while the advocates of *human hymns* can find neither plain nor doubtful precept nor example, *from the Bible*, for the use of such hymns in the worship of God. Yours truly,

Lindo, Abbeville, S. C., Feb. 3, 1843.

W. R. H.

---

Hundreds and thousands of persons are now employed throughout the Christian world in carrying among the destitute, tracts, Bibles,