

# A REPLY

TO

## MORTON ON PSALMODY:

TO WHICH IS ADDED

A CONDENSED ARGUMENT FOR THE EXCLUSIVE  
USE OF AN INSPIRED PSALMODY.

BY

ROBERT J. DODDS,

MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL

IN THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his  
own conceit.—Prov. 26: 5.

PITTSBURGH:  
KENNEDY & BROTHER, PUBLISHERS, THIRD STREET.  
1851.

## ERRATA.

The author not having had an opportunity of correcting the proof sheets of the first part of this work, the reader will please correct the following errors.

Page 17, line 9, for "cant," read "rant."

" " " 22, for "invite," read "indite."

" 23, " 4, for "illiberality," read "liberality."

" 33, "1-2, for "the divine," read "a divine person, the"

" 34, " 8, after the word *dead*, insert "And when, Bro.

Morton, could we learn from any book in the Bible that the son of *Joseph* and Mary attested his Messiahship by raising Lazarus from the dead."

Page 42, line 11, for "religion," read "religious faith."

" 44. " 22, for "Lord," read "word."

## P R E F A C E .

---

THE work to which the following pages are intended as a reply, purports to be a review of Dr. Pressly on Psalmody, by Rev. George Morton, of the Presbyterian Church. Mr. Morton would, so far as I am concerned, have remained forever unnoticed, had he not made a foul attack upon that version of the Psalms which is sung in the church to which I have the honor to belong, and in sundry other Presbyterian Churches of high respectability.

I am far from having so low an opinion of Mr. Morton's readers as to imagine that any of them are so ignorant or stupid, as to be unable to discover the true character of his statements respecting our metre Psalms, if they would but take the trouble to make the investigation. But there are some who are too charitable to suspect that a man of his standing, would, for the purpose of making out a favorite position, heap together assertions utterly untrue in point of fact; others, who never take the trouble to inquire into the truth of what they read; and others who, wishing above all things to have the Scottish

version of the Psalms of David brought into discredit, wisely refrain from examining anything which is said against them, lest the pleasing information should prove untrue: I thought it good, for the accommodation of these three classes of readers, to hold up Mr. Morton in a light so conspicuous, that they cannot fail to see him in his true character.

In my animadversions upon Mr. Morton's strictures on Dr. Pressly's excellent work on Psalmody, my design is, not to defend Dr. Pressly,—for he needs no defence in this case,—but to show how much credit is due to Mr. Morton for candor and judgment. The Dr.'s work speaks for itself.

Towards Mr. Morton I cherish no ill-feeling; nor am I conscious that in the following Reply I do him any injustice. If any one is disposed to censure the tone of my strictures, the character of the work which I have under review, is my apology. I would have been very greatly pleased if Mr. Morton had written a book which might, with propriety, have been answered in a different style.

It is my sincere wish and earnest prayer, that if the principles advocated by Mr. Morton should have the ill-success to fall a prey to the flames of that fire which “will try every man's work of what sort it is,—he himself may be saved;” at least “so as by fire.”

# REPLY, & C.

---

## PART FIRST.

### A GLANCE AT THE GENERAL FEATURES OF THE WORK.

---

#### CHAPTER I.

##### The Literary Character of the Work.

THE work before us, viewed as a mere literary production, possesses something charmingly peculiar. The learned author, disdaining to confine himself to the vocabulary of his predecessors, has, out of Greek materials, manufactured for his own special use, two beautiful tri-syllables—"Neodism" and "*Psalmionism*," which he defines thus:—"Neodism, from *neos* and *o-dee*—pleads for a new Psalmody. Psalmionism, from *psalmos* and *monos*—pleads for the exclusive use of the book of Psalms." This piece of service done to the English language, will be appreciated by all those who, like Mr. M., find their mother tongue too meagre to afford them the means of expressing all the thoughts which spring up in their prolific minds:—more especially if they take into consideration the fact, that these words came

into our language, not alone, but accompanied by their respective derivatives, "Neodist" and "Neodistic" "Psalmonist" and "Psalmonistic."

His whole work abounds with such elegant forms of expression as—"It looks like as though"—"as to the manner in which the Doctor sets aside the argument contained in the passage is this"—"it testimony and law"—"nothing nor nobody," &c. To lay before our readers all those passages in which Mr. M. exhibits a similar elegance of diction, would be an endless task; nothing less, indeed, than to transfer to our pages a very considerable part of his book.

In a controversial writer and especially one who, like Mr. M., deals much in the exposition of scripture, no qualification can be more commendable than perspicuity. Let the following passages serve to exemplify the success enjoyed by our author, in adapting to the capacity of the "plainest people," (p. 3,) the information which he is pleased to communicate—p. 92. Again: though a duty enjoined by participial language, is always subordinate to a principal duty, yet it may be principal to a third duty, which is subordinate to itself." What can be plainer than that? And yet, perhaps it is excelled in perspicuity by the following, p. 191; "Doctor, do you not know, that prophetic language always speaks of something future, no matter what tense the verb may be in, whether it speaks of something that has occurred, is occurring or will occur?"—Surely this is "milk for babes."

The strength and activity of our author's mind, as well the dignity of his modes of thought, and his skill in argumentation, are sufficiently evinced from the following specimen of extremely close reasoning, p. 150; "And this shows that his (Dr. Pressly's)

notion is utterly without foundation—no more defensible than that “the moon is made of green cheese !” He could offer as much proof for the one as he has done for the other, and it would be a good deal like what he has done, were he to start with this proposition: “The moon is beautiful, and is made of green cheese ; and labor through eighteen pages to prove that she is *beautiful*, and then occupy only four pages in proving that she is nothing but a cheese. In proving what needs no proof his arguments are abundant: but in proving what needs proof his arguments are very scanty. Yet he could offer the same kind, and more abundant proof for the moon being cheese, than he offers for his own notion. His own notion *appears* to be the correct one ; and the moon *appears* to be a cheese. A cheese is of a circular form, and the moon *appears* to be circular. A cheese is a kind of whitish color ; and the moon appears to be a kind of whitish color. A cheese has a flat face ; and the moon appears to have a flat face. And cheeses vary in size and the moon *appears* to vary in size too. And the proof is conclusive,—yes, more abundant, and more conclusive, than what the Doctor has offered in support of his own favorite notion.” It would certainly be very wicked for a man who can reason in a style so masterly, to bury his talent. But Mr. M. (to his praise be it spoken,) shows no disposition to inflict upon the world so great a calamity. If the passage to which our attention has just been directed, is worthy of admiration, the following should not be read without rapture: “Suppose you had obtained a fine horse, and you would take off his head ; and then cause him to grow all over with feathers ; would he be the same you received? Yes, he would, all but ;—all but what? All but the absence of the

head, and the presence of the feathers, and the want of life. And these changes make him to be not the one you obtained. That one had a head, but this one has none : that one had no feathers, but this one has : that one was living, but this one is dead. Before you have the *same*, you must put on the head, take away the feathers, and give him life. And thus it is with Rouse's paraphrase of the 18th Psalm : he has taken away the head ; he has put on the feathers : and he has killed it !" (p. 30.) Any word spoken in commendation of this sublime passage would be worse than lost.

As Mr. M. writes for the "plainest people," he for the most part, curbs his genius, and restrains it from flights too lofty and sublime ; but ever and anon it breaks over the bounds assigned to it, and mounts to its proper level. You have an instance of this on p. 80 ;— " You pass along the \* pleasant vale beautified with the various flowers that smile forth from besides your path. You see before you on a gentle elevation, the † verdant grove in all its inviting and luxuriant loveliness. Delighted you enter ; and as you pass up, ‡ the ear is charmed with melody and song, poured forth by the feathered songsters of the wood. You reach the || opening above ; and lo ! at your feet there lies § a spacious chrystal fountain. The margin, all around, is adorned with the choicest verdure and bloom. The myrtle, palm, and amaranth, the eglantine and rose. And the clear rocky bottom \* of gems and gold, pours forth a constant, pure, pellucid stream, in that sparkling fountain, ever flowing, and for ever full. With pleasing admiration you stand and gaze into the clear sparkling

\*What vale? †What grove? ‡Up what? ||What opening?

§When did fountains first begin to lie? \*Mark that; it is not the fountain itself, but the *bottom* of it, that pours forth the stream.



pool ; and the sweet voice of the water nymph † calls you to drink. You quaff it, and O how refreshing ! how exhilarating ! how healing !” Our author’s fancy takes such liberty here, as evidently to carry him above the subject of Psalmody altogether ; and yet the great mass of his readers are so utterly destitute of feeling and sense, as to consider this transporting passage nothing better than a piece of bombastical cant.

Mr. M. is not one of those morose and sullen spirits, who disdain all jests and flows of humor ; and yet, (to his honor be it spoken,) his sallies of wit, are of that solemn, grave and serious kind which best becomes a minister of the gospel, having no tendency whatever to provoke the reader’s mirth, but rather serving to deepen his gravity. It were needless to give specimens of his wit, since they abound on almost every page of his work ; and the reader will easily distinguish them by the accompanying notes of admiration.

He is a poet too ;—see the following, p. 26.

“ He would invite ; and forged a wight,  
To fit in tight and make it right.”

and the following, p. 29 :

“ His human wisdom hard he plies,  
Anon came forth the words, *that flies* ;  
And then to these he adds, *that lies* ;  
And thus his rhyme together ties.”

It is much to be regretted that a poet so gifted, had not laid the world under obligations to him, by publishing a volume or two of poetry. After all, it

†The chrystal fountain, our author tells us, is the word of God ; but what is meant by the *water nymph* in this sublime allegory?

is to be hoped that the judicious reader will conclude that the two specimens given above,—flaming as they do with poetic fire,—are almost as valuable as a volume of the same sort. Perhaps Mr. M. will take compassion on the church and furnish her with a book of hymns, of his own composition.

Indeed, to sum up all his virtues in one view, he possesses the true secret of book-making; viz: the art of expanding a few select ideas, into a volume of considerable size. Every reader will see that if our author had not paid some attention to this important rule, but like your impolitic scribblers, had always ceased writing when he had exhausted his ideas, his book instead of containing 248 pages, would not have amounted to one-fifth of that bulk; and, as a matter of course, would not easily have been sold for fifty cents per copy.

## CHAPTER II.

The Spirit in which the Author Conducts his Review.

It is delightful to witness in a writer on religious controversy those marks of courtesy, candor and honesty, which evince a desire to arrive at the truth on the point in dispute.

How far Mr. M. has succeeded in mitigating the harshness of controversy, by observing the principles of honor and christian courtesy, in his work on Psalmody, a very few extracts from that remarkable book, will serve to show.

On p. 20 he is pleased to express his opinion of the following stanza, in our metrical version of the second Psalm :

“Thou shalt as with a weighty rod  
Of iron break them all,  
And as a potter's shred thou shalt  
Them dash in pieces small.”

It will be remembered that the translation of the Psalms from which this passage is taken, is that prepared by Sir Francis Rouse, Esq., M. P., a distinguished Hebrew scholar; revised successively by the Westminster Assembly and General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and for the last two centuries used by the best and greatest men in the Church of Christ, in the celebration of God's praise. And, apart from the sanction of such high authority,

the sentiments contained in this verse, and the manner in which they are expressed, must seem to most readers to be at once strong, beautiful and sublime. Mr. M's. comment on the place, however, is,—“What a sublime idea Rouse presents! The idea of dashing a weighty iron rod against a piece of crockery-ware! What a *striking* figure! It just took Rouse to do it. And he carries out the idea; for he says ‘them dash in *pieces small*.’ Of course, when the *piece* is dashed in *pieces*, the *pieces*, will be small! But there is no such small affair in the Psalms of inspiration. It is original with Rouse.” The reader will perceive that in the verse of the Psalm alluded to, there is nothing about “dashing a weighty iron rod against a piece of crockery-ware.” It contains, indeed, a prediction that Christ's enemies shall be broken as with a weighty rod of iron, and that like a potsherd they shall be broken to shivers; but the idea of dashing a weighty iron rod against a piece of crockery-ware, whether it be low or “sublime,” is altogether original with Rev. G. Morton. His exclamation, “what a *striking* figure!” would doubtless be an excellent pun, did it not carry on its face a contemptuous sneer, aimed at the word of God: for the reader will perceive by reference to the prose version of Ps. 2: 9, and our Saviour's allusion to the place, Rev. 2: 27, that in neither is the figure any less *striking*, than in the stanza respecting which Mr. M. makes himself so merry. And mark, with how much deference he speaks of Sir Francis Rouse, “It just took Rouse to do it,”—“there is no such small affair in the Psalms of inspiration. It is altogether original with Rouse.” Indeed, to speak so contemptuously of so great a scholar as Sir Francis Rouse, and of the Westminster Assembly and General Assembly of the Church

of Scotland, who revised and approved his version of the Psalms, would be worthy of the severest censure, were it not for the admitted fact that Mr. M., who does so, is "*the man and wisdom shall die with him.*" Again, p. 35; "And Rouse says, 'He let out the southern wind *to go,*'—to go where?—Perhaps to go and inspire Rouse." Indeed this kind of humor is characteristic of his whole work; and especially of his second chapter, in which he attempts to destroy the authority of our metrical version of the book of Psalms; and which, by the way, contains 44 pages. This scurrilous and abusive treatment of Sir Francis Rouse and the Church of Scotland, has very much the appearance, it must be confessed, of causeless, deep and impotent malice against "*The Psalms of David in Metre,*" and those who use them in the celebration of God's praise. But we ought to be cautious how we impugn any man's motives; and perhaps those of Mr. M. in this instance are of the holiest description. It may be that the fermentation of certain malignant humors in his heart had filled him with a violent spleen against all "*Psalmionism*" and "*Psalmionists*;" and that he wrote his second chapter, merely by way of unburdening his mind of its filthy load in order that he might prosecute the remainder of his work with the purer feelings.—Probably he thought that it would have been presumptuous in a mortal man, to have attempted to imitate the example of Michael the Archangel, who, when he disputed with the Devil, about the body of Moses, did not dare bring a railing accusation against him;—if indeed, he does not consider Sir Francis Rouse worse than the Devil.—Or, perhaps he foresaw that this low, scornful, sneering way of writing, would render his book popular with his "*Neodistic*" brethren.

Mr. M. like every other prudent controversialist, takes the precaution not to present his argument, till he has done what he can to prepare the mind for its reception. How fair the means are, to which he has recourse for this end, the candid reader will judge, after the perusal of a few extracts. Mark the following, p. 12 :—“There seems to be some relation between a fondness for Rouse’s Psalms, and a want of liberality for the cause of Christ. In the compass of my own knowledge, I could refer to the case of several individuals, for the verification of what I say. They are great sticklers for Rouse ; but very stingy in their contributions. I know one very partial to the ‘Old Psalms,’ who has several times left the church, during public worship, just because the pastor or perhaps an agent brought before the congregation the cause of Missions, or some other benevolent object.” Now this attempt to fasten upon a large class of christians, a failing which has been observed in a few individuals belonging to that class, would, under ordinary circumstances, be esteemed to the last degree illiberal, base and unjust.—There are “*in*” the compass of Mr. M.’s “knowledge, several individuals” who “are great sticklers for Rouse, but very stingy in their contributions.” And he knows “one,”—(yes, no less than ONE,) “very partial to the ‘old Psalms,’ who has several times left the church during public worship ; just because the pastor, or perhaps an agent brought before the congregation the subject of missions or some other benevolent object.”—And what is the conclusion ? one which none but our learned author could draw from such scanty premises :—that “there seems to be some relation between a fondness for Rouse’s Psalms, (that is the *Psalms of inspiration*,) and a *want of liberality* for

the cause of Christ!'" One would think that it would have been bad enough to conclude that there was "some relation between a fondness for the *Bible Psalms*, and a want of illiberality for the cause of Christ," if upon a careful examination of well authenticated statistics, it had been found that those who confine themselves to an inspired Psalmody, contribute less for the support of the gospel, *in proportion to their numbers*, than those who use a Psalmody of human manufacture. But far be it from me, that I should try Mr. M. by the same rule which I would apply to others;—perhaps he had reasons known to himself, for drawing from the unimportant and insignificant statement which he has made, an inference so disrespectfully to the Psalms of David. However, after what he has said himself, he will not be offended if I state some things which he knows to be facts; that there are not only "several individuals," but thousands, who belong to those churches in which uninspired hymns are used, who hold slaves,—thousands who play cards,—thousands who travel, visit, read the newspapers and write letters on the Lord's day.—That not *one-tenth* of those who are members in his "Neodistic" fraternity ever worship God in their families.—That there are large communities of the users of human Psalmody, who deny the divinity of Christ, and large communities of them, who deny a future state of punishment. Our author well knows "one," not very "partial to the 'Old Psalms,' a minister of the Gospel in the Prysbyterian Church, who *preaches against returning thanks after meals*, and practices accordingly; and I can inform him of another who is probably the most abandoned profane swearer in Pennsylvania,—who by his profanity has gained for himself the epithet of *swearing*

———, or, Devil ———, who is, nevertheless, a member in regular standing, in a “Neodistic” church, and served with acceptance one term in the eldership. The reader, in drawing his inference, may either adopt Mr. M.’s method shown above, or follow a course of his own.

Our author, on p. 11, gives further proof of his candor. He says, “In the former class, (“Neodistic” churches,) there is undoubtedly quite as much vital piety and true godliness, as in the latter, (“Psalmonistic” churches,) and we have abundant evidence that this is the belief, especially of the Associate Reformed Church: because she is very willing to receive accessions from the ranks of the Presbyterians. Even those who are not in good and regular standing in the Presbyterian Church, are very gladly received into her bosom; showing that Presbyterians, of an inferior quality are considered *as* good material for building up the Associate Reformed Church.”—But why, (the reader will naturally inquire,) does Mr. M. single out the Associate Reformed Church from among several others equally Psalmonistic, and aim at her this underhanded stab? Is this fair? Oh, yes, reader: I can easily convince you that nothing can be fairer.—You see, Mr. M. is writing against Dr. Pressly; and Dr. Pressly is Prof. Theol. in the A. R. Church. As stratagem is allowable in war, so in religious controversy, all policy however cowardly, base, and dishonest, ought to be not only tolerated but applauded; and what more politic in reasoning against Dr. Pressly, than to assert that the A. R. C. in which he teaches divinity, receives into her fellowship disorderly members of the General Assembly Church; and to *insinuate* that this is her common practice? It is true that he has not *proved* that this matter is as he



represents it; but I think nothing the less of him for that: for how could he prove it, since *it is not true*. Besides, we should remember that it is no part of his policy to prove things.

After the taste that we have had of our author's quality, it would certainly be very unreasonable to deny him the right of making Dr. Pressly say what he pleases; more especially, as this is a right on which he seems to set a high value. How he uses this privilege, the reader will perceive by reference to pp. 8, 9, where he will find the following, "and does Dr. Pressly believe, that Dr. Swift, in doing this, (giving out, in his congregation, a hymn from the Assembly collection,) is influenced by such haughty impiety and satanic pride, as is implied in 'arrogating to himself that glory which Jehovah declares he will not give to another.' I am fully persuaded were Dr. Pressly publicly to answer this inquiry, he would answer, *No*: He would say he does not believe Dr. Swift guilty of such daring impiety.—And in saying so, he would admit all that for which we contend. Because he would admit, that Dr. Swift has authority for conducting the worship of God in the manner in which he does. And without advancing far, we come to what might be the end of the controversy, namely, that we have authority to use in the worship of God, songs of praise not found in the Book of Psalms. Dr. Pressly must admit of this, or else hold Dr. Swift guilty of the great wickedness implied in arrogating to himself the glory that belongs to God." But Dr. Pressly holds, that he is not thus guilty; and hence admits that he has authority: and thus proves that his own belief is contrary to his own reasoning!" Now, some niggardly reviewers would content themselves with commenting upon what a man *has* said,

—a thing which we could do ourselves without their aid; but Mr. M. generously leads us into a field of inquiry, which, without his assistance, we could never have entered,—remarking at length upon what Dr. Pressly *would* say under given circumstances. Some persons may be so captivus as to ask, ‘how does Mr. M. know how Dr. Pressly *would* answer the question which he suggests, if it were publicly asked, or that he would condescend to give *any answer* to a question proposed in terms so offensive?’ But what matter how he knows it if he knows it at all? And Mr. M. certainly does know what Dr. P. *would* say; or else he would not, upon such a supposition, dare to assert that Dr. Pressly has admitted “that we have authority to use in the worship of God, songs not contained in the Book of Psalms;” and much less, that the Dr. is so dishonest, as to reason throughout his whole book against his own belief.

If reasoning against a man, from what he *would* say, is worthy of commendation, as being a more speedy method of ending a controversy, than reasoning from what he *does* say; a capacity for discriminating between the blunders of a writer, and the error of the press is no less praiseworthy, in its own place; as being well calculated to maintain justice between the author and printer. This latter excellence shines in its highest perfection in Mr. M. Witness the following, p. 134. “Again the Dr. says, ‘the ninety-sixth and parts of some other Psalms. are found in the *Second* Book of Chronicles.’ But this is not so: something like them is found in the 16th Chap. of the *First* Book of Chronicles. This is *no typographical error*, for he gives it in *words*, not in *figures*. But it is a sample of his usual want of accuracy; and an evidence that he takes things on rumor, without examining for him-

self. Nor is it like a *typographical* error to give the '15' of Second Chronicles instead of the 5th. *It looks like as though* he had heard somebody say it was in the 15th, and gave it so." So the reference in the Dr.'s book, to *Second* Chronicles in place of *First* Chronicles, is not, *cannot be* a typographical error," because the number is given "in words, not in figures!" And "15 instead of 5th *does not look like* a typographical error," although the number is given in "figures" not in "words." Why may words not sometimes be printed amiss, as well as "figures," and why by an error of the press 15 may not be substituted for 5th, as well as any one number for another, he does not condescend to tell us; and perhaps if the reason were made known, it would be above our comprehension. But if the mistakes referred to, did not originate with the printer, might they not at least be accidental blunders in Dr. P.'s manuscript? No, indeed; Mr. M. has set that matter to rest. The former "is a sample of the Dr.'s usual want of accuracy, and an evidence that he takes things on rumor without examining for himself;" and the latter "*looks like as though* he had heard somebody say it was in the 15th, and *gave* it so." How fervent the charity of our author! Poor Dr. Pressly! It seems that he has never read the Bible himself, and is consequently obliged to make use of Scripture as he can catch it from the lips of his neighbors. Perhaps the Dr. has no Bible:—but would it not have been better for him to borrow one from Mr. M. (who doubtless has two or three of them,) than to *quote Scripture at second hand*?

A superficial reader of Pressly on Psalmody, if he did not agree with the Dr. on every point, might perhaps give him credit for being *honestly mistaken*. But our author, who has doubtless searched Dr.

Pressly's heart, (for how else could he tell what he *would* say, under supposed circumstances?) seems to know whether or not the Dr. *thinks* what he *says*, and does not fail to expose him when he finds him lying. On page 9, he says, "what the Dr. next brings forward as an argument, is the case of Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, who 'offered strange fire before the Lord.' And on page 10, he (Dr. P.) represents, Neodism as the very indential sin of Nadab and Abihu." And after laboring through four pages to set aside the Dr.'s argument, our author, p. 13, says, with great *humility*, "Now, Dr. Pressly is perfectly aware, that we have given a true representation; that there is positively *no evidence of any kind tending* to show, that Neodism is similar to the sin of Nadab and Abihu, and why does he represent them as similar?" How very flattering!—Dr. Pressly "is *perfectly aware*—that there is positively no evidence of any kind *tending to show*, that Neodism is similar to the sin of Nadab and Abihu," and yet "he represents them as similar;" that is, in plain English, he makes a representation which he well knows to be false. Surely Mr. M. has seen the Groves of Blarney. He hurls a few more compliments at the Dr. on p. 111:—"Indeed I never saw, and I question if any one ever saw, an equal amount of misrepresentation *in* the same compass;—but how is it possible to account for such *dissimulation*?" This deceitful representation, too, is from the Professor's chair, which is supposed to be the watchful guardian of morals!" Instances of the same style of argumentation might be multiplied indefinitely, from the work before us; let one or two more suffice. On p. 123, are these remarkable words; "he (i. e. Dr. Pressly) labors through two dozen pages to prove what he does not

believe.”—That is, he devotes 24 pages to wilful lying. Again, p. 141, “my very dear Doctor; you know very well, that the way you exhibit the matter, is merely a misrepresentation.” It is truly matter of rejoicing, that in the person of Mr. M. there exists a man sufficiently endowed with Christian fortitude, to give the lie to any man who may entertain a view opposite to his own; and who is not by any sickly squeamishness, held back from performing this painful duty, to a man twenty years older than himself, even though he were Senior Professor, in a respectable divinity school.

After all that has been said it will not be thought strange that our author everywhere treats Dr. Pressly as an outlaw, and withholds from him that courtesy which is commonly extended to a respectable antagonist, in religious controversy. In the dark character with which he invests Dr. Pressly, representing him as a man who ordinarily quotes scripture at second hand—a man who makes no scruple of *laboring* through two dozen pages to prove what he does not believe,—the charitable reader will find an apology for such bursts of eloquence as the following:—“But all ye connoisseurs of criticism see that you fail not, to secure for yourselves the Dr.’s work on Psalmody; and turn to his ‘critical analysis,’ and summon all your powers of intellect for the *enjoyment* of something *profound*, examine it with care—but I exhort ye not to laugh! And then too it is just from the Doctor’s hand—direct from the wonderful philological chair—coming from the very fountain of Biblical science—and set forth by the *Chief Rabbi of that notable school!* It must be remarkable!—and it is! All who *want to have* a curiosity in criticism—get it! Happy youth! who resort to that school! When the master is so profound in

Biblical criticism, doubtless they will all be much distinguished in this department of sacred learning," (pp. 104, 105.)—"We find the Doctor is a great *protestor*; and no wonder when he ranks himself at the head of the Protestant Church, and acts in her name! But then *his Highness* ought to be careful not to protest against himself," (p. 77.)—"Away in the backwoods among the boys in the common schools perhaps something like it has been heard. But coming from the learned Doctor; and the *Chief Rabbi* among his brethren; this is the most astonishing of all!" (p. 116.)—It must be of vast advantage to that branch of the church, to have their chief theological chair *replenished* with such an embodiment of accurate Biblical knowledge!" (p. 135.)—"Why my dear Doctor! your representation is most exquisite foolery; and if you were to try your skill again, I do not think you could beat this." C. p. 192.) The very *evangelical* spirit which breathes through the above passages of "Morton on Psalmody," and I may add, through the whole book,—for it is all of the same stamp,—our author, no doubt, imbibed from the "*Evangelical Psalmody*," which he has so long been using. This is his way of "instructing *with meekness* those who oppose themselves." It is worthy of observation, that there is nothing of this humor discoverable in Dr. Pressly's Review of Dr. Ralston's Inquiry; which shows plainly that Dr. P. is totally ignorant of the fundamental maxims of religious controversy, and utterly destitute of the most important qualification of a Reviewer. And though the art of flavoring one's arguments with such spice as this, is no invention of our worthy author,—nothing having been more common ever since the time that Sarah detected Ishmael sneering at Isaac, (Gen. 21: 9,)—yet he is entitled to great

praise, since he practises it on a larger scale than any of his contemporaries.

Far be it from me to attempt to gain for Mr. M. a reputation which he does not deserve. And lest the partiality to him, which I have contracted by reading his book, should mislead my judgment, or misguide my pen, I have made it a point, (as the reader will perceive,) to give large extracts from his work in support of everything which I have alleged.

And now I leave it with the judicious reader to decide whether Mr. M. be not a reviewer of infinite candor, charity and courtesy.

## CHAPTER III.

Theological Views of the Author.

The Author's opinions on the subject which he professes to discuss, will in a suitable place, receive that attention to which they are thought to be entitled. My object in the present chapter is to pass a few remarks on such peculiar doctrines as may be incidentally inculcated in the work under review. And this is the more needful, because many who examine with care and attention an author's views on the question which forms the main subject of his work, are often less disposed to investigate the truth or falsehood of doctrines inculcated in a more incidental way.

Far be it from me, to charge Mr. Morton with denying the divinity of Christ. The following passages in his work on Psalmody, sufficiently vindicate him from any such imputation "God has many sons; yet he has but one only *begotten* son, which signifies, a son possessing the same divine nature with himself, (p. 19.)—"Now this explains to us very clearly what psalms they were, which Paul (of Samosata, the Arian,) put a stop to—Psalms composed by faithful Christians from the beginning, in honor of Jesus Christ, speaking of him as no other than Christ indeed," (p. 221.)—"But Jews who hate Jesus could not unite in singing the Psalms—commended by the Apostle,—Psalms in which they



spoke of Jesus—maintaining that he was the divine Son of God,” (p. 98.)—These three passages, which I have discovered by diligent search, I take pleasure in laying before the charitable reader; who will rejoice in being convinced from them, that our illustrious author is not a Socinian. Nor is this defence of his orthodoxy unneeded. All great men are at times unfortunate; and Mr. M’s. misfortune is, so to have expressed himself, as very distinctly to convey the idea that Christ is but a mere man;—and that in more places than one. On p. 165, he says, “Here” (Rev. 5,) “the man Jesus, the son of *Joseph* and *Mary*, is represented as a *Lamb*; but there is no such idea in the Book of Psalms.” The reader will perceive at once, that to assert that Christ is the son of *Joseph* and *Mary*, is unequivocally to assert that he his a mere man. Such a form of speech, is precisely in accordance with the phraseology of the unbelieving Jews of our Saviour’s time; Luke 4: 22, “Is not this *Joseph’s* son?” Jno. 6, 42, “Is not this Jesus, the son of *Joseph*, whose father and mother we know?”—And charity would constrain us to pronounce the use of it by our author, a mere accident, were it not that he repeats it again and again.—“The Old Testament Scriptures tell us everywhere and in various ways, that the Messiah shall \* come. But the New Testament Scriptures tell us, that he is come, and point us to him, saying, This man, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of *Joseph* and *Mary*, is he of whom Moses in the Law and the Prophets did write.”—“Peter says, ‘Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made *that same Jesus*, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.’ The grand object of all this

\* Quere :—Do the Old Testament Scriptures tell us (believers of the 19th century,) that Christ *shall* yet come?—But this by the way.

testimony, which is so abundant in the New Testament is to bring the people to believe and confess, that Jesus of Nazareth, the *son of Joseph* and Mary, is the Messiah promised in the Old Testament Scriptures." (pp. 189, 190.)—"When could we learn from the Psalms, that the *son of Joseph* and Mary attested his Messiahship by raising Lazarus from the dead," or in any other way; that he had a Messiahship to attest; or indeed, that Joseph or Mary ever had a son? In perfect consistency with the passages quoted above, is the following, p. 96; "The Psalms contain a great deal concerning the Messiah; but they do not tell us *who the Messiah is*; they do not tell us that *Jesus who was born of Mary*, is that Messiah." Now, it is certain that the Psalms do tell us,—Ps. 2: 7—that the Messiah is the Son of God; nor has this, as we have already seen, escaped our author's notice. And if Christ be a *divine* person, then informing us that he is the Son of God, is telling us *who* he is; while informing us that he is the son of Mary, is only telling us *one of the things that he has done*;—viz: that he has assumed our nature, in the womb of the Virgin Mary. Representing him as the son of Mary, never identifies his person, or tells us *who* he is; unless, as the Socinians maintain, he is a human person, a mere man. It cannot have escaped the notice of the observant reader, that our author, throughout the paragraph from which the last two quotations are taken, seems to have a special care to keep our Saviour's manhood before our minds;—as, "when the *man* Jesus was baptized"—"testified that this *man* was the Messiah"—"the *man* who journeyed from place to place through the land of Judea"—"that this very same *man* is now exalted to the right hand of God." Now the most captious can

find no fault with him for applying the term *man* to Christ; for *man* he certainly was. But his apparently studious use of this phraseology, even when it mars rather than helps the force, perspicuity and beauty of his sentence, may draw upon him, from some quarters, suspicion as to his soundness in the faith; especially as he does not in the meantime take any pains to insist on our Saviour's divinity. And such a suspicion will not be likely to be in any measure removed by the recollection that in four different places he calls the Messiah the Son of *Joseph* and *Mary*; and that he represents such a designation of Him as the only method of telling *who he is*. After all, I must be allowed to assure the reader that Mr. M. cannot be a *consistent* Socinian; for even in that paragraph which would seem the most objectionable, as expressing, both directly and indirectly, Socinian views, he says, (p. 98,) that the Psalms sung by the Collossians, with the approbation of the apostle, were such as taught that 'Jesus was a Divine person.' Perhaps he has some new theory of his own (akin to that of the ancient Nestorians,) according to which he views our Saviour as being a *divine*, and yet a *human* person; subsisting in two persons, as well as possessing two natures; being the Son of God by eternal and ineffable generation, and at the same time, by ordinary human generation, the Son of *Joseph* and *Mary*. And (by the way,) if such be the Saviour in whom he believes, it is not to be wondered at that he advocates the use of a new and un-inspired psalmody; since neither the Book of Psalms nor any other Book in the Bible, knows anything of *such* a Christ. Probably his mind is so *deep*, that he himself cannot see to the bottom of it, and of course does not know very well what he does believe; or so *capacious*, that he is able at the same

time to entertain two opposite beliefs. It may be that, as on the subject of Psalmody he makes *common cause with all Socinians*, he wishes, by inculcating their views of other subjects, to give them the full benefit of his alliance with them. Or, finally, is it not possible that in order the more effectually to avoid being dogmatical, he makes it a matter of conscience to contradict every important statement which he makes? Certainly this last supposition is much favored by the complexion, and I might say *complexity* of his whole work on Psalmody.

Mr. M.'s *twofold* view of the person of Christ, will help us to account for his teaching *two* ways of salvation, which he certainly does, in very plain terms. On pp. 191: 2, he favors us with the following strictures upon a sentiment of Dr. Pressly: 'And then look at the bottom of p. 95;' (of Pressly on Psalmody;) 'you say, ever since the first promise of a Saviour was given to our lost world, Jesus Christ has been the only hope of sinful man. By faith in Him, as exhibited to them upon the infallible testimony of God, believers were saved under the Old Testament.' Yes, Doctor, but Jesus Christ was never exhibited until he was born at Bethlehem; and how could men have faith in Him before they heard of Him? They had faith in a promised Messiah; but before they could have faith in Jesus, they must learn that Jesus is that Messiah; and this they could never learn until Jesus came. And my dear Doctor! will you allow me respectfully to tell you that *no man ever believed in Jesus before he was born*. And even none believed in Him until they had sufficient evidence that He was the Messiah, the promised Saviour.' 'You see, Doctor, it is *not true*. That *ever since the first promise of a Saviour, Jesus Christ was the only hope* of sinful man. Because *he was*

*not the hope of any man until he came into the world*, and was made known to men as that Redeemer who was promised. And all that is written in the New Testament; and all the miracles wrought by our Saviour and by his apostles; and all the miraculous events connected with his birth, life, death, resurrection, and ascension, were designed to convince men that this Jesus was the Redeemer, and to persuade them to put their trust in Him. *And if men always trusted in Jesus before he came*, what was the use of all this to lead them to do what they were doing already? Why, my dear Doctor! your representation is *most exquisite foolery*.'

The reader will perceive that I have given Mr. M. ample space to speak for himself. And it will be observed that, like every other good Christian, he believes that men are saved by faith in Christ Jesus, ever since his coming in the flesh. For he says that Jesus Christ 'was *not* the hope of any man *until He came into the world*;' plainly implying that *since that time, He has been* the hope of men.' That this is his view of the *present* way of salvation, is still made evident from what immediately follows in the same connection: 'And all that is written in the New Testament, and all the miracles wrought by our Saviour and by his apostles,' &c., 'were designed to convince men that this Jesus was the Redeemer; and to persuade them to put their trust in Him.' Now, this opinion of his, that men are *now* saved by faith in Christ, is unquestionably correct, for it is perfectly Scriptural; but the soundness of his other doctrine, that sinners were saved in some *other way* under the Old Testament dispensation, might well be called in question, if it had been advanced by any other than the infallible George Morton. That he holds the *opinion* is certain. His words are, 'Before they

could have faith in Jesus, they must learn that Jesus is the Messiah; and this they *could not learn until Jesus came*. And, my dear Doctor! will you allow me respectfully to tell you that no man ever believed in Jesus before he was born.' And if they did not, *could not* have faith in Christ Jesus the Mediator, they were not saved by faith in Christ; and if saved at all, they must have been saved in some way altogether different. But it is not merely by just inference that this sentiment is contained in his words; he has expressed it in the plainest form. Speaking of Simeon, he says, 'He had *saving faith*, long before he believed in Jesus as the Redeemer; for he never believed in Jesus until Jesus came.'

With regard to the orthodoxy of our author's views on this subject, I will not hazard an opinion; but content myself with observing that the Prophet Isaiah and the Apostle Peter are plainly at war with him: for Mr. M. says, 'Jesus Christ was never exhibited until he was born in Bethlehem;' whereas Isaiah says, (Chap. 42: 1,) 'Behold my servant whom I uphold, mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth;' and Peter says, (Acts 10: 38, 43,) 'How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power. To Him give the prophets witness,' &c. Now when Isaiah calls upon the men of his day to *behold* the Saviour, he certainly insinuates very strongly that he was then *exhibited*; (for how else could they *behold* Him?) and when Peter asserts that to Jesus of Nazareth all the prophets gave witness, it is certainly implied that he was *exhibited*; for it is not easy to conceive how they could give testimony to one who was not exhibited. Again, our author says, 'no man ever believed in Jesus before he was born;' but the Apostle cited above, says (Acts, 2: 22, 32,) 'Ye men of Israel, hear these

words. Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles, and wonders, and signs ;— ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain. David speaketh concerning him, ‘ I foresaw the Lord always before my face ; for he is on my right hand that I should not be moved.’ Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David ; being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit upon his throne ; he seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ ; that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption ; this Jesus hath God raised up, to which we are all witnesses.’ From this it is evident that Peter thought that at least one of the Old Testament saints believed in Jesus Christ before he was born ; and there is certainly some foundation for such an opinion, in David’s own enlightened confession. But it must not be thought strange that Prophets and Apostles do in some points differ from our author, since even the Rev. George Morton, Dr. Pressly’s learned Reviewer, is at open war with him on the same point. This discrepancy between Rev. Morton and Rev. Morton, appears very strikingly in what he says about Simeon, p. 72 : ‘ The devout Simeon believed in Jesus ; but not until it was revealed to him by the Holy Ghost that the child Jesus was that promised Messiah in whom he had been trusting all his life.’ Simeon never believed in Jesus till it was revealed to him that he had been believing in him all his life ! He had been believing in him all his life ; and yet he never believed in him until ‘ Jesus came, and it was divinely revealed to him that he was the Saviour in whom he had trusted’ !!

If inspired prophets and apostles oppose the view

of Mr. M. on this subject, they do no more than is done by their Divine Lord; who very clearly represents himself to have been both exhibited and believed in, under the Old Testament dispensation. In proof of this, I refer the reader to Jno. 5: 35: 'Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me.' What Scriptures? Those of the Old Testament, of course; for there were then none else. And of whom do they testify? 'Of me,' says Jesus. Again; v. 46; 'For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for *he wrote of me.*' Moses then wrote of Jesus Christ; and yet Mr. M. declared that 'he was not exhibited till he was born in Bethlehem!' To the same purpose, is Jno. 8: 54. 'Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he *saw it* and was glad.' And how did Abraham see Christ's day, if it was not by believing on his name?

All must grant that there is a sense in which Christ was never exhibited till the fulness of time; viz: that never till then was he *visibly* exhibited in our nature. But this is not the sense in which the word '*exhibited*' is used in this connection, by Dr. Pressly and his Reviewer;—the Dr's words, on which Mr. M. comments, are 'By faith in him as exhibited to them *upon the infallible testimony of God, &c.*' Now it will be borne in mind that faith, which is 'the substance of things hoped for, *the evidence of things not seen,*' (Heb. 11: 1.) does not require the visible exhibition of its object, before it can be exercised. And it is most likely, that those who wish to rest their opinions upon 'the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone,' will not hesitate to believe that 'the one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus,' was by divine revelation exhibited in various ways.



before as well as since his advent in the flesh ; and that God's elect, under the former dispensation, embraced him for salvation, by the like precious faith to that by which we are now saved. And this view of matters, if it be correct, may help to reconcile good men now, to the exclusive use of that collection of Psalms, which so well served the purpose of God's people under the Old Testament dispensation.—But this by the way.

One feature of our author's Old Testament way of salvation, I am free to say I do not like. He represents the faith of Old Testament saints as meriting their justification. His words are, 'He (i. e. Simeon) had saving faith ; he was justified *on account of* his faith in a promised Redeemer. Now all those churches which confine themselves to the use of the Book of Psalms in the celebration of God's praise, are Calvinistic in their views of the way of salvation ; and maintain with the Apostle of the Gentiles, (Rom. 3: 24,) that sinners are 'justified *freely* by God's grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus ; and by consequence, that they are not justified *on account of* their faith, or any other good thing 'wrought in them or done by them ;' and with the same inspired writer they 'conclude that a man is justified,'—not *on account of* faith as a deed of the law, but—'by faith, without the deeds of the law.' And indeed, with the Bible in their hands, it is not easy for them to believe that any sinner is justified *on account of* his faith ; especially if it be such a defective faith, as Mr. M. would make out the faith of Old Testament believers to have been,—a faith which had no respect to Jesus Christ the one Mediator ; or such a bungling faith, as is professed by some in New Testament times, which sometimes looks upon our Saviour as a divine person, the only begotten Son of God, and anon re-

gards him as a human person, the Son of Joseph and Mary.

There is something in the manner in which our author expresses himself with regard to the two ways of salvation, which would almost lead us to believe that, in his opinion, the difference between the two, is, that the saving faith of Old Testament saints rested upon the Saviour himself; whereas the saving faith of New Testament saints rests upon the name *Jesus*. Whether he entertains the opinion that the name *Jesus* is a proper object of religion or not, it is certainly a faith much akin to one which he clearly does hold, and which he maintains at great length; viz: that the name *Jesus* ought to be worshipped.—Not merely that our Saviour himself ought to be worshipped;—in this all good christians would concur with him;—but that the word *Jesus*, one of his names, is entitled to religious worship. This doctrine he inculcates at large, pp. 182—188. He delivers himself as follows:—‘Again; ‘thou shalt call his name *JESUS*; for he shall save his people from their sins.’ But *this* sacred name of the Redeemer is not found once in the Book of Psalms. And must the name of *Jesus*, be excluded from the Psalmody of his own Church? How can the Christian Church engage in the worship of God without using the name of *Jesus*? It is impossible: and why banish this name from one important part of that worship?—Did the foolish mind of man ever invent a greater absurdity? That the church redeemed by the blood of *Jesus*, when she lifts up her voice to bless him for salvation, must not dare to name his name? That name so dear in heaven and upon earth: which the eternal *Jehovah* has proclaimed above every name—‘therefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name, which is above every name, that at the name of *Jesus* every knee

should bow, and every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.' But Psalmonistic Churches in their songs of praise can never make this confession. When they lift up their voices in a song of praise, they can never glorify God the Father by confessing that Jesus Christ is Lord of all. And why not? Do not the psalms speak of the 'Son of God,' of the 'Redeemer,' of 'the King of Glory?' Are not the 2nd and 110 Psalms, for example, beautifully descriptive of the kingdom and power and glory of our Saviour? True; but all this does not amount to what our author means. when he speaks of using 'the name of *Jesus*.' To be plain; when he uses the phrase, '*the name of Jesus*,' he means simply the *word Jesus*. But if we follow him a little further, we will find him to explain himself;—'They need not point us,' he adds, 'to such psalms as the 2nd and 110th, for this exalted name *Jesus*, is not in the *whole book* of Psalms.' This puts it beyond all doubt, that when he *says* 'the name of *Jesus*,' he means neither more nor less than the name *Jesus*. Now mark what he says about this name. 'And they (Psalmonists) will teach us, that this name,' (the name *Jesus*), 'which God has proclaimed from his throne, as the most exalted and glorious, at which the inhabitants of heaven, and of the earth, and of those under\* the earth, bow in submission, must never once be named in the church, in any of her songs of praise! A *name* which is the theme of constant adoration by the church in heaven, and the church on earth; but it must never be heard upon the voice of her songs!'—Observe, it is not Jesus himself, but the *word* 'Jesus,' one of his names, that Mr. M. represents as being the theme of the

\* Who are the inhabitants "of those under" the earth?

Church's adoration. Further on, he says, 'Yes, indeed, the man who feels that he is redeemed by the precious blood of Jesus will praise his name,'—that is, the name Jesus—'in a song,' or, in other words, will worship it. Again; "But when the church shall be visited with the full blaze of that millennial light and† purity, and truth, such a doctrine will be heard no more at all in her. There will be no hesitation then to praise the name of Jesus,'—that is, by Mr. M.'s own explanation, the *name Jesus*,—'in a song.'—In the millennium, it would appear, the church will make it a prominent part of her religion, to worship the *word Jesus*, praising it in a song. Further; 'Yes then, and now, and till then, ever and always, will the church of Jesus Christ raise the loud songs of glory and gladness, and thanksgiving, to the exalted name of Jesus: '—that is, to the *name Jesus*. And again; 'Dr. Pressly might as well think to stem the ocean's tide, or stay the rolling thunder in its path-way cross the heavens, as that he will prevent those redeemed by the blood of the Lamb from praising, in their songs, the precious name of Jesus,'—that is, recollect, as he himself explains it, the *Lord Jesus* which is one of the names of 'their gloriously exalted Saviour and King.' But it is not necessary to multiply quotations; in those given above, there is a superabundance of evidence that he deifies the word Jesus, and claims for it divine honors;—nothing less than that, like Christ himself, to whom it belongs as one of his names, it be worshipped with songs of adoration and praise! or rather, he seems to care but little whether Christ be worshipped at all, or not; provided, due homage be paid to the name Jesus. He has not told us why this name is more worthy of

\* What appearance does a "blaze of purity" present?

worship than the terms, Lord, Christ, Messiah, Saviour, Redeemer, Shiloh, &c.; but perhaps their apotheosis will take place when he is ready to favor the world with a book upon some other subject; and then, if he and his 'Neodistic' brethren do not worship enough, it will not be for want of plenty of gods.

That our Rev. author inculcates the worship of a word of two syllables, viz: 'the name Jesus, it is impossible to deny. Whether in this he is right or wrong, I leave entirely to the judgment of the reflecting reader. But lest any one should be disposed to censure him too harshly, as teaching idolatry, allow me to turn the reader's attention to the fact, that if he has demanded for one of our Saviour's names, divine worship, he has on the other hand, effectually counteracted the operation of his teaching, by the contrary influence of his example: for from p. 183, to p. 188, as well as in sundry other pages, he has used the name Jesus, (which, like all other divine names, should never be taken in vain.) with a needless frequency, which—were I not a reviewer, and of course bound to be favorable to my author—I would not hesitate to characterize as profane.

## PART SECOND.

AN EXAMINATION OF MR. MORTON'S PROCESS OF  
ARGUMENTATION.

## CHAPTER I.

## HIS PREFACE AND FIRST CHAPTER.

After what we have seen of the *general character* of Mr. Morton's profound work on Psalmody, we will not be expected to dwell at very great length upon an examination of the successive steps by which he pursues his course of argumentation. Indeed, it would savor not a little of presumption, for a man of ordinary size to make any very lengthy strictures upon the statements, observations and conclusions of so able a writer, so powerful and at the same time so generous a disputant, and so deep a divine, as we have already seen our distinguished author to be. However, lest he should think himself slighted, we will not pass him by without making some reply to his labored arguments on the great question at issue between him and Dr. Pressly.

To begin with his Preface :—He there informs us of the momentous occasion which induced him to enter upon the great work which he has in so masterly a manner performed. Nor was this information unneeded ; for without it, his readers would undoubtedly have been much at a loss to know why any sane

man would think of placing himself before the public in the extraordinary attitude which it has pleased Mr. M. to assume. He accounts for what he has done in the following words, p. iii : ‘It may not be improper to state the occasion which has led to the appearance of this work before the public. It is simply this : that in the discharge of his ministerial duties, the author was called to labor within the bounds of churches where the subject of Psalmody was much agitated by Psalmonites,—their ministers dwelling much upon it as a theme of public discussion ; and with the usual aim of disturbing and making inroads upon the Presbyterian church.’ Yes, reader, incredible as it may appear to you, our author has actually found that in some neighborhoods where he has preached, the ministers of the Covenanter, Associate, and Associate Reformed Churches, had the daring effrontery to maintain from the pulpit that the one hundred and fifty Psalms which God has made, and embodied in the Bible, are superior to any that uninspired men can make ; and even to insist at large upon this preposterous tenet ! And that their hearers, instead of scouting a dogma so preposterous, not only fell in with this absurd opinion, but were so fanatical as to defend it zealously in private controversy ! After all, Mr. M. could probably have borne with them in this, had he not, upon looking into their hearts, perceived the baseness of their motives. But when he saw that all this was done ‘with the usual aim of disturbing and making inroads upon the Presbyterian church,’ he justly concluded that forbearance was no longer a virtue, and arose in his might to avert the fearful consequences of this unholy agitation. But there is another circumstance which must be taken into the account, (same page.) ‘It was found that Dr. Pressly’s work on Psalmody was

in circulation, and constituted the principal armory of Psalmonites, from which they were furnished with weapons to assail the cause of truth, and do injury to the interests of our beloved Zion. In view of these circumstances, the author believed it would subserve the cause of truth to put into the hands of our people a plain and pointed review of the Doctor's work; which might be used as a shield to protect them against the continual assaults to which they were exposed.' The 'Neodists,' although far outnumbering the 'Psalmonites,' were among the latter 'as lambs among wolves.' The 'Psalmonites,' besides possessing the Bible and common sense, were armed *cap a pie* from 'Pressly on Psalmody,' while the 'Neodists,' although they two, as may be presumed, were endowed with common sense, had access to the Bible, and had, or might have had, 'Baird's Review of McMaster,' 'Ralston's Inquiry,' &c., were nevertheless exposed defenceless to the deadly shafts of their ruthless assailants. In this extremity, our author comes to the rescue of his 'Neodistic' brethren, and casts over them a shield of triple adamant, in the form of a 'Review of Pressly on Psalmody.'

A sight of the terrible suffering endured by the Neodists in the dreadful contests through which they had to pass, stirred, as might be expected, the deepest sympathies of Mr. M.'s benevolent heart. 'In the prosecution, then, of this object,' says he, 'I have endeavored to write in a plain style, that the plainest people might understand. And that it might be especially advantageous to them, has been a prevailing desire in the preparation of this work. Because it is well known that they are much *plagued* and *harassed* on this subject by the continual interference of Psalmonites.' Plagued, no doubt, with texts of Scripture, and harassed with unanswerable argu-



ments thrown in their way by unfeeling Psalmonites,' who make no scruple to *interfere* with them by propounding the most perplexing questions.—Cruel, hard-hearted Psalmonites,

‘How can you hope for mercy, rendering none?’

Nor is it rarely that the Neodists are treated in this unworthy manner. The wicked Psalmonites seem to take a peculiar pleasure in tormenting the men that dwell on the earth. “In some sections of the country,” says our author, “they seem determined never to let the subject rest, and are watching every opportunity, which they think may be improved in any way for the promotion of their own interests. And hence, Presbyterians are under the necessity of defending their own principles and practice.” How obstinate and incorrigible are these same headstrong Psalmonites! Untouched by any feeling for the misery which they cause,—unawed by the opposition of the multitudes, they will persist in asserting and maintaining their principles! And then they are so unreasonable as to study the promotion of their own interests! And then see the pass to which it has come with Presbyterians. Who would have thought that they would ever have been reduced to the direful “necessity of defending their own principles and practice?”

Mr. M. does not seem to have at all designed his first chapter as any part of his argument upon Psalmody; but rather as a preparatory appeal to popular feeling.

On p. 6, he makes the following quotation from Pressly on Psalmody:—“when men, therefore, take this matter into their own hands, and undertake to determine how God shall be praised, or with what he shall be praised, do they not plainly arrogate to

themselves that glory which Jehovah declares he will not give to another?" Upon this passage he he remarks as follows: "Now the question may well be asked, does the Doctor believe that Neodists are guilty of such an awful sin as this. The sin of arrogating to themselves the glory that belongs to Jehovah! The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church authorized a book of Psalms and Hymns to be used in the worship of God. And does Dr. Pressly believe that the Ministers and Elders composing that Assembly arrogated to themselves the glory that belongs to Jehovah? Does he believe that there was a single man of them, who wished to have given to himself the glory that belongs to God? I presume he does not. And why then does he intimate that such is the case?" But where, Mr. Morton, 'does he intimate that such is the case?' Where has he *mentioned* the Ministers and Elders of whom you speak? and where does he speak of any one "wishing to have given to himself the glory which belongs to God?" And how can he intimate that certain men are guilty of a certain sin, without mentioning either the men or the sin? Dr. Pressly, indeed, has said that "those who undertake to determine how, or with what, God shall be praised, arrogates to themselves the glory which belongs to Jehovah;" but it is Mr. M. himself who intimates that the Ministers and Elders, composing the General Assembly which authorized the book of Psalms and Hymns, are the persons who undertake to determine how, or with what, God shall be praised. Dr. Pressly describes a character which every good christian is free to hold in utter abhorrence; Mr. M. points us to the Ministers and Elders composing a certain General Assembly, as the persons to whom that character belongs, and on that

ground, attempts to hold up the Dr. to public odium and popular indignation. But let us hear what he has to say more: "Does he believe that such men as Dr. Alexander, and Dr. Hodge of Princeton, and Dr. Elliott and Dr. Herron of Pittsburgh, 'arrogate to themselves that glory which Jehovah declares he will not give to another?' Surely he does not so believe. Were the public to esteem him as thus believing, they could not for a moment consider him as possessing the spirit of a christian. And if the Doctor does not believe so, why does he represent them as thus guilty?"—(p. 7.) Now the discerning reader will see that all this is very politic; and when a disputant knows that he has not the truth on his side, and is conscious of the weakness of his arguments, nothing can be more in place than artifice, fraud and cunning; "Be ye wise as serpents." Yes, Mr. Morton, it is very politic, in the opening of your discussion to represent Dr. Pressly as inveighing against some men whose praise is in all the churches. But is it true that Dr. P. has represented these men as thus guilty? Has he anywhere in his book so much as named Drs. Alexander, Hodge, Elliott and Herron? It is true he has said that "those who undertake to determine how, or with what, God shall be praised, plainly arrogate to themselves the glory which Jehovah has said he will not give to another;" and even Mr. M. will not be so mad as to deny the truth of this proposition:—but has he represented Drs. Alexander, Hodge, &c. as the persons who are thus guilty? And if not, why does Mr. M. charge him with having done so? And must no man write against any principle or practice which Mr. M. knows to be approved by Drs. Alexander, Hodge, Elliott and Herron? Must nothing be denounced as an error or a sin, if we know it to be countenanc-

ed by the practice of the leading men in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church? This were indeed, a short method of settling controversies in the Church. In order to decide whether any practice is sinful or not, all that you will do, if you follow our author's advice, will be to inquire whether or not it is followed by Drs. Alexander, Hodge, &c. If it has the sanction of their example, it cannot be wicked: and if not wicked it must be innocent. I am well aware that these mee do not claim to be either impeccable or infallible; but no matter—both are claimed for them by Rev. George Morton, and that is enough.

He treats with equal candor, the Dr.'s remarks upon the sin of Nadab and Abihu.—“What the Dr. next brings forward as an argument, is the case of Nadab and Abihu, sons of Aaron, who ‘offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not. And there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord.’”—(p. 9.) It will be seen by reference to Dr. Pressly's work on Psalmody, that his reference to the history of Nadab and Abihu, is to prove, not that the use of uninspired Psalmody is without divine appointment, but that *whatever is without divine appointment* in the worship of God, is displeasing to him; and, by consequence, *if* the use of uninspired Psalmody is without divine appointment, it is displeasing to God. For the subject under discussion, in that chapter in which he refers to the sin of Nadab and Abihu, is simply, “the importance of regarding divine appointment in the worship of God.”—(Pressly on Psal. p. 7.)

Mr. M. however, resents this allusion to the sin and punishment of those who offered strange fire before the Lord, as an intolerable wrong done to

those, who, like himself, sing human Psalmody; "thus he attempts," says our author, (p. 9,) "to range a large portion of the Christian Church in company with Nadab and Abihu, as partaking of their sin and exposed to their punishment." Not so, brother Morton; if it be true that "a large portion of the Christian Church," use a Psalmody which has not the sanction of divine appointment, they range themselves in company with Nadab and Abihu; if it be not true, then Dr. Pressly's remarks about the sin of Nadab and Abihu, have no application to them. Yet the Dr.'s mention of the sin and punishment of those ancient corrupters of God's worship, seems to stir Mr. M.'s indignation from its lowest depths. He says, p. 13, "He (Dr. P.,) knew full well that what is perfectly harmless in itself, may have a violent prejudice awakened against it, by giving it a bad name, and classing it with that which is known to be detestable; and this is that stealthy, creeping kind of argumentation which runs through the whole of his remarks concerning men 'arrogating to themselves the glory that belongs to Jehovah,' and 'Nadab and Abihu offering strange fire:' and about 'building alters,' and 'offering in sacrifice pigs and kids.'"

Why does our author fly into so great a passion on this occasion? Is it because Dr. Pressly maintains "the importance of regarding divine appointment in divine worship?" There is surely nothing in this to awaken the indignation of any honest Presbyterian. Is it because that, in order to show "the importance of regarding divine appointment in divine worship," the Dr. has made allusion to the history of Adab and Abihu, to the restrictions about the building of altars, and to the laws relating to sacrifice, &c.? Surely Mr. M. is not opposed to the use

of Scripture in religious controversy. Is it because Dr. Pressly assumes, at the outset, that Neodism is like the sin of Nadab and Abihu, like offering pigs instead of kids, &c.? This cannot be; for it is not true that the Dr. has made any such assumption;—this being the very point which, throughout his whole work, he labors, and as some think, labors successfully, to prove. May we not, without any breach of charity, suppose that the true secret of Mr. M.'s rage against Dr. Pressly, for mentioning Nadab and Abihu, lies in the fact that our author is conscious of having offered strange fire to the Lord, ever since, in violation of solemn vows, he abandoned the faith of his fathers, and apostatized from the Reformed Presbyterian Church. We all know that those who apostatize from the truth, are its bitterest enemies. At all events, it is a *significant fact* that, (whatever be his reasons for it,) he has conceived a peculiar dislike to that part of Dr. Pressly's work on Psalmody, in which that author argues "the importance of regarding divine appointment in divine worship."

His vindication of the Neodistic Brotherhood from the charge of offering strange fire, is highly amusing. He says, pp. 10, 11, "Where has there ever been an individual, or a congregation, consumed with fire for praising God in a song not taken from the Book of Psalms? And if the Lord has not shown his displeasure, by sending temporal judgments, has he done it by sending spiritual judgments? The church of Rome corrupted the worship of God, and he manifested his sore displeasure by withholding from her the influences of his spirit; 'by sending strong delusions that they may believe a lie;' and by leaving her to the control of the Devil, and men of corrupt minds; until she is now become a synagogue of Sa-

tan. But the Lord has not dealt so with Neodistic Churches.”—By the way, did not our author reflect that the church of Rome is “Neodistic?”—But let us follow him a little farther: “As to the evidences of the divine presence among them, they will very honorably compare with those we call Psalmonistic churches.” And farther on, “In the former class, there is undoubtedly as much vital piety and true godliness as in the latter.” And again; “They seem to be the special objects of Divine regard, when compared with Psalmonites.”

And which are the Neodistic churches? The O. and N. S., Free and Cumberland Presbyterians; Lutheran and German Reformed; Calvinistic, Free-will, Seventh-day, Dunkard and Campbellite Baptists; Methodists North and South, Episcopal and Wesleyan; Congregational and Episcopal Churches; together with Romanists, Unitarians, Swedenborgians, Universalists, and some other denominations of less consequence. In this list, it is true, there are enumerated some societies which are, in reality, Synagogues of Satan, and Churches only in name, but their example is not, on that account, the more worthy of imitation; and they are all Neodistic.—And what churches, on the other hand, are they which our author denominates Psalmonistic? The Reformed, Associate, and Associate Reformed Presbyterian, and the United Presbyterian Church of Ireland, with some smaller Societies.

Now, let any decent Presbyterian look at the average condition of the churches of the former class, and the average condition of those of the latter class, and decide whether or not it is true the Neodistic churches have fully as much evidence of the divine favor, as those which are Psalmonistic; and that “the former, compared with the latter, seem to be the special objects of the divine regard.”

Is it an evidence of the divine presence with those churches, and of the divine regard for them, that they entertain the utmost diversity and contrariety of views on every religious subject? If so, then our author is assuredly right; for among that class of churches which he denominates Neodistic, are to be found those who hold Calvinistic, and those who maintain Arminian views, respecting the way of salvation—those who believe that there are three divine Persons, and those who assert there is only one—those who regard Christ as God equal with the Father, and those who say that he is only a mere man—those who practice and defend the worship of images, pictures, saints and angels, and those who denounce all such worship as gross idolatry—those who claim for infants the right to the ordinance of baptism, and those who refuse them that privilege—the advocates of Congregational, Presbyterian, and Episcopal forms of church-government—those who maintain that there is a heaven but no hell, those who hold that there is both a heaven and a hell, and those who assert that there is not only a heaven and a hell, but also a purgatory, for departed souls. It is, doubtless, a strong and incontestible evidence of the divine favor to churches of this class, that they comprise persons believing in every doctrine which has ever been maintained, every doctrine which has ever been doubted, and every doctrine which has ever been denied on earth.

Is it an evidence of God's favor to Neodistic churches, that family worship\* is not kept up in one

\* It must be acknowledged that in some of those churches which confine themselves to the Psalms of inspiration, family worship is in some places lamentably neglected; but it is well known that the neglect of this duty is incomparably more common in those churches which Mr. M. calls Neodistic; and that in those parts of churches of the former class, where this duty is much neglected, there is a proportionate want of zeal and tenacity for the exclusive use of David's Psalms.



tenth of the households of which those churches are composed,—and that in their fellowship there are thousands of habitual profane swearers, slaveholders; and open Sabbath-breakers? Alas, for the Psalm-onistic churches! They have never yet been endowed with such a spirit of liberality, as to open their doors alike to the “precious and the vile.”

Is it an evidence of the divine presence with those churches, that a vast majority of those who pretend to be converted at those seasons of excitement which are so frequent in some of them, give no evidence afterwards of being really under the influence of divine grace? If so, then those churches which our author calls Psalmonistic, are behind; for though the spirit moves upon them silently and constantly like “the waters of Shiloah, which go softly,” yet they cannot boast of their camp-meetings, protracted meetings, and noisy ‘revivals,’ like some other churches. Yet there are some so old-fashioned, that they think of churches as they do of individuals;—that it is better they should exhibit a habitual and uniform compliance with the requirements of the gospel, than that they should be religious by ‘fits and starts.’

And, to go no farther, is it a mark of the divine favor to Neodistic churches, and a mark of God’s gracious presence with them, that *no two of them can agree upon a system of Songs, for the celebration of God’s praise*, but that every church must have its own Hymn Book? Go into a Presbyterian family, and you will find on the stand a Presbyterian hymn-book; enter the house of a Methodist, and you will find a Methodist hymn-book; the Baptist carries to church a Baptist hymn-book: the Unitarians have a Unitarian hymn-book; the Universalist has a hymn-book for his own special use, &c. &c. This may be to Mr. M. a very satisfactory evidence

of the divine presence enjoyed by Neodistic churches ; but to me, I must confess, it seems to be *sectarianism* in its worst and most inexcusable form. Whether this state of things be desirable or undesirable, there is nothing of the kind in Psalmonistic churches. You would search in vain for a Reformed Presbyterian Hymn-book, an Associate Presbyterian Hymn-book, or an Associate Reformed Hymn-book. These churches all “ lift up the voice together ; ” they offer to God the same songs ; they all, with one consent, use in divine worship God’s Hymn-book, embodied in the Volume of Divine Revelation,

## CHAPTER II.

The Author's examination of "Rouse's Psalms."

'Rouse's Psalms!' methinks I hear the reader exclaim; 'why, I never heard of such Psalms before.' But reader, you are in probability not so ignorant as you imagine. It is very likely you have seen the book. Did you never see a little book entitled

**THE PSALMS OF DAVID IN METRE, TRANSLATED AND DILIGENTLY COMPARED WITH THE ORIGINAL TEXT, AND FORMER TRANSLATIONS. MORE PLAIN, SMOOTH AND AGREEABLE TO THE TEXT THAN ANY HERETOFORE. ALLOWED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE KIRK OF SCOTLAND, AND APPOINTED TO BE SUNG IN CONGREGATIONS AND FAMILIES."**

And sometimes for brevity's sake, simply

**"THE PSALMS OF DAVID IN METRE."**

That is the book of which Mr. Morton is speaking when he says, (p. 15,) "It is well known that the Psalms used by Dr. Pressly in the worship of God, are those called the 'Psalms of Rouse.'"

But who calls them the 'Psalms of Rouse?' Is this the name given to them in common parlance, in those places where they are known, and the English language is spoken? Are they commonly called the 'Psalms of Rouse' by the booksellers? Are they called the 'Psalms of Rouse' in the license granted by

Her Britannic Majesty to Scottish publishers? And, (which is still more to the purpose,) are they, in the title prefixed to them, styled the Psalms of Rouse? Did Mr. M. ever see, either an old Psalm book or a new one, from either the British or American press, which bore on its title page “The Psalms of Rouse?” To every one of these questions, Mr. M., if he wishes to tell the truth, must answer ‘no.’ By whom, then, are they called the Psalms of Rouse?

By Rev. George Morton, Dr. Pressly’s most learned Reviewer. He undertakes to prove that they are not the Psalms of inspiration, and very prudently, before he begins, takes for granted the thing which he proposes to prove; and in order to reconcile his readers to his assumption, he intimates that these Psalms are called the Psalms of Rouse. In order that the reader may see honesty of this policy, I will suppose a parallel case. I sit down to write a review of Morton on Psalmody. If about the commencement of such a work, I announce to my readers, that the work on which I intend to make a few strictures is that which is called “An impious attack on the Book of Psalms,” am I, in the use of such language, doing justice to Mr. Morton, or am I not? I submit this question to the decision of the candid reader.—By the way, Mr. M., a question just occurs to me; did you ever read of Ananias and Sapphira?

There will probably arise no occasion more favorable than the present, for the examination of the argument which Mr. M. draws from the phraseology used with reference to this version, by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1649. He says, p. 62: “But we find from the Record, that the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, in this case, did not call Rouse’s Psalms a version, as the Doctor represents; but uniformly called them a

*paraphrase.*” By the way, it is not true, that Dr. Pressly represents the General Assembly as have called this translation of the Psalms, a version: he calls them a version himself, as Neal, Hethrington and sundry other writers of considerable note have done, and says that the General Assembly ‘adopted them as being more agreeable to the text than any heretofore prepared.’ Nor is the Dr.’s argument at all taken from the phraseology employed by that Assembly, as Mr. M. insinuates. But to proceed with our author; “there are several acts, and in all they are called a paraphrase. One is an act for revising the paraphrase of the psalms brought from England, &c.” But do you forget Mr. M., that this same ‘Paraphrase’ was published by the authority, and under the supervision of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, bearing the following title,—‘*The psalms of David in Metre, Translated, and diligently compared with the original text, &c.?*’ The phraseology used by the General Assembly, taken in connection with the notorious fact to which I have adverted, only proves, that two hundred years ago, the word ‘paraphrase’ was used in a sense different from that in which it is now understood. And this is the less matter of surprise, since many other words have, in the same time, undergone a much greater change in their signification.

But I freely grant that the title-page of a book is no infallible index to its real character. It must be admitted too, that the fact that our Psalm-book was published by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, under the title of ‘the Psalms of David in Metre,’ and that it has borne the title, before the world, with impunity, for the last two hundred years, only proves that its claims as version of the Book of Psalms have been sanctioned by the highest human

authority. And hence, Mr. M. has an undoubted right to examine into its pretensions, and decide for himself, whether or not it be in reality what it purports to be,—‘The Psalms of David in Metre.’

When our author sat in judgment upon our metrical version of the Psalms, he would have done himself a kindness by procuring a correct copy. He would not then have been so unfortunate as to say, (p. 36,) “Rouse says,

‘For that they were but fading flesh,  
To mind they did recall.’

The Psalm says, ‘It was God who remembered they were but flesh;’ but Rouse says, ‘It was the people who remembered it.’”—A mere typographical error, Mr. Morton; as you will see by examining other editions of the Psalms. The passage is in Ps. 78: 39. The reader will find, by comparing different editions, that the true reading is, ‘to mind he did recall,’ and, of course, that the mistake originated not with Rouse, but with the printer. Nor is this the only place where our author finds his charge against Rouse, upon an error of the press. This serves to show the care with which he has examined the Psalms, which he handles so unmercifully, and upon which he pronounces so confidently.

He seems also to have, as every minister ought to have, a most extensive and minute acquaintance with his Bible; as is evident from his judicious observations, upon Psalm 2: 1, p. 19. “He,” viz: Rouse, “says, ‘why do the people mind vain things?’ But this does not convey the idea contained in the Psalm at all. The Psalm says, ‘why do the people imagine a vain thing?’ One specific thing; and then goes on to explain what that one thing is. And it is the vain design of preventing the establishment of the Messiah’s kingdom. But according to Rouse, it

would be, ‘ why do the people mind the vain trifles and follies of the world ? ’ The spirit did not design to have such a thing in the second Psalm ; and a Psalm that has it, is not the Psalm of inspiration.”— It is a great pity that the apostles and their company did not think of this, when they had occasion to quote this verse, Acts 4: 25. But by way of apology for them, it must be observed that they had no opportunity of comparing their Greek translation of the Bible, with our English version, and were consequently obliged to use such Scripture as was accessible to them ; if indeed they did not, like Dr. Pressly, quote scripture at second hand. Whether this plea will excuse them or not, it is a matter of fact that they declare that God has said, by his servant David, ‘ why do the——people imagine vain things ? ’ Whereas Mr M. affirms, that ‘ the Spirit did not design to have such a thing in the second Psalm. And a Psalm which has it is not the Psalm of inspiration.’ Perhaps they thought that ‘ one specific thing ’ might comprehend in it, as details, many things ; as for example, that the ‘ vain design of preventing the establishment of the Messiah’s Kingdom,’ might include the subordinate designs, of crucifying the Saviour, robbing him of his headship over the church, withholding from him submission in civil affairs, supplanting his psalms by introducing those of men, &c. ; and that consequently, either ‘ thing ’ or ‘ things ’ might very well express the meaning of the Spirit in the place. But whatever may have been their views in admitting the word ‘ things,’ into the first verse of second Psalm, the Christian world will not look with indifference upon the zeal and magnanimity of our author, in confronting them boldly, and rebuking them sharply, for

thus corrupting the sacred\* text. Besides, from what our author has said on this subject, we can see by what a depth of research he is qualified for deciding upon the claims of Rouse's version of the Psalms.

He makes a rare display of wisdom, learning and justice, in trying the merits of our metrical version of the Psalms, by that which we have in the common English translation of the Bible. This will doubtless strike most people, as exceedingly unfair. But perhaps it is to be attributed to an unwillingness to make any parade of his skill in the Hebrew language, arising from his extreme modesty. Or perhaps it has its true cause in a benevolent desire to leave the minds of his readers under a pleasing impression, that they are all every whit as competent to judge of the correctness of a translation of the Psalms as he is; and indeed, it is my candid opinion that they are. At all events, it is certain that he very rarely appeals for the truth of his criticisms, to the original Hebrew; but almost uniformly to the common prose version; and this version he ordinarily styles, 'The Psalms,' in contradistinction to the Scotch Metrical translation.

It is on this principle that he says, (p. 34,) "Rouse says:—

'And by his power he let out,  
The Southern wind to go.'

But the Psalm says, 'by his power he brought in the south wind.' Thus the one flatly contradicts the other." Now, it is easy to see, that if I were sitting

\* "It is now clear that the Parson, as I thought at first, never insulted St. Paul in the least;—nor has there been, brother, the least difference between them."—"A great matter, if they had differed, replied my uncle Toby;—the best friends in the world may differ sometimes."—*Tris, Shan.*



in judgment upon the prose version, with the determination to condemn it, I might as well say, 'King James' Translators say,' 'By his power he brought in the south wind;' but the Psalm says, 'And by his power he let out the southern wind to go.' Thus the one flatly contradicts the other. Indeed it is no more true that the Psalm says, 'By his power he brought in the south wind,' than it is that the Psalm says, 'And by his power he let out the southern wind to go.' The prose translation of the Psalm says the one, and the metrical translation of the Psalm says the other; but the Psalm, in the form in which it was originally given by the Spirit, says neither the one nor the other; for as our learned author sagely remarks: 'No inspired man ever wrote in English.' The Psalm in the original says: *vayenaheg beuzzo theman;* which is rendered into English in one form, by the translators appointed by King James, and in another form by Sir Francis Rouse, with the concurrence of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. I leave it altogether with the intelligent reader, to determine which of these authorities has given us the true meaning of the Hebrew Text, or whether it has been given by either of them; and to decide whether or not there is, in reality, any very great difference between 'letting out the south wind,' and 'bringing in the south wind.'—By the way, I would take it as a special favour, if Mr. Morton, who seems to be a man of learning, would condescend to resolve a question in Meteorology, which for some time has weighed upon my mind. It is this: Does the south wind blow in different directions, according as it is 'let out,' or 'brought in?' On the same page he says: 'The Psalm says, Feathered fowls as the

sand of the sea ;' but Rouse says, ' like as the sand which lieth the shore along.' On p. 37, "the Psalm says, ' they remembered not his hand ;' but Rouse says, ' they remembered not his power.' On p. 25, „Rouse says, ' Thickest clouds were under his feet;' —By the way, ' Rouse ' says, ' Thickest clouds of darkness were under his feet.'—And on p. 20, "Rouse says, ' He destroys all liars ;' but the Psalm says, ' He shall destroy them." In all these places, and in numberless others which might be adduced, he quotes, not the Original Hebrew, but the prose translation, in order to set aside the authority of Rouse's version. Indeed he never quotes from the Hebrew at all.

What would Mr. M. think of any one, who would set up the metrical version of the Psalms, as a criterion by which to try the correctness of the version which we have in prose, in our English Bibles? And yet this is the very thing which he has done himself ;—with this difference, that instead of trying the prose version by the Metre one, he tries the metre one by the one in prose. If both these translations had been prepared at the same time, no sane man would have perpetrated the sublime folly of testing the one by the other ; and it is impossible to see why a few years of priority in its execution, should give the one an authority not possessed by the other. But all this serves to show how high is the authority on which our author has condemned the Scottish version of the Psalms.

For the most part, however, he disdains to make any reference to either the original Hebrew or the prose version in support of his criticisms ; or to bring forward the authority of any translator, critic, or lexicographer, ancient or modern. For example ; p. 26: " This is not what the Spirit of inspiration

has said; and how then can it be inspired?"—"There is no such thing in the Psalm at all."—" 'Cleanness of my hands appending in his eye;'—this is not what is in the Psalm." And p. 27, "'But will bring down the countenance of them whose looks are high.' What authority has he, (Dr. Pressly) for using this? And what authority for the following: 'The Lord will light my candle so, that it shall shine full bright?'" But his readers will find this method of reasoning copiously exemplified on almost every page from the 15th to the fifty eighth. Throughout his whole second Chapter, his argument against Rouse's version is, 'Rouse says so and so, but the Psalm says no such thing.' Why the man speaks like one pronouncing oracles. The Rev. George Morton

"Doth bestride the narrow world  
Like a Colossus! and we petty men  
Walk under his huge legs, and peep about  
To find ourselves dishonorable graves."

And who is this George Morton? The great Don Quixotte of religious Chivalry; the invincible champion of 'Neodism.' He is the man who rebukes Sir Francis Rouse for admitting into his translation of the first verse of the second Psalm, the word 'things,' which occurs in the same verse as quoted by inspired men; and chastises him for mistakes committed by careless printers. The man who has, for his own use, invented the expedient, (so happy for smatterers,) of comparing one translation of the Psalms with another, in order to test its claims. He it is, who, in his single might attacks that version of the Psalms, prepared by Sir Francis Rouse, Provost of Eton College,—revised by the Westminster Assembly and General Assembly of the Church of Scotland,—and recognized as a transla-

tion, by the Christian church, for the last two hundred years; and gives his readers his unsupported word for it, that it is not a translation of the Psalms at all.

When our author makes statements with respect to what *is* and what *is not*, in Rouse's version of the Psalms, his readers would do well to open a psalm-book, and examine for themselves the places to which he refers; for it has been his misfortune to make a very great number of exceedingly gross misrepresentations. And this is much to be regretted, for he is, probably, a man of some veracity. I will present my readers with merely a sample of our author's misstatements.

Speaking (p. 7,) of Ps. 2;9, he says, "the Psalm says 'thou shalt break them with a rod of iron;' but Rouse *leaves this out*." It is not necessary, in this instance, for the reader to refer to his psalm-book; for Mr. M. immediately adds that Rouse says "thou shalt break them as with a weighty rod of iron." So that, by our author's own account, Rouse not only has not left out the sentence in question, but has inserted two additional words. On Psalm 78, 41, he observes, (pp. 36, 37,) "The Psalm says, 'They limited the Holy one of Israel;' this peculiar and important phrase, 'Holy one of Israel,' Rouse leaves out, and consequently does not give the sense." Here too, he corrects his misrepresentation, by contradicting his own statement; for he immediately adds, "He, (i. e. Rouse,) has jumbled it together thus;

'And limits set upon  
Him, who, in midst of Israel, is  
the only holy one.'

He has 'left it out,' and yet he has 'jumbled it to-

gether!' Bravø! I hope Mr. M. will enlighten us respecting the possibility of such a thing, when he next ventures before the world in duodecimo. Surely, if, when he was preparing his work on Psalmody, he had kept it steadily before his mind, that he was writing for 'the plainest people,' he would have left out much of what *he* has jumbled together; as they would thereby have been saved a world of perplexity.

But he does not often set himself right by contradicting his misstatements. Respecting the 31st verse of Ps. 78, he says, (p. 36,) "The Psalm says, 'the wrath of God smote down the chosen men of Israel;' but Rouse says '*Death* overwhelmed them.'" But his readers can see, by looking into their Psalm-books, that Rouse's version does *not* say *Death overwhelmed* them. In comparing our two metrical versions of Psalm 25, alluding to the 5th verse, he observes, "The one says 'I wait;' and the other, 'I wait *expecting*;' but it will be seen by reference to the place, that it is not true that either of them says 'I wait *expecting*.'—(p. 55.) The following statement, (p. 23,) respecting Rouse's translation of Ps. 10, 8, contains the same amount of truth; "The Psalm says 'he sitteth in the lurking places;' but Rouse's inspiration falls short," (Reader—do you see the *sneer* on our author's face?) "and he leaves out lurking places." Whoever takes the trouble to examine, will find that Rouse does not leave out lurking places, but that he expresses the same idea by the word closely; which, for aught that Mr. M. has shewn to the contrary, may express the meaning of the Hebrew text more accurately than lurking places does. Again, on p. 25, he remarks, "The Psalm, (Ps. 18; 6,) says, 'my cry came before him;' but Rouse leaves this out also." Now, by reference to

the metre version of this Psalm, it will be seen that only the words ‘before him’ are left out; and I am willing to submit it to any competent Hebrew Scholar—provided he be an honest man—whether it be not better to leave them out, than to insert them in the place which they occupy in our common prose translation. There, it is—“my cry came before him, even into his ears.” The literal rendering of the Hebrew is, “my cry before him, came into his ears:” The learned reader will perceive the truth of this observation; and the unlearned may as well take my word for it as that of Mr. M.; especially as I am supported in it by the Greek of the LXX, where it is,—“my cry before him, entered into his ears;” and by the French of Martin, who has it,—“the cry which I uttered before him, came into his ears,” The leaving out of the words ‘before him,’ I freely grant to be a slight blemish in the Scottish version, in which it is,—“to his ears came my cry;” but this has nothing to do with the *truth* of our author’s statement. He declares that—“my cry came before him,” is left out, while it is all there but two words; he might as well have said that the whole Psalm is left out, On the same unfortunate page he observes, “The Psalm says, ‘the foundation of the hills were shaken;’ this too, is omitted by Rouse.” The common prose translation says “the foundations also of the hills were moved, and were shaken;” Rouse’s translation says, “the hill’s foundations moved were;” so that, with the exception of one word, Rouse gives all of what Mr. M. says he has omitted. How Mr. M. could be either so reckless or so careless, as to make statements like this, the falsehood of which, may be detected by every child who has a psalm-book, and is able to read it, is one of the unfathomable mysteries. Such misrepresen-

tations he has scattered with a liberal hand over the whole 44 pages of his second chapter. There is quite a groupe of them a little farther down the same page, from which the last two passages have been cited. "He did fly on a cherub—swift wings—his flight was from on high—thickest clouds of the airy firmament—brightness of light before his eye—his thick clouds passed away—hailstones and coals of fire did fly—the Lord God thundered in his ire—and the highest gave his voice there—he sent abroad his arrows—he shot out his lightnings—vast foundations of the world. The ideas conveyed by this language are all from Rouse." Now, I think this is the boldest assertion that has ever been made, since the time that Cain said he didn't know where his brother was. Mr. Morton, your Reverence's must have been very bad when you wrote that passage; for it is utterly untrue. Those who can, may consult their Hebrew Bibles, and those who cannot do that, may examine, in their English Bibles, King James' translation of Psalms 18, v. 10, 14, and determine for themselves, whether or not the ideas contained in the language quoted by our author, 'are all from Rouse.' But enough has been said, (and proved,) to shew how much credit is due to our author's word. It is well for him that he writes for the 'plainest people;' for no others would believe his statements about what he is pleased to style 'Rouse' Psalms.'

His inventive powers are surpassed only by his talent for discrimination. In the comparison which he institutes, between the short metre, and the common metre version of Psalm 25th, he edifies his readers with a great number of very nice distinctions; I wait to notice but a few. The first two verses in the short metre version are:

“To thee I lift my soul,  
 O Lord I trust in thee.  
 My God let me not be ashamed,  
 Nor foes triumph o’er me.”

In the common metre they read thus :

“To thee I lift my soul, O Lord.  
 My God, I trust in thee ;  
 Let me not be ashamed ; let not  
 My foes triumph o’er me.”

To most readers, these two stanzas would, undoubtedly, both convey precisely the same meaning ; But Mr. M., who has probably looked at them through a microscope, asserts that ‘the inspired Psalm cannot be both of these.’ (p. 55.) Again, same page, he remarks, “The one says, ‘Show thy ways, Lord ;’ the other, ‘O Lord show me thy ways.’ The one, ‘Teach me ;’ the other, ‘O teach thou me.’ It is very plain that these cannot both be the Psalm given by inspiration.” Let the reader put these fragments together, and weigh the difference. In the one it is,

“Show me thy ways, O Lord.  
 Thy paths O teach thou me ;”

in the other :

“Thy ways, Lord show ;  
 Teach me thy paths.”

Why may not both of these have been translated from the same Hebrew text ? The one says, ‘teach me ;’ and the other, ‘O teach thou me.’ *It is VERY PLAIN (!!!)* that these cannot both be versions of ‘the Psalm given by inspiration ?’ Well done, Mr. Morton. You can certainly split a hair into more pieces, than any other man of the age.—It is no wonder that



a man whose glance is so penetrating as to enable him to see a wide difference between one thing and the same thing, should discover a vast discrepancy between 'Rouse' and 'the Psalms.' It is unnecessary to multiply examples of the closeness with which our author marks distinctions; those given above, will suffice to show how important, in general, are those points in which he professes to have found a difference between Rouse's version, and the 'Psalms of inspiration.'

It would surely be instructive, to hear our discriminating author compare Hebrews 1, 10-12, with Psalm 102: 25, 27; from the Septuagint version of which passage, the apostle's words are quoted. If he were to compare them in the same style in which he has compared the short and common metre versions of the 26th Psalm, he would proceed as follows:—"The one says, 'Of old thou hast laid;' the other, 'Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid.' The one, 'the work of thy hands;' the other, 'the works of thy hands.' The one, 'thou shalt endure;' the other, 'thou remainest.' The one, 'like a garment;' the other, 'as doth a garment.' The one, 'as a vesture thou shalt change them;' the other, 'as a vesture, thou shalt fold them up.' It is very plain that these cannot both be the Psalm of inspiration. Why, Paul does not quote scripture at all."—Far be it from me to represent Mr. M. as having said this; but I think the reader will agree with me, that he might as well have said this, as what he has said.

After all that we have seen, of the research, Biblical learning, judgment, honesty, modesty and wisdom of this most accomplished critic, it will not be difficult to form a correct estimate of the weight which is to be attached to the following pithy par-

graph, p. 31. "I have compared Rouse's 22d Psalm with that of inspiration, and I have noted in it more than thirty variations from the original. (?) And hence, it and the inspired Psalm are two things very different from each other. Any man, by comparing them, can easily see, that Rouse's paraphrase of the 22d, is no more inspired, than his paraphrase of the 18th. Indeed, I have examined (!) a great many and I cannot find one of Rouse's, which agrees with the Psalm of inspiration. Even the shortest Psalm, the 117th, has in it a discrepancy for every line it contains."

I have no disposition to call in question Mr. Morton's right to dissent from the unanimous vote of the Westminster Assembly, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and the scholars and divines of the last two hundred years; or from any human authority however great. But when he contradicts so great a 'cloud of witnesses,' as have given their testimony to the excellence of Rouse's version of the Psalms of David, and expects others to accompany him in the stand which he has taken, would it be too much to desire him to assign some reason for assuming the position he is pleased to occupy? Could he not, for example, have pointed out to us, "the more than thirty variations from the original," which he thinks he has descried in the Scotch version of the 22d Psalm? Informing us, at the same time, what Hebrew words have been translated amiss, upon what authority he can assure us that they are incorrectly translated, whether the error in the translation is trivial or important, and whether or not there are any critics, translators, or lexicographers, who at all countenance the rendering given by Rouse. What Hebrew words, if any, have been omitted by the translator; what words, phrases, or sentences,

if any, not contained in the original, either expressly or implicitly, have been introduced into the translation; and how far, words so introduced, change the meaning of the text, &c. But perhaps this would have been too great a compromise of our author's dignity.

Even if Mr. M., in the most candid, thorough and skillful examination of the book entitled the Psalms of David in metre, had discovered in it many variations from the exact import of the Hebrew original of the book of Psalms, this would not prove that it is not a translation of that book; but only that it is not a *perfect* translation; and he might prove the same thing respecting every translation of the Psalms or of the Bible. There never has been a perfect translation of the Bible, or of any part of it, into English or any other language; nor will there ever be, until it is produced by an inspired translator; for,

1. Many expressions in the Greek and Hebrew originals of the holy scriptures, are elliptical; while in many instances we can neither be infallibly certain how the ellipsis ought to be supplied, nor make sense in the translation without supplying it in some way.
2. There are many words and forms of speech in every language, the exact and full import of which cannot be expressed by any words or forms of speech, existing in any other language.
3. The originals of the old and New Testaments were not, in the days of inspiration, divided into sentences by periods, colons, &c., nor marked with parentheses, notes of interrogation and the like.
4. There are some Hebrew, and perhaps some Greek words, the precise meaning of which it is not certain that any man "knoweth till this day."
5. There are, in the Hebrew Bible and Greek Testament, many words respecting the meaning of which there is a difference

of opinion among those most deeply versed in sacred literature. And, 6. There are, in originals of the Old and New testaments, many words which have more meanings than one; and without inspiration, the most learned will often fail, infallibly to determine in which sense they are used, in this or that particular place.

Hence, no translation of the Psalms, or of any other part of the Bible, can be *perfect*. Different translations may express the meaning of the original with more or less accuracy, and yet all be translations. Two translations may, in many instances, differ much from one another, and both from the original, and both still be translations. Let the reader look at Psalm 40, vv. 6—8, and compare it with the same passage as quoted from the Septuagint version by the Apostle Paul, (Heb. 10, vv. 5—7,) and he will see how far two versions of the Psalms may vary from one another, and still both be versions of the Psalms of inspiration.

It is easy, then, to see to what extent there is truth in that maxim of our author, which lies at the foundation of all his criticisms upon Rouse's versions of the Psalms. It is as follows (p. 16). "The Psalms of inspiration have in them just what the Spirit of God designed should be in them; no more, and no less." This, as a matter of course, is true of the Psalms in the original Hebrew; but as we have already seen, it is not true of any *translation* of them, ancient or modern, in prose or in verse, in English or in any other language. Hence, all such arguments as the following involve all the essential elements of nonsense. "Now, we know from the first Psalm that the Spirit did not design to have any thing in it about *perfect* blessedness: but Rouse's Psalm has, and this is contrary to the design of the Spirit;

and therefore it cannot be inspired. The Spirit of God designed that the Psalm should be one way, and Rouse has it another way. Rouse's way is contrary to what the Spirit intended it should be; and can it, then, be any thing less than impious folly to say that this psalm of Rouse's is the psalm of inspiration?"—(p. 18.) It would be easy to prove, if it were in place to do so, that Rouse's rendering of this verse is more faithful to the Hebrew than that of King James' translators is;\* but be it so, that Rouse has inserted the word 'perfect' without any authority from the original: it by no means follows that what Rouse has given us is not a translation of the Psalm of inspiration. One gratuitous word in a translation of a psalm, does not so vitiate it that it ceases to be a translation. And if it were true, according to Mr. M's. representation, that there is nothing in the Hebrew corresponding to the word *astray* in the first verse of the metre version of this Psalm, —to the phrase *that grows*, to the word *well* in the third verse,—or to the word *appear* in the fifth verse; and that *For why?* in the sixth verse does not express the meaning of the original; it by no means follows from all this, that that which has all these blemishes in it, cannot be a version of the first psalm of inspiration. Nay, it might have more deviations from the exact sense of the original, than Mr. M. represents it to have—and greater ones too, and still, be not only a version, but an excellent version of the first inspired Psalm.

\* Some, (and our author among the rest,) have alleged that the sentiment here expressed by Rouse's version is not true. But see John 6; 47, "He that believeth on me hath" (not shall have) "everlasting life." If "everlasting life" be not "perfect blessedness," what is perfect blessedness?

We might well be excused from entering into any more particular examination of any part of Mr M.'s *critical* review of Rouse's Psalms, but lest he should be offended at the brevity of the notice taken of him, let us look into the force, justice and truth of his observations on one of them ;—for example, the second, on which he makes himself as merry as on any of the rest. He treats upon this Psalm, pp. 18—20.

He begins with the first verse ; “ He” (viz. Rouse) “ says, ‘ why do the people *mind* vain *things*’ The Psalm says, ‘ why do the people imagine a vain thing.’ One specific thing,” &c. Observe here, he tries the metre by the prose. His chief objection to Rouse's translation of this verse, is, that in it the word *things* is used in the plural number.

We have already seen that the apostles and their companions, (Acts 4 ; 25) commit the same mistake ; not, indeed, in the way of translating—for they merely quote from the Septuagint version—but by way of recognizing as a translation that which in place of the word ‘ thing,’ psalm 2 ; 1, has the word ‘ things,’ and consequently “ does not convey the meaning of the psalm at all,” and therefore is not the word of God. Although he *says* nothing against the word *mind*, in the same verse, he shows, by printing it in italics, that it does not meet his approbation. The word used in the same place in the prose is, “ imagine.” The word in the original Hebrew is *yehgu* ; and the Greek word answering to it, where the passage is quoted, Acts 4 ; 2, is *emeletesan*. It will be seen, by reference to Hebrew and Greek lexicons, that the meaning of these words is not expressed by either *mind* or *imagine* according to modern usage. According to *modern* usage, I say ; for the time may have been when either *mind* or *imagine* conveyed the same idea in English, that *yehgu* does in He-

brew, or *emeletesan* in Greek. But the Hebrew word in the original of the psalm, and the Greek word in the original of Acts, 4; 25, means to meditate, or study.—See Prov. 24; 22, Isa. 33; 18, Mark 13; 11, and the lexicons of Parkhurst, Gesenius, Schrevelius, &c.

Yet I am far from being disposed to deny either the prose or metre to be a version of the inspired Psalm; for, at a former period of our language, both *imagine* and *mind* may have conveyed to an English reader the meaning and force of the original; *imagine* comes near to it yet, and *mind* still nearer; and the context renders it utterly impossible for any child, who is able to read, to misunderstand either the one or the other.

But we have dwelt too long on this silly cavil of our author; let us proceed to his second objection to Rouse's version of this psalm. It is as follows; "Rouse says, 'princes are combined *to plot* against the Lord;' but the psalm does not say so. It says, 'they take counsel together' against the Lord." Here, too, the authority upon which he condemns Rouse, is that of the prose version. The prose says "princes take counsel together against the Lord;" the metre says "princes are combined to plot against the Lord." And it may be added, the Septuagint, as quoted, Acts 4; 25, says, "rulers were gathered together against the Lord." By Mr. M.'s logic, the first of these is *the* Psalm; and neither of the others can be so much as a *version* of the psalm. It would require the man who has discovered that 'teach me,' and 'O teach thou me,' cannot both be translations of the same Hebrew sentence, to discover very much difference between 'taking counsel together,' and 'being combined to plot,' against the Lord.

However, the slight difference which does exist

between them, is altogether in favor of the metre version. The Hebrew word rendered into English by these different forms of expression, is *nosedu*; which in its primary signification means *to found* or lay a foundation; and perhaps the most literal rendering of the passage in question would be, "counsellors are founded against the Lord;" that is, firmly settled, in their opposition to him. Parkhurst, (Heb. Lexicon,) in explanation of the Hebrew word under consideration, says, "To be founded, firmly fixed, or resolved; occ. Ps. 2; 2, 31; 14."

The prose translation only gives the idea of consultation, which is not contained in the Hebrew at all, only as it is implied in the word *rozenim*, which is differently translated, counsellors, princes, rulers; and leaves out the idea of combination, or settled compact, which, according to the best authorities—and among the rest Acts 4; 25—is the chief thing pointed at in the Hebrew text. The metre gives the idea both of consultation and of combination; and must, therefore, I think, by every good scholar, be allowed to be, in this instance, incomparably better than the prose.

After having annihilated v. 2, he proceeds to demolish v. 4, of the metre version of this Psalm. "Rouse says, 'the Lord shall scorn them *all*;' but this is not in the inspired psalm." Here he gives his readers only his own authority for the soundness of his criticism.

Could you not afford to be a little more explicit, Mr. Morton? Do you mean that the line which you have quoted is *all* an addition to the psalm, or that only one word of it is such? By the "inspired psalm" do you mean the original Hebrew, or the prose translation? Our author will not dare deny that "the Lord shall scorn them" is in the Hebrew



psalm ; and he cannot prove that *lemo* is not an emphatic form of the Hebrew pronoun, and that it does not carry nearly the force of “them all.” And if the word *all*, in the translation, were not either in whole or in part warranted by the original, still, the alteration which it makes on the sense is so slight, that Rouse’s version of this psalm might have three or four such blemishes, and still be a most excellent translation.

On verse 6, he has the following : “ Rouse says,

‘ Yet, notwithstanding, I have him  
to be my king appointed ;  
And o’er Zion my holy hill,  
I have him king annointed.’

Just compare this with what the Psalm says : ‘ Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion ;’ the psalm speaks about a *king*, but Rouse speaks about a *him*. This pronoun *him* has no antecedent—it does not stand for any noun—it represents *nothing nor nobody* ! nor does it at all convey the meaning of the psalm. God, the Father, is represented as speaking ; and he says, Notwithstanding the opposition of the wicked, I have set, or annointed my *king*, upon my holy hill of Zion. But Rouse says, ‘ I have appointed *him*.’ Who ? And I have annointed *him* ! Why, this verse of Rouse’s is hardly like the psalm at all ; it is not even a good imitation.” It will be seen from this that Mr. M. can not only tell us what *the Psalm* says, but give us an infallible explanation of its meaning. Let us, at his suggestion, compare Rouse’s translation with what the Psalm says ; not with the prose translation merely, as he does, but with the original Hebrew. The words are *veani nasachti malchi al Tzion har-kod-*

*shi*. Our author decides upon the meaning of this sentence as promptly, positively and authoritatively, as if it had not been differently explained by the ablest Hebraists. In the Septuagint and Vulgate, it is rendered "I am appointed king by him," &c. In the common English translation, "I have set (margin, annointed) my king," &c. And in the German of Luther, "I have set or appointed," &c. Parkhurst, in his lexicon, translates it, "I am annointed for king," &c. It appears, then, that some authorities explain *nasachti* to mean I *have* set, or appointed, and others, I *am* set or appointed; while some explain it, I have annointed, and others, I am annointed. Rouse, and the Church of Scotland, like king James' translators, have seen fit to render the verb, not passively—I was, &c. but actively, I have, &c. and with this our author cannot, consistently, find fault; for he has declared this to be the language of the Psalm. Again, Rouse, and the Church of Scotland, conceiving that the idea of appointing to the regal office, and that of anointing may both be contained in the Hebrew word, have given both in the translation, thus;

"———I have him  
to be my king appointed;  
And \* \* \*  
I have him king anointed,"

so reconciling the views of other translators. And in this point too, they must meet Mr. Morton's approbation; for he says, "God, the Father, is represented as speaking; and he says, 'I have *set* or *annointed* my king,' &c." The Sept., the Vulg. and Parkhurst, as quoted above, by making Christ the speaker, and rendering the verb passively, tell us who

it is that is anointed or set up for king. Our metre version, although (like the prose,) it makes God the Father, the speaker, renders the announcement equally definite, by supplying the word *him*; a liberty which is often taken by translators, and is the more warrantable in this instance, as the pronoun has a very good antecedent in the word 'Anointed, Messiah, or Christ,' in the second verse.

The only remaining difference between the prose and metre translations of this verse, is, that in the former the word *al* is rendered 'upon,' and in the latter, 'over.'—Every Hebrew scholar knows that the word is equally capable of both these translations; and so far as it concerns the case in hand, the only question is, which of these two meanings was it designed to convey in this place? As a matter of fact, it is well known, that David was not anointed king upon Zion, but at Bethlehem and in Hebron; whereas it is not only true, but,—if we understand Zion to be put, by a figure, for Israel,—a truth very much place in this connection, that he was anointed king over Zion. And then, applying the whole to Christ as typified by David, we may read in this verse an announcement of Christ's headship over the church; as his Mediatorial headship over the nations is distinctly announced in the verses which follow. The prose translation of this verse, is certainly somewhat imperfect; for it does not distinctly convey the idea of setting up a king, or elevating office at all; which all agree to be the general import of the Hebrew word *nasachtî* in this verse. The only idea that it distinctly conveys, is that of putting a king in a particular place. The metre is incomparably better.

His first observation on v. 7, is, "Rouse has a sure decree; but the Psalm says nothing about a sure decree."—This is very short and comprehen-

give. But, Mr. M., can you prove that ‘*el hok*’ does not mean a sure decree? One thing is certain; ‘the Psalm’ does not speak of a decree that is *not* sure. So that if there is a blemish here, in Rouse’s version, it is a very slight one. He remarks in the second place,—“Rouse (says,) ‘Thou art my only Son;’ but the Psalm does not speak of an only Son.” It is freely granted that the translation would have been better without the word ‘only;’ but those who reflect that it is certain, from Heb. 1; 5, that the word *Son* is here used in that high sense in which none but Christ is the son of God, will see that this is a very small imperfection in the translation. And it may here be observed that when a man is preparing a versified translation, for the purpose of being sung in divine worship, he takes no more liberty, in *supplying*, to fill the measure, a word which does not really alter the meaning of the text, than is taken by a man preparing a prose translation, when he supplies a word to make smooth English.

In treating of verse 9, our author displays a peculiar zeal for the purity of the sacred Scriptures. He says, “The Psalm says ‘thou shalt break them as with a weighty rod of iron;’ but does not say with what.” It will be observed that here, as elsewhere, he makes one version a criterion for the trial of the other. That which he declares Rouse leaves out, he tells us in the same breath, Rouse has given us in full, with two additional words. The insertion of the word *weighty*, I am not disposed to vindicate; Yet it must be allowed to be beautifully explanatory of the word *iron*, as used in the text; and the reader can judge how far it impairs the force of the passage. “Rouse says ‘thou shalt break them *as* with a weighty rod of iron;’ but does not say with what.” And does Mr. Morton think that the heathen will be

literally broken 'with a rod of iron?' If he does, he has good reason to find fault with Rouse for inserting the word *as* in this sentence. But those who understand the passage in a figurative sense, and view this sentence as merely a comparison, as I am sure most of his readers do, will consider the supplement a most excellent one, and the metrical version in this sentence superior to the prose. It is no very uncommon thing to supply the word *as* in translating the bible;—see Prov. 25; 12, 20, &c., &c. Again; "Rouse says, 'break them *all*;' but not so the psalm." Well; what does the psalm say? Would it not be little enough to inform us of that, Mr. Morton, before you require us to believe that Rouse has committed a serious error in saying 'break them *all*?' However, it will not be denied that *break them* is a more accurate rendering of the Hebrew, than *break them all*. Still, I confess myself unable to discover any real difference between the two.

But our author has something more to say about this verse; "Rouse says, 'like a potter's sherd;' but the psalm, 'potter's vessel.' There is a great difference between a vessel and a fragment of one." That depends somewhat upon circumstances, brother Morton; for the purpose of carrying water, there is, undoubtedly, 'a great difference between a vessel and a fragment of one;' especially if the fragment be of such form and dimensions as to be unfit to contain anything; but if you merely wish to make a trial of your strength in shattering it, you will find that a good heavy blow will have about the same effect on the one, as on the other. Of course, in such a simile as that in the text, the one conveys precisely the same meaning and force that the other does. And I will venture to predict that when "the

great day of Christ's wrath is come," it will make but little difference to infidel and anti-christian nations, whether they are broken 'like a potter's vessel,' or 'like a fragment of one.' Our Saviour, making allusion to this passage, says, Rev. 2; 27, "as the *vessels* of a potter, shall they be broken to shivers." Do you not think, Mr. Morton, that there is a great difference between a single vessel and a plurality of them? Indeed, it is by no means certain that the Hebrew word *cheli*, in this verse of the psalm, means, specifically, either a sherd, or a vessel; for the learned reader knows that there is nothing in the Hebrew language, which imposes on the noun the same restrictions that the article *a* does in English; extending it to an entire object of the kind described, and limiting it to a single one; and the unlearned reader can judge whether the use of the more general form of expression, 'potter's ware' or even as our author says, 'crockery-ware,' in the translation, would not give more force to the simile. It is certain such a rendering would not impair the sense; and it would seem to be countenanced by the verse in Rev. 2d, already cited. However, I do not insist upon this criticism; for, just or unjust, I deem it unimportant; since the intelligent reader must see that if either—*the vessels of a potter*—*a potter's vessel*,—*a potter's sherd*, or *potter's ware*, conveys the exact and full meaning of the Hebrew phrase, *kichli yotzer*, the other three *must*, also, be good translations of the same phrase, in the connexion in which it stands in this verse. But our author adds, "What a sublime idea Rouse presents! the idea of dashing a weighty iron against a piece of crockery-ware!" For my part, I confess myself unable to perceive that there is anything at all puerile, low or vulgar in such an idea, if it be presented upon a prop-

er occasion ; and how could there be, since it originates with Mr. Morton, himself ? for the reader has already seen that there is no such idea in Rouse's version of the Psalm. His last objection to this verse is, that Rouse " says, ' them dash in pieces *small*.' " Here he chuckles heartily over his own new idea of dashing a weighty iron rod against a piece of crockery-ware. " Of course," says he, " when the *piece* is dashed in pieces with a weighty iron rod, the *pieces* will be small ! But there is no such small affair in the Psalms of inspiration. It is altogether original with Rouse." Wonder if Mr. M. laughed himself into fits at that very *amusing* threatening in the psalm ? But the most of that which he here represents as being original with Rouse, is, in fact, original with Morton. And as for that obnoxious word *small*, did he take the pains to ascertain whether or not the Hebrew word *tenappetzem* signifies ' thou shalt them dash in pieces *small* ?' What does Christ say, Rev. 2 ; 27 ?—" *Syntribetai*—they shall be broken to shivers ;" and the same verb is used in the active voice in the Septuagint translation of this verse of the psalm. Are ' shivers' small pieces or large ?

And now, having followed Mr. Morton through his whole criticism on the Scotch version of the second psalm, I take pleasure in leaving it with the discerning reader, to decide with how much truth our critic says (p. 18), " We have seen then, that Rouse's first psalm is *not* the first psalm of inspiration ; and the claims of his second are no better." It is confidently believed that if he succeeds no better against any of them, than he does against the second, his readers will be utterly at a loss to know from what quarter he gathers assurance to say, (p. 54,) " The proof, then, is superabundant (!) to show that Rouse's

psalms are not the psalms of inspiration ;” that is, that the book which is entitled *The Psalms of David in Metre*, is not really a version of the Book of Psalms. However, it must not be forgotten that he writes for the ‘ plainest people.’

Since our author is so great a linguist, he is, doubtless, able to give a *literal* translation of the following sentence of plain Latin :

“Parturiunt montes ; sed nascitur ridiculus mus.”

He will be able, also, to inform us whether or not the following, from an excellent author, is well translated. “The end of the commandment is love ;—from which some having *swerved*, have turned aside unto vain jangling ; desiring to be teachers of the law ; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm.”

If I have thus entered into a minute examination of Mr. Morton’s observations on the second psalm, it is not because I thought that he had, by his criticisms, placed in jeopardy the authority or credit of Rouse’s version of the second or any other psalm ; but because I thought this a favorable opportunity for throwing out a few hints, tending to show what an excellent metrical version of the Psalms we have. Its excellence consists, not in smoothness of versification,—for it is granted that it has many rough verses, and awkward rhymes ;—but in that which is infinitely better,—*fidelity* to the original Hebrew.

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 translations 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. If Mr. M. thinks that 'Rouse,' as he contemptuously styles it, is no translation of the psalms, let him prepare a translation of them; if he thinks it is a *bad* translation, let him improve it, or make a better one.

If it should, after all, be true that what purports to be the Psalms of David in metre, sung by the Psalmonistic churches, *is* the Word of God, how do you propose, Mr. Morton, to answer at the day of judgment for all the *smart* things you have said about them, throughout the 44 pages of your second chapter? This, of course, is your own business, and not mine; only I thought it but brotherly to remind you of it, knowing well that you will not be able to *impair the authority* of the Book of God's remembrance, or *sneer away* the force of the final sentence of the Great Judge.

## CHAPTER III.

Mr. Morton's idea of human composure.

Mr. Morton,—You should have left off writing when you had finished your second chapter; its completion marked the culmination of your star.

The dispute about what is, and what is not human composure, being merely a question of words, has, of course, nothing to do with the controversy on Psalmody. If it were only agreed what should be sung in God's worship, and what should not, it would matter less whether this or that be called divine or human composure. But an author who has plenty of time on his hands, may very profitably increase the size, and enhance the value of his book, by introducing into it a great deal of matter which has no bearing upon the subject which he professes to write. Our author has pursued this course with most admirable success.

One of the most curious of his digressions, is that in which he attempts to confound his readers' notions of the distinction between *divine* and *human* composure. Most of those who have written on his side of the controversy on Psalmody, have aimed at the same laudable end; but none of them so successfully as he has done.

The reader knows, that to commit to writing words dictated by another, is not to *compose*, but only to *write*. Hence, the Bible, in the original

languages, being dictated by God himself, to the men who were employed to write it, was not composed, but merely written by those men. Again, to express in one language, either in verse or in prose, that which an author has composed in another language, is not to compose, but to translate. Hence, the Bible, or any book of it, being rendered into English by some man skilled in Greek and Hebrew, is not composed, but translated by that man. On the other hand, if any one expresses his own thoughts—let him have gathered these thoughts from what source he may—in his *own words*, then he composes; and the composition is still his, though translated into a thousand languages.

When the terms *divine* and *human* are used, in speaking of any composition, or composure, they are descriptive, not of its *character*, but of its *origin*. Divine composition or composure, is that which God has composed;—human composition or composure, is that which man has composed. Mr. M. is a scholar, and knows that this is the full import of these terms, when used in such a connection.

Our author, in his chapter on “human composure,” treats mainly of divine composure. With regard to the amount of divine composition existing in the world, he sets forth quite contradictory views.

He says, p. 75, “And if the subject matter is inspired, that is enough; the song is an inspired song. For everybody knows, and the Doctor admits it, that the composition has its character from the subject matter. Every song, then, having for its subject matter inspired truth, is in reality an inspired song.” Again, on p. 76, he says, “And so in a treatise on divine things: it is not the composure, but the subject treated, or the matter of the composition, that gives it its distinctive character;—that makes it not

a human, but an inspired or divine composition ” Mr. M. undoubtedly possesses a private knowledge of the meaning of the terms ‘divine,’ ‘human’ and ‘inspired;’ but it is to be lamented that when he comes before the public, in his work on Psalmody, he uses them in a sense altogether different from their true meaning. The intelligent reader is aware that while it is true, that a composition receives its distinctive character from its subject matter, the application of the terms ‘divine’ and ‘human’ to it, has nothing to do with expressing a description either of its subject matter, or of its distinctive character. And still less does the word *inspired*, when applied to a composition, describe its character; since it only describes one of those numerous ways in which divine compositions have been communicated to men. The reader cannot fail, then, to see that to say, “it is the subject treated, or the matter of a composition that makes it an inspired composition,” is a near approximation to nonsense; and that to say, that “every song having for its subject matter inspired truth, is in reality an inspired song,” is a little like blasphemy. Why, at that rate, every sound work in the world, upon theoretical or practical divinity—every good treatise on any religious subject, is divine composition—inspired of course—the word of God, and therefore of equal authority with the Bible!

But Mr. M. is not a man of one idea, and therefore he seldom inculcates any doctrine without teaching its opposite. Whether he observes this rule merely to preserve his equilibrium—or that he may the better accommodate himself to the conflicting views of the numerous classes of Neodists—or that the very plain people for whom he writes may be doubly armed, does not distinctly appear. This, however is his mode of teaching.

Accordingly, after he has announced to us that every book which contains divine truth, is divinely inspired, he proceeds to let us into the painful secret that there is no Bible—no divine word—no “inspired composition” in the English language.

On p. 86 he expresses himself after this fashion : “ Thus it was with the churches of Ephesus and Colosse : they were called upon to sing ‘ Psalms and hymns and spiritual songs ;’ and the songs prepared by inspiration in the Old Testament, they could not sing, because the Hebrew was to them a dead language ; and they could not sing it any more than Dr. Pressly himself. They might draw the matter of their songs from the Hebrew songs ; but the Hebrew songs themselves, prepared by inspiration they could not use. Or, as the Greek was their vernacular tongue, they might use the Greek translation of these songs. But that they did so, is not very probable, as this translation was not written in poetry at all. And even if they had used this, it would not have been the songs prepared by inspiration.” From this extract it is not difficult to learn our author’s sentiments.—‘ If the Ephesians and Colossians had sung the Greek translation of the songs contained in the Old Testament, they would not, in so doing have sung the songs prepared by inspiration :’—that is, the Greek translation of the Book of Psalms, to which the primitive christians had access, and from which the apostles quoted so freely in proof of their doctrine, was not the Book of Psalms at all. And why might not that Greek translation of the Book of Psalms contain “ the songs prepared by inspiration ?” Mr. M. tells us, same page,—“ The inspired songs of the Old Testament are written in Hebrew, and that has been a dead language to her ever since her (the christian church’s,) first existence.

She might translate these songs;—but the songs themselves she could not use.” Now, if the Greek translation of the Book of Psalms, used by Christ, his apostles, and the primitive christians, could not be the inspired Psalms, merely because it was a translation, and not the original, no more, for the same reason, could any other book in that Greek translation, be the inspired scriptures; and consequently the christian church, in that age, had no access at all to the written word of God. And the same reasoning will apply with equal force to English translations; nor has our author any disposition to exempt them from its sweeping conclusions. He says, p. 85, “We have seen that Rouse’s paraphrase of David’s Psalms is a human composure. And Watt’s Psalms and Hymns are the same. And all the sacred songs we have in English verse, are the same. Because no inspired man ever wrote in English verse.” He observes farther, p. 71, that “no inspired man ever wrote in the English language,” either in verse or in prose. And it is easy to see, that if ‘all the sacred songs we have in English verse, are,’ necessarily ‘human composure,’ simply ‘because no inspired man ever wrote in English verse,’ then, too, all the sacred songs we have in English prose, such as the prose version of David’s Psalms, the song of Moses, Ex. 15, the song of Deborah and Borak, Jud. 5, &c., must be human composure, because no inspired man ever wrote in English at all. For the same reason, no other part of any English translation of the Bible, can be any part of that Scripture which is given by “inspiration of God,” since, as Mr. M. remarks, “all inspired men wrote in either Hebrew or Greek:”—and, as a matter of course, we have no bible in English at all—and, (which is still worse,) never can, till doomsday,

have the Bible in any of the thousand languages spoken by human sinners.

Mr. M. does not make this startling disclosure, without preparing us for it; which he does in the following words, p. 61; "A translation, then, to be strictly a translation, must set forth just the ideas contained in the original, *no more*, and *no less*." It will be seen that if this be the true definition of a translation, then it is not possible for uninspired men to translate the Bible; since no man in the world knows fully and exactly what ideas are contained in the original Scriptures; and no man but our learned author has such absolute command of language, as to be able, if he did know them, to express them in another language, without the least excess or defect. Mr. M.'s definition is, indeed, quite descriptive of that imaginary thing, a *perfect* translation; but if we refuse to read the Scriptures, till we obtain a *perfect* translation of them, we will live without the Bible a long time.

After all that Mr. M. and others can do, to confound people's notions about divine and human composition, the unsophisticated are likely to continue to believe, as they have believed all along, that the 39 Books of the Old Testament, and the 27 Books of the New,—whether in the sacred originals, or in any translation in prose or in verse,—are *divine composition*; to the utter exclusion of all other books or writings, ancient or modern, in verse or in prose,—from the Confession of Faith down to Morton on Psalmody.



## CHAPTER IV.

Mr. Morton's arguments for the use of an uninspired Psalmody.

Our author, having by his critical review of Rouse's Psalms, and his lucid definition of human composition, prepared the way for an advantageous statement of the question at issue, says, p. 85, "having no sacred songs, then, but those composed by uninspired men, the question arises, is it proper to use these in the worship of God?" Do you mean, Mr. Morton, to affirm that the 150 songs of the Book of Psalms are not sacred songs? Or would you be understood to assert that they are "composed by uninspired men?" Please choose your alternative.

After the very *fair* and *honest* statement of the question, to which we have just adverted, he proceeds to present a number of arguments for the lawfulness of singing in divine worship, songs composed by uninspired men. Of each of these arguments we will take a passing notice.

His first argument is taken from Col. 3 ; 16. "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, in all wisdom ; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs ; singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." Or rather, his argument is taken from his own interpretation of this text.

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, not because it is Mr. Morton's—for he wisely forbears to use it—but 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 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 them-

selves 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 Collossians, 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 alibi :) 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.

But to return to our author. His exposition of the passage is as follows, p. 93 ; “ ‘ Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, in all wisdom.’ And how shall this be done ? By ‘ teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord.’ Be constant and diligent in this practice of teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, and the result will be, that you will have the word of Christ dwelling in you richly in all wisdom. This, then, I take to be the correct

exposition of the passage." He educes his argument from this exposition of the passage, by a most extraordinary feat of logic. He says p, 94, "We see that it authorized the Collossians, and that it authorizes us, to use psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, composed by uninspired men; because it enjoins the use of songs, drawn from the word of God, the New Testament as well as the Old. And there being in the New Testament no songs ready for our use, those drawn from it must be the composition of uninspired men. But how does it enjoin the use of songs from the whole word of God? Because it says that by these songs we make ourselves familiar with the whole word of God. And if the use of them makes us familiar with the whole word, they must be drawn from the whole word." It will be seen from this, that his argument depends, 1st, on his explaining the phrase, "the word of Christ" to mean the Scriptures—the whole Scriptures, not merely in their *spirit*, but in their *letter*. This he assumes, but does not prove to be the import of the phrase. And this assumption is the less warrantable in him, as he asserts, p. 87, "my belief is, that by it, ('the word of Christ,') the Apostle meant the doctrine of salvation through Jesus Christ, as it was then preached to the christian church; and that he did not mean the Old or New Testament. Dr. Baird, in his work on Psalmody, makes this very clear to my mind." His argument from the passage rests, 2d, on the assumption that the use of psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, is enjoined as the sufficient means, and not as an evidence of compliance with the command, "let the word of God dwell in you richly, in all wisdom," All must see, that to give force to his argument, this must be proved, not assumed. His argument depends, 3d, upon the extravagant assump-

tion that "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom," means "make yourselves familiar with the whole word of God." According to this interpretation, if his first two assumptions be true, we must have embodied in our system of psalmody all the narratives, and all the genealogical tables in the Bible! for how else will the use of our psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs "make us familiar with the whole word of God?"

But which of the psalms, hymns or spiritual songs used by the church to which Mr. M. belongs, makes him familiar with the whole book of Esther? which of them makes him familiar with the first chapter of first Chronicles? And which of them, I may add, makes him familiar with the 109th Psalm?

It is obvious, that so long as any one of the three positions mentioned above, as assumed by Mr. M., remains unproved, his argument from the passage in question amounts to no more than his own assertion that we are authorized to use, in God's worship, an uninspired psalmody. And yet he has not so much as attempted to prove any one of them. Even his remarkably *clear* dissertation upon clauses verbal and participial, and duties principal and subordinate, in so far as it has meaning and truth, applies as well to precepts enjoining one duty, as an *evidence* of having performed another, as to those enjoining one duty as a *means* to the performance of another. Still, strange as it may seem, he pursues (except when he turns aside to spit in Dr. Pressly's face,) and enforces this baseless argument through 35 pages.

If asked what *is* the meaning of the verse, I might reply that an answer to such a question has nothing to do with the refutation of our author's argument. However, I am not averse from expressing my views of the meaning of so plain a passage.

But before proceeding to do so, I must be allowed to observe that Dr. Adam Clark, who held the same opinion that Mr. M. does, on the subject of psalmody, alters the punctuation of the verse, so as to make it read thus ; “ 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.” And if this be the true reading of the text, it subverts at once, not only our author’s argument, but also all the arguments on the same side of the question, 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 hearts to the Lord.” The text in dispute, Col. 3 ; 16, is “ 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.” 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.

Our author’s next argument for the use of an uninspired psalmody, is from the assumed fact, that the specific end for which the songs, contained in the Book of Psalms, were given, was *not* that they should be employed in singing God’s praise.

We find in the bible a book of lyric poems, which is, in several places in the New Testament, styled “the Book of Psalms;”—that is, as Mr. M. explains it, p. 99, “songs sung to musical instruments.” More than 50 of these songs are, in their titles in-

scribed "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 Israel;" 2 Sam. 23, 1. 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.

It is true, there are in the word of God other songs, which we know to have been sung to God on certain extraordinary occasions. But these songs are, for the most part presented to us only in connection with the record of certain historical facts, to which they have reference, in order to illustrate and complete the narrative; they were not, by the inspired compiler, introduced into the book of psalms, and were, in the days of inspiration, excluded from the stated services of the Temple. We have no evidence, then, that these songs 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 anything into the worship of God, the absence of divine appointment, is equal to a prohibition.

From all this it might be justly inferred, that the psalms were given, not only for the specific end of



being employed in singing God's praise, but that they should be used for this end to the exclusion of all other songs.

Yet our author utterly denies that singing was at all the end for which the psalms were given. On p. 136, he says: "The principal object at which the Doctor aims throughout these two chapters, is to prove, that the purpose for which the psalms were given, was, that they might be used by the church in praising God. But I apprehend this is a very important mistake under which the Doctor labors. He cannot produce a single text which teaches, that the book of psalms was given for the specific end of being employed in singing God's praise. All the proof he can find is inferential." Some men have a great dislike to *inferential* reasoning; especially when the inferential reasoning is conclusive, and goes against them. However, Mr. M. has a text for *his* notion of the matter; he says, p. 137, "the specific end for which the psalms were given was *not*, that they should be employed by us in singing God's praise. 'This is directly contrary to the Doctor's proposition, and to prove it, I appeal to the infallible word of God. Rom. 15, 4: 'For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.' Here there is no fallacy, no inferring, no surmising as to the object for which the psalms were given. The unerring word of truth tells us that they were given for our learning, and not for our singing." What profound logic! The psalms were given for our learning, therefore, they were not given for our singing! And yet our author, when treating of Col. 3, 16, points out singing as the most efficient means of learning, since, in his estimation, we are by singing

to make ourselves familiar with the whole word of God. By the same method of reasoning, which he here uses, he might establish the equally plausible conclusion, that the Old Testament was not given for our reading. Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning. Here is no fallacy, no inferring, no surmising as to the object for which the Old Testament scriptures were given. The unerring word, of truth, tells us that they were given for our learning, and not for our reading!

If anything is wanting to shew 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 word 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."

I am aware that Mr. M. has made a criticism upon the translation of the passage quoted above; but it will be appreciated by those who have read his learned dissertation upon Rouse's psalms. He infers too, from Isa. 38, 20, that Hezekiah introduced into the worship of God, songs composed by himself, and asserts that he was not an inspired man. But it will be hard for him to prove that Hezekiah's songs are not embodied in the book of psalms; and harder still, to prove that he was not an inspired man. See Isa. 38, 9--20.

But he has still another subterfuge ; that is, that if there ever was an appointment requiring the book of psalms to be used in the singing of God's praise, it was made under the Old Testament dispensation ; and, therefore, is not binding now. He says, p. 127. "And we have seen, that the practice of the Jewish church in her forms of worship is no rule for the Christian church." 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 authorising 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 shew so unequivocally that God gave the book of psalms to be used in the celebration of

his praise, do not shew 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 shew 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.

Our author, having succeeded to his own satisfaction, in proving that the psalms of inspiration were not given to be sung, proceeds to present and enforce his third argument for an uninspired psalmody. This argument he founds on the supposed insufficiency of the psalms of David. The caption of his sixth chapter, p. 154, is, "The psalms of David not given to the New Testament church to constitute her psalmody, because they are not sufficient."

Now I think I do not undervalue Mr. Morton's judgment, when I pronounce him utterly incompetent to determine, apart from divine institution, what should, and what should not be comprised in a system of psalmody. The praises of the church ought to be descriptive, of the deep things of God, which are known only to the spirit of God.

However, he brings forward several considerations

in proof of the insufficiency of the book of psalms as a system of praise. His first proof is taken from 1 Cor. 14, 26, or rather from a perversion of that passage. The text reads thus: "How is it then brethren? when ye come together every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying." On this verse, Mr. M. observes, very judiciously, that the apostle does not here reprove them for *having* a psalm, &c., but for the unseasonable utterance of it. In this he is undoubtedly right. The disorder here reprov'd 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.

But how does he raise from this passage, an argument for the insufficiency of the Psalms of inspiration? He does it by the happy expedient of taking for granted, that the psalms which the Christians had, were communicated to them, by the Spirit of inspiration, and not selected from the book of psalms. And if the Spirit gave them new psalms, it would follow, as a matter of course, that the psalms which they had in the Bible, were not sufficient. 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. But Mr. M. insists that these psalms were given at the time, by the Spirit. He says, p. 158: "It is worthy of especial notice, that these psalms composed by the

Christians of Corinth were given by the Holy Ghost." It is very readily admitted, Mr. M., that they were given by the Holy Ghost; for they were undoubtedly selected from the Book of Psalms; but it is not so easily conceded that they were "composed by the Christians of Corinth." And how you can stand up before the world, and say (p. 159,) that in this verse, "we are told, that for the benefit of the church, the spirit gave to some doctrines; to others tongues; to others revelations; to others interpretations; and to others psalms." I am utterly unable to comprehend.

He next argues the insufficiency of the Book of Psalms, from those songs contained in the book of Revelation, chaps. 5, 15, 19. He presses these passages into his service, by taking for granted two things which he ought to prove. 1st. That these songs are descriptive of Church's Psalmody, at those periods of her history to which these prophecies refer. 2d. That the substance of these very songs, is not contained in the Book of Psalms. So long as either of these two points remains unproved, Mr. M's. argument is worth no more than his assertion. But he draws inferences with extraordinary dexterity; it matters not at what conclusion he wishes to arrive, he can reach it from whatever premises he is pleased to lay down. It is worthy observation, that, in order the more to enforce the argument which he draws from these passages in Revelation, he ridicules Dr. Pressly not a little for saying that the passages in question "were given by the Spirit, and are a part of the sacred volume!"

His third proof of the insufficiency of the book of Psalms, as the Psalmody of the church, is, that "it is not sufficient!" p. 174. A most conclusive argument, truly, if the premises were but well established.

His fourth argument (p. 175,) is, that “the ritual of the New Testament church, is altogether different from that of the Old; and hence, her *dialect* must be different. The common dialect of the Old Testament church, was to speak of high-priests, and Levites, and altars and trumpets, &c.—But the New Testament church has in her *ritual* none of these things, and her language cannot be based upon them. She speaks of one great High-Priest, the Lord Jesus Christ. And instead of speaking of the blood of bulls and of goats, etc., she constantly speaks of the blood of Jesus Christ which cleanseth from all sin. And she has no priests; but she speaks of presbyters, or elders; and deacons; and ambassadors of Christ; and ministers of the churches. But there is no language in the Psalms corresponding to these.”

This argument, if it had any force, would lie, not against the sufficiency, but against the suitableness of the Psalms for N. T. worship. And if it were skillfully presented, it would not be devoid of plausibility. A very few observations, however, will serve to show that the premises on which it rests are true only to a very limited extent; and that so far as they are true, they do not contain the conclusion which Mr. M. attempts to draw from them.

If the terms “ambassadors of Christ,” “ministers of the Churches,” &c. do not occur in the Book of Psalms, it does not follow that there is not any language in the Psalms which the Spirit designed us to understand and apply in the same sense in which these terms are understood and applied. In singing the 16th verse of Psalm 132, “I will clothe her *priests* with salvation, &c.” the New Testament worshiper knows very well that by the word *priests*, in this verse, the Spirit meant not only the priests, under the

law, but also the ministers of the New Testament. The use of the word priests does not make the passage in the least obscure ; for no person who has read the New Testament can fail to understand it as meaning the ministers of the gospel. If, then, the phraseology of the psalms does not render them in the least obscure, the mere fact of its being different from the phraseology commonly used, does not argue that it is in any degree inappropriate for the use of the christian worshipper.

But if it were true that there is “in the Psalms no language corresponding to ambassadors of Christ, elders, deacons, &c. it would by no means follow that the psalms are insufficient as a system of praise. The only rational conclusion would be that we ought not to speak of ambassadors of Christ, &c. in singing God’s praise. In singing psalms, we worship, not the officers of the church, but God.

Our author asserts that “there is no language in the psalms corresponding to ‘the blood of Jesus Christ;’” but surely he had not so low an opinion of the intelligence of his readers, as to imagine that any of them would believe him. If, indeed, he uses the word blood in the same sense in which a physiologist would use it, it is true enough, that there is no language in the Book of Psalms corresponding to the blood of Christ ; nor is the absence of such language any serious defect in a system of Psalmody. But if, by ‘the blood of Christ,’ we understand his sufferings, there is certainly in book of Psalms language corresponding to it very closely. It may be affirmed without fear of successful contradiction, that the sufferings of Christ are more fully described in 22d and 88th Psalms, than in any part of the New Testament.

After all that has been said by Mr. Morton, and



others, 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 worshiper, (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.”?

Mr. M.’s next proof of the insufficiency of the psalms of inspiration, is taken from the “*vocation*” of the church. He says, p. 178, “The high calling of the christian church, then, is to convert the world to the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ. But if she use only the psalms in her songs of praise, to this high vocation she can never once allude.”

Did Mr. M. ever read the 72d Psalm? But perhaps he will say that this psalm is descriptive, not of the church’s instrumentality, but of Christ’s agency, in the conversion of the world. Be it so. It is no part of the church’s duty to sing praise to herself. All the missionary psalms are in praise of the God of missions. And it is not too much assert that

72d Psalm, the latter part of the 22d Psalm, and the 96th Psalm, are not only better, but infinitely better missionary hymns than were ever composed by Heber or any other man.

His next argument for the insufficiency of the psalms eclipses the glory of all the rest. It is presented and enforced pp. 180-183, and the substance of it is, that the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper are not named in the book of Psalms; and we need a psalmody in which they *are* named.—By the same profound logic, these psalms were equally ill adapted to Jewish worship, since they do not name circumcision, or the passover. This idea is certainly quite original;—that we cannot praise God in a suitable manner, upon the occasion of the administration of an ordinance, unless the ordinance be named in the song of praise!

But again: the insufficiency of the psalms, is argued from the fact that they do not contain the name *Jesus*. “Again, ‘thou shalt call his name *JESUS*; for he shall save his people from their sins.’ But this sacred name of the Redeemer is not found once in the book of Psalms.”—p. 183. I only wait to observe that it is in the elucidation of this argument that our author inculcates the worship of the word *Jesus*.

His last proof of the insufficiency of the psalms, is summed up in the following words, page 193:—“We say then, if the church be confined to the book of Psalms, she can never in her songs of praise, confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. She may do it in other parts of her worship; but she never can in her psalmody.” And why can we not in the psalms of divine inspiration, praise Christ in the faith that he has come in the flesh? If they pointed the O. T. worshipers to the Messiah *then* to come,

does it follow that they point *us* to a Messiah *yet* to come? Does Mr. M. when he reads the psalms, read of that Saviour who has already come into the world, suffered and returned to heaven? or does he read of some Messiah yet to come? 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.”

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 an-

other 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.

Besides, 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 forever. Let it be remembered, too, that since the completion of the book of Psalms, God has neither prepared for us, nor bidden us prepare for ourselves, additional songs of praise.

Mr. M.'s fourth argument for an uninspired psalmody, is stated in the caption of his seventh chapter, p. 198 ; "Same authority for using our own language in praise as in prayer." And a little farther down, on the same page, he says, "It is granted that the people of God may use their own language in praying to Him ; and that in their prayers they were to praise Him. And if it is proper for them to *say* His praises in their own language, why may they not *sing* His praises in their own language."

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 all-wise God, unwilling to require of his worshipers 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, has 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 not, 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 shewn, 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.

Our author, in applying this argument, uses the following remarkable words, p. 205 : “ Indeed, the idea, that the Psalmody of the Christian church was finished by a ‘ sweet Psalmist of Israel,’ while nothing else appertaining to her, was finished without the labors of Christ and his Apostles, is, to say the

least, entirely unreasonable : and it is unscriptural ; and it is positively impossible ; if her Psalmody is what it ought to be.”—It is not only unreasonable and unscriptural, to suppose that the sweet Psalmist of Israel, who spake not of himself, but as he was moved by the Holy Gost, could have finished, for the Christian church, a suitable system of Psalmody ; but the thing is positively impossible ! That is, it was positively impossible for the Holy Spirit, by the instrumentality of David, to prepare a complete system of Psalmody, for the use of New Testament christians ! If Mr. M. had only thought of this at first, it might have saved him a great deal of labor. If he had but established at the outset, the position which he here assumes, he would have terminated forever this whole controversy on Psalmody.

## CHAPTER V.

Mr. Morton's remarks upon the History of Psalmody.

Dr. Pressly has a chapter upon the ancient history of Psalmody. He says: "Let us inquire, in so far as we have history for our guide, what was the practice of the church in the age immediately succeeding the time of the apostles." Mr. Morton strongly charges the Dr. with falsifying, in this matter. His remarks upon the Dr's. deductions from Pliny's letter, will serve to shew with how much justice and ability he prosecutes this charge.

Our author says, p. 216: "His (Dr. Pressly's) first testimony is the letter of Pliny, Governor of Bythinia and Pontus in Asia Minor, to the Emperor Trajan, written about A. D. 111. Pliny states in this letter, that the Christians of Bythinia, 'were wont to meet together on a stated day, before it was light, and sing alternately a hymn to Christ as a God.' The Doctor will have it, that this piece of history speaks in his favor. He says: "It will not be denied by any who are acquainted with the Book of Psalms, that these sacred hymns speak of Christ, —Christ the Lord of glory, is the great subject of this book. Then with the strictest propriety it might be said that in singing these Psalms, the primitive Christians celebrated the glory of the Lord Jesus



Christ as a divine person. The conclusion then, to which we are conducted, is, that there is nothing in this account of the worship of the primitive Christians, which in any degree, militates against the opinion that they employed in the worship of God the songs of inspiration; much less is there anything to prove that they were accustomed to employ hymns, composed by uninspired men.' Thus the Doctor makes appear that the primitive Christians used the book of Psalms to the exclusion of all other compositions." Now, the candid reader will see that the Dr. does not attempt to prove any such thing from the passage in Pliny's letter, to which he refers. He shows very clearly, that the words of Pliny do not prove that the primitive Christians used human compositions in singing God's praise; but he does not so much as *hint* that they do prove that human compositions were not used.

Mr. Morton, after this barefaced misrepresentation of Dr. Pressly's argument, proceeds to confront him with Neander. "But let us compare this," says he, "with what the celebrated historian Neander says on this subject, p. 192: '*singing* also passed from the Jewish servise, into that of the Christian Church. St. Paul exhorts the early Christians to sing spiritual songs. What was used for this purpose were partly the Psalms of the Old Testament, and partly songs composed with this very object; especially songs of praise and thanks to God and Christ; and such we know Pliny found to be customary among the Christians. In the controversies with the Unitarians, about the end of the second century, and the beginning of the third, the hymns in which, from early times, Christ had been honored as a God, were appealed to.' Now this history is very different from that of Dr.

Pressly.”—And what if it is, Mr. Morton? Has not Dr. Pressly as good an opportunity of knowing what the Apostle Paul means by ‘spiritual songs,’ as Neander has? And has he not as good a right as Neander, to draw his own conclusions from Pliny’s letter to Trajan? Yet Mr. Morton asks triumphantly,—“if the Doctor is right, why did he not state that Neander falsifies on this subject?”—The answer is easy;—it is no part of Dr. Pressly’s character as a gentleman, to give the lie to every man who differs from him in opinion; and still less, to step out of his way for this purpose.—And Mr. M. adds with the same air of triumph, “Now why did not Dr. Pressly bring forward this piece of history which so flatly contradicts himself, and show, that is incorrect?”—I can easily let you into the whole secret, Mr. M.: Neander is a writer of the present age; and Dr. Pressly being a man of sense, or at least desirous to be esteemed such, did not wish to make himself supremely ridiculous, by producing the speculations of a modern historian, in evidence of the ‘practice of the Church in the age immediately succeeding the time of the apostles.’—And I know another author who might have partially saved his credit by avoiding this same stupendous folly.

## CHAPTER VI.

Mr. Morton's last chapter.

Mr M.'s last chapter is peculiarly brilliant, and sheds a lustre upon all the rest of his book.

I must be allowed to observe, by the way, that though neither Mr. M., nor any other man who has written on his side of the question, pleads for the *exclusive* use of an uninspired Psalmody; yet all who oppose the *exclusive* use of an inspired Psalmody, practically put themselves on this ground. For it is notoriously a matter of fact, that the introduction of *uninspired songs into the worship of God*, is almost uniformly followed by the *total disuse of the Psalms of inspiration*. Whether it be, that the principle upon which men adopt an uninspired Psalmody, necessary leads them to discard the Psalmody of the Bible, or, that the use of the former, creates a distaste for the latter;—one thing is certain, (and Mr. M. knows it) viz: that the one part of the Christian world uses an inspired Psalmody exclusively, and the other part, with few exceptions, uses *exclusively* an *uninspired Psalmody*. This is the exact practical difference between “Psalmonism” and “Neodism.”

Our author accounts in the following manner, for men holding what he calls “Psalmonistic” views;—p. 234: “The cause, no doubt is found in the

deranged state of the human mind, resulting from sin's influence on the faculties of the soul."—A very satisfactory way, truly, of accounting for the fact, that some men prefer the Psalms which God has made to those composed by men !

On p. 236, he is a little more definite, and points out *prejudice*, as the form in which the depravity of the human mind operates, in the production of this sad effect. "For this opinion," says he, "that Psalmonism is sustained chiefly by the prejudice of education, there are several reasons—we offer but a few." It is not necessary to examine all the reasons which Mr. M. assigns; let his concluding one be taken as a sample of the whole. It is as follows;—"Another evidence of Psalmonism being upheld principally by prejudice, appears from this, that Psalmonistic Churches are composed chiefly of those who are called the Scotch-Irish population. In those countries, their prejudices grew out of the practice of using the "old Psalms," and when they come here they are still retained; and unimpaired, if possible, handed down from one generation to another. And it is to be lamented, that many of them manifest more interest for these old notions, than they do in the behalf of piety and temperance. But the fact that Psalmonism is fostered only among these, amounts to *positive proof*, that its main support is derived from prejudice of education."

I give this argument in full, because of its great importance; and, seriously, I deem it as candid, pertinent and forcible, as any other argument in the book. It is certainly well suited for the winding up of such a work as "Morton on Psalmody." The reader will please notice the full force of Mr. M.'s grand climacteric. "Psalmonistic Churches are composed chiefly of those called the Scotch-Irish

population,"—that is, of Irish Presbyterians and their descendants: *therefore*—reader, mark the inference,—THEREFORE "the main support of Psalmism is derived from the prejudice of education!!"—If Englishmen, Frenchmen, Yankees, Germans, or any other than those whom our author denominates 'Scotch-Irish,' preferred an inspired to an un-inspired Psalmody, we might give them credit for being rationally convinced of the justness of their preference; "but the fact that Psalmism is fostered only among the 'Scotch-Irish,' amounts to *positive proof*, that its main support is derived from the prejudice of education!!"

This glorious termination of Mr. M.'s process of reasoning, can hardly fail to remind the reader of our Saviour's observation, that "if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch." It would perhaps be wicked so to apply the passage; but its obvious applicability, would certainly be at least an extenuation of the offence.

And now, Mr. Morton, leaving you where you have left yourself, I am prepared to take my leave of you. But before we part, let me exhort you to reconsider the subject on which you have written, before you issue a second edition of your work; and to be on your guard, 'lest haply,' under the pretence of contending against Dr. Pressly, 'you be found fighting against God.' I know that the multitude is on your side; but you will readily grant that this fact is no indication that you are in the right; and however painful it may be to those who plead for the exclusive use of an inspired Psalmody, to see the multitudes against them, this state of things gives them no manner of concern for the ultimate success of their cause. You will agree with us that the time is coming, and is not far distant, when Zion's

‘watchmen shall lift up the voice; *with the voice together shall they sing*: for they shall see eye to eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion.’ It must be admitted on all hands, that the only Psalmody in which the whole Church can unite, in these sad days of division and sectarianism, is the Psalmody of the Bible; it is clear that in this *all Christians might* unite; and for our part, we are firmly persuaded that there never will be a general union in any other. In the mean time, we will, by the grace of God, continue to stand on ground which *might* be common, knowing that those who assume a ground which *must* be sectional, must be responsible for existing divisions, and assured that those who have gone out from us, will return again, and that they and we together, will yet celebrate in songs of the Spirit’s composure, the exalted glory of him ‘who inhabits the praises of Israel.’

A CONDENSED ARGUMENT FOR THE EXCLUSIVE  
USE OF AN INSPIRED PSALMODY.

To those who do not measure the force of an argument by the number of words in which it is presented, the following comprehensive view of the principal arguments for the exclusive use of an inspired Psalmody, may not be unacceptable; especially if they justly appreciate the importance of the point at issue. At all events, it possesses this recommendation—that if it fail to convince or instruct, there will not be much time lost in its perusal.

In order to examine fairly, this important subject, it is necessary

I. To define accurately, the point at issue. And here let it be observed,

1. The question is not respecting any *particular version* of the Psalms—should this or that particular version (the Scottish, for example,) be used to the exclusion of *other versions*?—but respecting the Psalms themselves—should the *Book of Psalms*, either in the Original or in some version, constitute the exclusive Psalmody of the Church?

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 song's which it contains, to secular uses—is it lawful to sing them for the purpose of learning music, &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

II. 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

III. To offer a few arguments, in support of the position laid down; and 1, songs, to be suitable for the celebration of God's praise, must be descriptive, not of anything 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 compos-



ed 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 supplication, 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 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, *may* have *errors*, and *must* have *defects*, since all men 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 to 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,

3d. 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 impossible 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 employ-

ment 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 purest of those churches, which use human composure in singing God's praise, are perpetually changing their systems of psalmody. This shews, 1st. That the attempt to provide a system of uninspired psalmody satisfactory to the minds of Christian worshippers, has hitherto, proved a signal failure. 2d. That when any church adopts, as a part of her worship, the singing of human composition, her psalmody is liable to be corrupted to any extent, by designing men. 3d. That the head of the church looks with disapprobation, upon the use of human psalmody. " Meddle not with them that are given to change." Prov. 24: 21. " Now that which decayeth, and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away." Heb. 8: 13. The psalms of inspiration are as immutable as the eternal God.

6. The use, in divine worship, of songs of praise composed by men, is adverse to the use of the psalms of inspiration. In nearly every instance where human psalmody has been introduced into the church, it has banished from the altar of God, the Psalms of the Bible, or is gradually working that

effect. It believed, that if those who first opened the door of the church, for the admission of human psalmody, had foreseen this consequence, they would have pursued a very different course. Those who defend the use of human psalmody do not plead for the exclusion of the Book of Psalms from the psalmody of the church; and yet this is found to be the practical result of the operation of their principles. The songs of praise which God has made, and songs of praise composed by men, may both be used in the same denomination of Christians; but very rarely are they both used—and scarcely ever, for any great length of time—in the same congregation, or in the same family. Now, it is obviously sinful to prefer human to divine composure; and that which is found to induce such a preference, cannot be right. “Thy word is very pure; therefore thy servant loveth it.” Ps. 119: 140.

7. There is in the word of God a plain warrant for using the Book of Psalms in singing God’s praise; but no warrant for applying to the same use any other songs. Therefore the Book of psalms should constitute the whole psalmody of the church.

We have in the Bible, a book consisting of one hundred and fifty lyric poems, written at different periods, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and collected and arranged by an inspired compiler. Many of these songs, not differing in their character from the rest, are in their titles inscribed, “to the Chief Musician.” They abound with ascriptions of praise to God. They were, in the days of inspiration, sung to God’s praise in the stated services of the Temple, and are, in the New Testament, styled “the Book of Psalms,” that is, songs to be sung in divine worship. This certainly amounts to demonstrative proof, that the end for which God gave these

psalms, was, that the singing of them might be a part of his worship. And we accordingly find that when the purity of divine worship was restored in the reformation under Hezekiah, this use of the Book of Psalms was expressly enjoined. "Moreover, Hezekiah, the king, and the princes, commanded the Levites to sing praise unto the Lord with the words of David and Aseph the Seer." 2 Chron. 29: 30. "So the service of the house of the Lord was set in order." v. 36.

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 connexion 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 comprized in the book of psalms. Much less are we authorised, 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 wor-

ship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Matt. 15: 9.

Since, then, the bible shews divine appointment for the use of the book of Psalms in singing God's praise, and does not shew 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 ordinance of prayer and praise differ in this,—that in the former the thoughts, suggest the words; and we should therefore use the word 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 sung a hymn. Matt. 26: 50. *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 Psalms 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, Coll. 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 of 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 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 prim-



itive 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, we will understand them the better. 4. *We* have a better opportunity of understanding them than Old Testament worshipers 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 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 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 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 worshipers 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 interest 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 on earth as it is in heaven," rest assured that very soon, in songs appointed by Jehovah's own high authority, the devout worshiper will everywhere "give to 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 Isr'el in his Maker joy,  
and to Him praises sing;  
Let all that Zion's children are,  
be joyful in their KING.

THE END.

