

daim have brought it as a grievous charge against them. The fact that no objection was raised on this point, may be regarded as conclusive evidence, that the inspired psalms formed the matter of praise, as the other Scriptures formed the matter of instruction, in the early christian church as they had done in the ancient church. Viewing all these evidences combined, we have the most valid reasons for regarding the inspired collection of poetry contained in the Bible, as the psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs referred to by the apostle; but not one reason for believing that uninspired poetry is intended, or that such was used in the worship of God in the primitive church.

Mr. Harvey thinks it impossible, if we sing the psalms and do not sing uninspired hymns to fulfil the injunction, "Give thanks to God and the Father in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that is," he says, "the historical Christ, not the promised Messiah known to the ancient church, but the one Mediator, the man Christ Jesus." Does he mean to insinuate that the "promised Messiah" and the "one Mediator," are different persons. "The whole worship of the church of God since the revelation of the first promise of mercy to man, has been conducted through Jesus Christ. The church of God in every age is one, the covenant of Grace is one, the Mediator is one, and to the church of Old he was as *really* revealed as he is to the church of this day, and was by her believing members as really confided in for salvation as by the saints of the New Testament. The object of worship has always been the same, and the great medium of access, the Son of God, as Redeemer, has always been the same. *"There is not salvation in any other."* How then can it be denied that the Old Testament worship was conducted in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. The language of the Confession of Faith is: "Religious worship is to be given to God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit,—and since the fall not without a Mediator; nor in the mediation of any other but Christ alone." This is the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church, and of the Holy Scriptures, and Mr. Harvey in subscribing this, "form of sound words," ought to understand it, and understanding it, ought not to contradict it. Will he maintain that no acceptable thanks giving was offered to God under the Old Testament dispensation? If it was acceptable, it could only be so, by being offered through Jesus Christ the one Mediator. There is nothing more supremely absurd, than to suppose, that the Holy Spirit who inspired holy men of Old to write the psalms for the use of the church in the service of praise and thanksgiving in the sanctuary, did not understand the economy of

Redemption. The Holy Spirit who operates on the hearts of the subjects of grace, and indited these spiritual songs, understood well the scheme of mercy, and on no other scheme, could he direct them to God. But, perhaps, it will be contended, that the express words and letters constituting the sound in the name of Jesus, or for Christ's sake, are necessary for evangelical songs of praise. In how many, it may be asked, of those uninspired hymns which are used in the public worship of God, are these to be found? Let Mr. Harvey count the number, and tell us how many, and then atone for the quibble by at least a secret blush of generous shame. His objection is utterly without foundation.

Again he says it is, "wondrous pitiful," to find men arguing that we are offering strange fire upon the altar if in our songs of praise we name the name of Jesus." We ask Mr. Harvey did he not know when he penned that statement, that he was misrepresenting his brethren, who held views different from his on the matter of praise in the sanctuary? Did he not know, that it was not the name of Jesus in the hymn, they objected to, but the introducing of human hymns into service of praise without a divine warrant. Those who advocate the exclusive use of the inspired psalms, yield to none in their love and veneration for the name of Jesus, at which every knee should bow, but they do more, they revere the teaching and authority of him who bears that name. Many who profess a great deal of respect for the name of Jesus, are not distinguished for their regard to his teaching and authority. In their estimation the whole merit seems to consist in the sound of the name, we hope that this will not apply to Mr. Harvey, and in this we have the real germ of ritualism. In the statement to which we have referred, he has not only done injustice to those brethren who differ from him, but he has very unfairly misrepresented them.

Again referring to the Genevan Reformers, according to whose views of divine truth, and church government, the Presbyterian church was largely moulded, and who restricted the matter of praise in the sanctuary to the inspired psalms, he says: "There are still a few in these days who hold the same views" on church psalmody. The object of this remark is evidently to depreciate their opinions, because held by comparatively few. But does the existence of truth depend on the number of those who believe it? If so, Pilate might well ask, "what is truth?" Does the truth of the gospel depend on the number who believe it? Does the inspiration of the Holy scriptures depend on the number of those who believe it? Truth is the same whether