

study of the old and persecute the students of the new covenant? Who is it that sing "exclusively" the *hatred* of the king of the Jewish nation to his enemies; anathematizes all the Christian world, except a little handful of a particular sect of the Church of Scotland, for professing the dying *love* of the "King of kings and Lord of Lords." But the praises of Christ; the inestimable value of his sacrifice, the unspeakable Love of God in the gift of his Son to reconcile a world of rebels; the lost condition of the sin sick and guilt stricken world, dead in Adam; the merits of Christ's blood in furnishing the means of salvation; and the conditions implied in the covenant of Grace; the glorious plan of salvation, are themes which can *never*, NEVER emanate from the lips of the "exclusive" singer of David's typical Hebraisms, now to us almost unintelligible. Vainly do you quote from such excellent Christian reformers as Athenasius, Basil, Horsley, Bishop Horne, etc., eulogiums of David's Psalms: they do not cover your ground. *Be it remembered they all used hymns in public worship.* They can be of no use to the advocates of the "exclusive" use of the Psalms of David. But they are inspired and good, and therefore they *alone* are good, is the syllogism to which the whole matter is reduced by your logic. We *can* do without hymns, therefore, it is Scottically wrong to use them! We might legitimately go on and say, upon the same principle, having thus established the "*fact*" (as you would say) that whatever the Psalms teach is right; therefore, whatever they do not teach is wrong. But they never mention one word of a future state, the Divinity of Christ, the merits of his blood, the superior merits of the New Covenant, nor of His second coming—yea, many other points of most vital interest to the *Christian*—therefore, by your logic, if it be worth anything, these doctrines are essentially wrong. Yea, the doctrines of Baptism and the Lord's Supper—the very name Christian, or disciple is, by your theory, essentially *wrong*, and you would by it unchristianise the Christian world. Indeed, the very least that may be said of the salutary effects of your doctrine is, that it is in its tendency most decidedly anti-Christian. It is a doctrine no where to be found but among those who have gone as far as possible towards *destroying* the ordinances of Christ. Now this may seem a very harsh charge, but what would be said if it were found true? But it is neither the