

Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Now, that the Psalms were given by divine inspiration, only classes them with "Moses and the Prophets," who all wrote of Jesus; fortold His humiliation, death, sufferings, glorification, etc.; and also described the glorious state of His Church. Nor have you, Sir, shown any peculiar merit to be attached to that book, over the other books of divine inspiration. But you will doubtless concede that point without controversy; for, if the bible be a book of inspiration, the Book of Heaven, then all parts of it are parts of God's word, and to give preference to one part of God's word over another, would be to say that one part was *better* than another. But this would deny the absolute perfection of the whole, for that part cannot be *perfect* than which something is *better*.

Now, if no *peculiar* merit attaches to the book of the Psalms, over Moses and the prophets; shall they be chargeable with wantonness and irreligion; with a want of due reverence for the Psalms; who are not willing to give them any higher place than they will reserve for Moses? Paul says "*All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work.*" It would seem that the great objects for the perfection of the primitive churches, to be gained by the teachings of the scriptures of the old Testament, were "*doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness.*" Those seem to be the objects to be gained, from the reading of the old Testament scriptures, in those days when the new was not yet published. Yet, notwithstanding the writings of the old Testament are profitable in this respect to the Christian, that he may lack nothing; still, we are assured by inspiration, as inspired, and of later date, that, "Now we have obtained a *more excellent* ministry, by how much also He is the mediator of a better covenant (i. e. testament) which was established upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith "Behold the days come saith the Lord when I will make a new covenant (testament) with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers." Heb. viii. 6-9.

I am aware that, to many, this appears like a rude way to