

that the "Psalms are for perpetual but not exclusive use in praise"; and yet in his sixth article he plainly insinuates, that that there is no authority for their use in the Christian Church. It is surprising the facility with which hymnologists make assertions to support their views with apparent disregard to consistency. Whether are we to believe him when he says that the "Psalms are for perpetual use in the service of praise," or when he throws a doubt upon our authority to use them at all.

Mr. Harvey calls the Psalms the "Jewish Psalmody." Men who call the Psalms the "Jewish Psalmody," and the Scriptures the Jewish Scriptures, fairly lay the soundness of their orthodoxy open to suspicion. The Psalms are not the Jewish Psalms. They are God's Psalms, given for the use of his people, composed of Jews and proselytes, and collected and prepared especially for the use of the New Testament Church. The Scriptures are not the Jewish Scriptures. They are God's Scriptures, designed for the use of his Church in all ages. The epithet "Jewish," when applied to the Psalms or Scriptures, leaves the impression, and has the appearance of being intended to convey the idea, that they were for Jews alone, and not for Christians. This is entirely erroneous. The Sacred writings are designed for the whole human race, and not for any particular people or nation. Are the Psalms, or the Old Testament Scriptures to be called Jewish, because God inspired Jews to write them? The same objection will apply with equal force against the New Testament. It was written by Jews. It will apply to our Saviour, himself, who was a Jew according to the flesh.

Mr. Harvey very modestly asserts that "the vast majority of those who glory in the name of Calvin, have become like the psalmist, wiser than their teachers." The means, however, by which they have acquired this knowledge is quite different from that by which the psalmist acquired his. He obtained his knowledge by the study of the *divine word*, they obtained their knowledge by leaning upon their own understanding. God's statutes, that is God's word, were *his song*, in the house of his pilgrimage; the word of men is their song in the house of their pilgrimage. The proof which he gives of their having this attainment is, that they have discovered sundry defects in the inspired psalms, and that they are not suited to the Christian dispensation. As it is evident that they did not obtain this knowledge from revelation, they must have acquired it by their own unaided reason. Another proof of their superior attainments is, that they have discovered that Moses is opposed

to Christ, in consequence of which they have felt it necessary to add, to the song of Moses the song of the Lamb. If this be a fair specimen of Mr. Harvey's theology, we hope it is not of all hymnologists. If it is their claim to be "wiser than their teachers," it is open to very grave objections. If we were disposed to imitate his style of argument, we would say it was, "wondrous pitiful," to see a minister of the gospel pitting Moses against Christ, but we will not, because we do not approve of this course of argument, and because we think we have a better. Moses and Christ are in perfect harmony. Christ spake by Moses. The Church is one and the same in every age. The prophets of old spake by the Spirit of Christ. The Apostle Peter especially assures us of this. In speaking of the writings of the ancient prophets in reference to the Church, he says, "Searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory which should follow." It seems to be left for the wisdom of these latter days to discover that Moses opposed Christ. It is not a doctrine of revelation. Mr. Harvey seems not to be able to distinguish in the Old dispensation, what was designed to accomplish a certain end and then to pass away, and that which was intended to be permanent. What was typical and ceremonial, &c., was to be abolished, but the Old Testament Scriptures were designed for the use of the Church till the end of time. When the old dispensation was about to close, all the inspired writings were carefully collected, and arranged, under the immediate supervision of the Holy Spirit for permanent use in the Church. "Heaven and earth shall pass away but my word shall not pass away."

Again, to support his own views and bring discredit upon the opinion of those who differ from him, and to hold them up to ridicule, he says, is not their having "introduced the innovation of a metrical version, tunes of modern composition, the reading of the line, and the institution of a percentor, will worship? Who hath required this at your hands? Are not the inspired psalms dishonoured by these unauthorized, presumptions alterations and additions? This music which is undoubtedly a part of the service of praise is a mere human invention, just like the pulpit and the sermon in modern shape." How tottering must be the cause which requires to be supported by such arguments? This line of argument is not new, it is common to all hymnologists. It is so puerile, that it would be unworthy of notice, were it not so frequently brought forward. A metrical version is no more of an innovation