

perfect or imperfect. If perfect, then it is presumption to add to it. It may be argued that it is perfect so far as it goes. But this is not satisfactory, for it still leaves the idea of imperfection. If we admit this view, it makes man the judge of how far it is perfect, and how far it is not. If the church has a right to sit in judgment on one part of the divine word and decide what is deficient in it, has she not an equal right to do so on other parts? How dangerous a principle that man may rightly sit in judgment on divine work! I have never seen it proved from Scripture that God has given the church this right, or that he recognizes her as possessing this qualification. This is the most important point in the whole discussion. It is the one upon which the whole hinges. For if the church neither has the right nor is qualified to point out defects in the divine word, she can have no right to add what she may regard as lacking in any part of it. Has it ever occurred to hymnologists that what they are so anxious to introduce into the service of praise in the sanctuary, as an element of strength, may be a real element of weakness? That instead of advancing the cause of true religion it may be a means of retarding its progress? Instead of promoting union, it may be a chief element in perpetuating strife and division? Surely in a matter of such vital importance we have a right to ask something more reliable than mere human opinions to guide us.

Mr. Harvey refers to the opinions of eminent ministers of religion. It is true the opinions of such men are entitled to respect. But it must be borne in mind that they are fallible men, whose views are only to be followed in so far as they harmonize with the word of God. The church will do well to take heed to the injunction of her great Head, to call no man master. One is her master even Christ. God's cause has suffered great injury by trusting too much in man. There is a strong tendency at the present day to man worship, and to follow the opinions of men eminent for talents and learning, or distinguished for piety. How applicable is the divine injunction,

"Trust not in princes, nor man's son  
In whom there is no stay."

Never was the church in greater danger of drifting from her ancient moorings, or losing sight of her ancient landmarks than at the present day. Never was she in greater danger of trusting too much in man than at the present time. Never did she require to cling more firmly to the word of God as her only safe anchor, and of every innovation and change proposed to ask, "What saith the Lord."

In examining the opinions of the eminent men to whom he refers us, we find that they are mere opinions, supported, it is true, by the weight of their own names, but unsupported by solid reasons or divine authority. And we fear if their fame depended upon their advocacy of an "enlarged hymnal" in the service of praise in the house of the Lord, it would not have travelled very far.

Our attention is first directed to the views of Dr. Candlish, who "in the General Assembly of the Free Church proposed to add to the existing collection of paraphrases twenty-five of those hymns which had been manifestly owned and blessed by the Spirit of God in the conversion of sinners and the edification of saints." The reason which the Dr. gives why some hymns should be introduced into the service of the sanctuary, and thus placing them upon a level with the inspired Psalms, is that the Spirit of God has owned and blessed them by making them useful to saints and sinners. But are there not other human compositions—many books—"which have been owned and blessed by the Spirit of God in the conversion of sinners and the edification of saints," but would he, on that account, place them on a level with the word of God. They at least, according to his own argument, have an equal right to be introduced into the service of the sanctuary.

We are next referred to Dr. Duff; with regard to whom we would observe, that while an apostolic missionary, he is not on this account to be regarded as a competent authority on all questions, as witness the tone of his letter sympathizing with Stewart in the violation of a solemn vow, and condemning the church of which he was a member for adhering to a principle, which that church held on conscientious Scriptural grounds, while the singing of hymns is open to grave arguments. The Dr. expresses the highest admiration of the Psalms. He says "rather than forego the use of them I would be prepared to submit to any sacrifice." He speaks also in the highest praise of hymns which he regards as altogether invaluable, because of their evangelical element. He says of them, "rather than forego the use of these, I would also be prepared to submit to almost any sacrifice." He places uninspired hymns upon a level with the inspired Psalms; he does more, he exalts them in some respects above the Psalms, because of the evangelical element which they contain; but of which, it is evident, he considers the Psalms to be deficient. His reason for introducing hymns into the service of the sanctuary, is not very strong. Are there not other human writings as well as hymns which he regards as invaluable, be-