

and Romish delusion is more valuable than Protestant truth. Public opinion crucified "the Lord of glory." It is utterly vain to cry up *usage* in the Church, as an argument for hymns, unless it can be traced back to *apostolic* times, and shown to have had the seal of apostolic sanction. It is just at this point that the pro-hymnal argument, derived from long continued usage, utterly breaks down—the very point where it could be of any service to establish a Divine warrant. No uninspired hymns were used in worship in apostolic times with the apostolic approval. *The best age of the Church was a Psalm singing age.*

The plea for their use in praise derived from the *excellence* of many of the hymns in common use, is equally invalid. It is not disputed that some of them are full of sound doctrine and are beautiful poetic compositions. It is true that many of them are utterly worthless. The Rev. Dr. Bennet, St. John, in his *Wisdom of the King* properly characterizes many of them, when he declares that there is in them "much inanity, and in some instances much profanity and false doctrine embodied." It is readily conceded, however, that some are excellent. Yet, after all, the best of them are only *human* compositions. They are the words of fallible men and, as such, are not worthy to be compared with the utterances of the Holy Spirit. "The words of the Lord are pure words: they are like silver tried in a furnace of earth purified seven times." Moreover, it is a false principle to assume, that the great Object of worship will accept whatever the worshipper's judgment and taste may pronounce desirable. If an Israelite had sacrificed a bullock instead of a lamb in connexion with the Passover service, would the equal or even higher intrinsic value of the animal offered have secured its acceptance? Certainly not. The God of Israel must have what He prescribed, else He would not "smell a sweet savour" in the offering. Lacking Divine appointment, the costliest and most valuable sacrifice would have been a "polluted thing" on God's altar. As far as the outward expression of devotional feelings is concerned, acceptance is still a question of *Divine appointment*. So that, however *excellent* some of the common hymns may be in material, the question of their warrant is not affected. Their right to take a place in the praises of the Sanctuary is not to be determined by an inquiry into their *excellence*, but into their *Divine appointment*. After all that can be said eulogistic of the "grand and glorious Christian hymns," the Divine challenge must yet be met, "Who hath required this at your hands."

Our limited space forbids that we notice all the pleas by which a Scripture warrant is sought to be established for displacing the songs of inspiration by human hymns in the praises of the Sanctuary. One other must be adverted to, however, before we close. It is the plea that the Psalms are unadapted to the purposes of Christian praise—that they do not celebrate the great facts of human redemption—that they do not contain the name Jesus—that in the use of them the Christian sentiment is hampered in its efforts to find suitable utterance, and the emotions of the human heart require other songs for their full and suitable expression. It has been affirmed that "in no line sung" at the late meeting of the Presbyterian Council "was there the slightest recognition of Christ nor of Christianity." Of all the pleas by which it is sought to establish the