

A Reply

.....TO.....

Rev. H. J. McKelway, Editor of the
Presbyterian Standard,

On Psalmody,

.....BY.....

Rev. John T. Chalmers, D. D.,

Pastor of the

FIRST ASSOCIATE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
CHARLOTTE, N. C.,

And Author of

"TEN REASONS WHY."

Price:—Single copy, 10 cents; five copies, 25 cents;
12 copies, 50 cents; 30 copies, \$1.00.

Address the "Author," Charlotte, N. C.

"DR. CHALMERS' FAILURE," OR THE REVIEW OF "TEN REASONS WHY," REVIEWED.

Under the above heading the "Presbyterian Standard" of Charlotte, N. C., reviews a series of articles that appeared in its columns under the title "Why the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church Adheres to the Exclusive Use of the Inspired Psalter in the Worship of God." These articles have since been put into pamphlet form bearing the title, "TEN REASONS WHY" &c., and may be obtained from the author at Charlotte, N. C.

The Standard is edited by Rev. A. J. McKelway—a young brother (our readers will certainly judge him young by his fruits)—who some two years ago embarked upon the somewhat uncertain sea of religious journalism, becoming editor of the "North Carolina Presbyterian," but soon changing its rather "local" name into one more in keeping with the editor's aspirations, viz: "Presbyterian Standard."

As soon as we read the editor's review or reply, we requested him to allow us to put his article in the same pamphlet with our own, to which we would add a few pages of rejoinder, as we were anxious for all readers to see both sides of the question. The editor objected to "being sandwiched between two of our articles" and would have to claim a second reply. To this we had no objection, but later he informed us that the printing had gone too far to make the arrangement. This was to us a disappointment, but we have requested our own paper—"The Associate Reformed Presbyterian," published at Due West, S. C., to reprint the article from the "Standard"; and in its columns we present our rejoinder, as the "Standard" has closed its columns against us, saying "this is the last of it." This is the second time we have

Dept. of Archives & Special
Collection

McCain Library
Erskine College
Due West SC 29633

Erskine Seminary

had Presbyterian papers to "shut down" on a controversy of this character. We appreciate the courtesy of the "Standard" in allowing the original articles to appear in its columns, and are sorry if we abused its kindness by their length, after it so generously opened them for discussion and issued its bold challenge.

We would have been glad if the "Standard" could have stretched its courtesy just a little farther and given this article a place in its columns for the benefit of its own readers.

Not long since Dr. W. T. Eva, pastor of Bethesda Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, asked one of the church papers, the "Christian Instructor," to allow him to present in its columns the merits of the question as between the singing in public worship of psalms or hymns. He was cheerfully allowed all the space and time and "rejoinders" he wanted. The editor replied to his articles as they appeared, then published all of them in pamphlet form, and offered Dr. Eva as many copies as he might request. Not a single copy did he order or circulate.

For our own part we are not only willing but anxious to have both sides presented. It is the Truth we are after, and not a victory over some antagonist. If we are right, we have nothing to fear. If we are wrong, we are willing to have it demonstrated.

But now for the article in question, "DR. CHALMERS' FAILURE." This is the somewhat modest (?) title of the editorial. We must confess we rather like it, for it is reassuring. If the editor had been at all sure of his success in proving the "Failure," he would have left his readers to make the discovery for themselves. As it is, he must make the announcement in advance, lest they fail to see it. It reminds us of an old custom among painters in the crude stages of Art, of labelling their productions, as "This is a Horse," "This is a House," &c., for without the label you would never have recognized it as a picture of a horse or house. True productions of art

don't have to be labelled. It was Disraeli who said that "the critics were those who, having failed themselves, were desirous of proving all others' failures." We learn that the article referred to has since been put into a pamphlet, bearing even a more "arrogant" and "audacious" title, viz: "The Distinctive Principle of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church Examined and Refuted" (?)

The article is notable for its errors and mis-statements. Take the following for example: it says (1) that "the Superintendent of their Orphanage (Presbyterian) was a minister of the A. R. P. Church. This will be news to the superintendent himself, we are sure, as well as to all A. R. Ps. We mention this 'just to keep the record straight.'" But what if he had been! He might have been all the better for it.

(2) Again it says that the Moderator of the A. R. P. Synod said in response to the delegate from the S. P. Church, "that the A. R. P. Church believed in preaching the Word, praying the Word, and singing the Word." Wrong again! Here is what the Moderator said: "We read the Word, preach the Word, sing the Word." Not a syllable about "praying the Word." "Keep the record straight."

(3) This reminds us that in the first editorial reference to the subject of Psalmody, Feb. 21st, the "Standard" said: "We saw in Baltimore the other day that an Associate Reformed Pastor was going to preach on "The Man with the Hoe." The truth is that both preacher and congregation are Presbyterian. For the benefit of the "Standard" (not of its readers), and "just to keep the record straight," we give the following bit of history.

The church referred to was once a Psalm singing church. It introduced hymns and joined the Presbyterian church some eighty years ago. In 1824 the Presbytery of Baltimore refused to receive its pastor, Dr. John M. Duncan, on account of his denunciation of creeds in a sermon before the Princeton Seminary. The majority of its members adhered to him and became an independent organization. Is it any surprise that its members now are treated to such themes in its pulpit as "The Man with the Hoe?"

From Psalms to hymns—from hymns to a renunciation of creeds—from a renunciation of creeds to a Man with a Hoe in the pulpit!! Facile decensus.

(4) Another statement made by Mr. McKelway amazes us beyond measure, viz: "that Psalm singing was too small a subject for the discussion of the Westminster Divines."

This statement from the "Presbyterian Standard", in the face of the historical fact that the Westminster Assembly,—the most learned assembly, perhaps, ever convened on earth,—spent two years in the preparation of a version of the Psalms, and did on the 14th day of November, 1645, adopt said version!!

The version was then returned to Parliament, with the Assembly's recommendation, and was by them approved, and authorized to be used in all the churches. The form of recommendation as given by Neale, is in the following words: "Whereas the honourable House of Commons, by an order, bearing date Nov. 20, 1643, did recommend the Psalms, published by Mr. Rouse, to the consideration of the Assembly of Divines, the Assembly has caused them to be carefully perused, and as they are now altered and amended, do now approve them, and humbly conceive they may be profitable to the church, if they may be permitted to be publicly sung." Accordingly they were authorized to be used in the worship of God by both Houses of Parliament.

And yet we are told that "Psalm singing was too small a subject for the discussion of the Westminster Divines!" Surely a paper setting itself up, as its name implies, to be a "standard" for Presbyterians, ought not to be so amazingly ignorant of "Presbyterian Standards" and Presbyterian history.

But "just to keep the record straight", we will give a little more of this "Westminster Assembly" business. We have before us an act of Parliament, dated Feb. 6th, 1645, "approving and establishing the Directory for Public Worship." In this Directory thus approved and established by act of Parliament there is a section relating to "Singing of Psalms" as follows:

"It is the duty of Christians to praise God publicly, by singing of psalms together in the congregation, and also privately in the family.

In singing of psalms, the voice is to be tunably and gravely ordered: but the chief care must be to sing with understanding, and with grace in the heart, making melody unto the Lord.

That the whole congregation may join herein, every one that can read is to have a psalm-book; and all others, not disabled by age or otherwise, are to be exhorted to learn to read. But for the present, where many in the congregation can not read, it is convenient that the minister, or some other fit person appointed by him and the other ruling officers, do read the psalm, line by line, before the singing thereof."

Remember that this is the Directory prepared by the Westminster Assembly of Divines. How far the Presbyterian church has departed from the Directory let its present practice attest. Is it presumption to claim that the Psalm-singing churches are the true Presbyterians?

And yet the "Standard" affirms that "Psalm-singing was too small a subject for the discussion of the Westminster Divines!!"

Can it be possible that the editor of the "Standard" is ignorant of the fact that all the Westminster Divines were "Psalm singers," and that the version of the Psalms, sometimes contemptuously referred to as "Rouse's Version," bears the imprimatur of that august Assembly? Does the "Standard" not know that they had neither seen nor heard nor dreamed of that "Gibraltar"—"that mountain seen from afar to be impregnable—hymnology" which has been recently discovered in the neighborhood of the "Standard's" office?

True, the "Standard" fails to locate or make visible this "mountain" to its readers, but it must be somewhere about, for the "Standard" "says so." It may be better posted on Geography than on church history.

Now, in the light of the above, what becomes of Mr. McKelway's "railing accusation" hurled at the A. R. P. church of being guilty of the ugly "sin of schisms"? To hurl such an indictment against a church of the Lord Jesus Christ without sufficient ground is, to say the least, an "arrogant" and "audacious" act. But if it be true, as we have shown above, that Psalm singing was the doctrine and practice of the Westminster Assembly in 1645, yea, more, was the practice of all branches of the Presbyterian church for nearly a century and a half afterwards,—will Mr. McKelway please tell us "Who has departed from the "Westminster Standards" in this matter, and, consequently, at whose door justly lies the "sin of schism"?

But what surprises and amazes us most of all is, not so much Mr. McKelway's ignorance of the history of the Westminster Assembly, as his ignorance of the Standards of his own church. If he will open the constitution of his own church (unless the Standard's copy has been lost in the rubbish during some of its many removals from place to place), and will turn to chapter xxi., we will read for his benefit, (not that of his readers). Remember, Mr. McKelway, just what you said in your article. We will refresh your memory. Here is what you said: "We pass by the quotation from the Confession of Faith, with the remark that Psalm-singing was too small a subject for the discussion of the Westminster Divines, and that they were treating the subject of idolatry in the passage quoted."

Now listen while we read from your own Confession, (chap. 21, §1.) entitled "Religious Worship and the Sabbath Day:" Mark you, this is not a chapter on "the subject of idolatry" but on "Religious Worship"—"The acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by Himself, and so limited by His own revealed will, that He may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan under any visible representation or any other way not prescribed in the Holy Scripture." Did you get the words,—"Or any other way not prescribed in the Holy Scriptures"?

Now read on and you will find the parts of religious worship defined, such as Prayer, reading of Scripture, preaching, sacraments, &c., and among these in section 5, page 120,

"SINGING OF PSALMS WITH GRACE IN THE HEART."!!

This from Mr. McKelway's own "Confession of Faith," a book which to this day nowhere authorizes the singing of human composition in praise to God. And if Mr. McKelway will consult the proof texts as given by the Divines themselves in the original copies of the Confession, he will find three: viz., the two commands in Eph. and Coloss: To "Sing Psalms, hymns and spiritual songs;" and the one from James: "Is any merry let him sing Psalms." Now what do the readers of the "Standard" think of Mr. McKelway as an authority on the "Westminster Assembly" and the singing of Psalms? And what does he think of himself as an "authority" on the "sin of schism"?

And yet with his article punctuated and perforated with such inaccuracies, errors and mis-statements as we have noted above, the author actually makes the grave assertion that "Dr. Chalmers is not familiar with the literature of hymnology in general, or of the Psalms in particular." The reader is doubtless reminded of the appropriateness of Disraeli's remark about the critics, and our Saviour's saying "Physician heal thyself."

Taking up some of the statements of the article, (and we must apologize to the reader for the lack of anything like connection or logical sequence in our remarks, for we are now "following copy," and the article under review reminds us of a "crazy quilt" or piece of patch work to which a number of households had made contributions from their scrap bags;) we come

(1st) To the opening remark concerning the membership of the A. R. P. Church, and the figures of the "dyke", and the "gradually subsiding island." Here we find either a marked carelessness in reading or a studied perversion of the statement.

Here is what was stated: "Our Principle (not numbers) is that dyke, our declaration a standing protest against the view that any and every one may indict songs which shall supplant God's own word."

Does the "Standard" not know that the soundness and potency of a principle does not depend upon numbers? Noah, Elijah, Nehemiah, Daniel, Paul, Luther, Calvin, Cary—these men all stood single and alone, but they stood for a great principle. The men in Mecklenburg in 1775 were few in number when they signed the Declaration of Independence, but did they not stand for a great principle? On which side would the "Standard" have been found in 1775, according to its majority rule?

The "Standard" does not know, (but it ought to know) that the Westminster Assembly stood for the same principle.

How long is it since three-fourths of Protestant Christians were with us in this matter? How long since the Presbyterian Church was practically with us on this question?

It may be refreshing to Mr. McKelway or us to give a little history along this line. We will quote from the "Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America" by Rev. Chas. Hodge, D. D.,

of Princeton Seminary. Dr. Hodge says that the question of allowing ministers and congregations the liberty of using "Watts' imitation of David's Psalms" came up repeatedly, but was postponed from time to time until in 1765 "it was referred to Dr. Finley and Mr. McDowell, who made the following report upon it, which was adopted. "The Synod judge it best, in present circumstances, only to declare that they look on the inspired Psalms in Scripture to be proper matter to be sung in divine worship, according to their original design, and the practice of the Christian churches; yet will not forbid those to use the imitation of them, whose judgment and inclination lead them to do so."

Here we have the Presbyterian Church of the United States declaring that the inspired Psalms are proper matter to be sung in divine worship, according to their original design and the practice of the Christian churches, while Mr. McKelway in his article says: "We deny that the whole book of Psalms was ever intended for singing in Christian worship." We simply put the Presbyterian Church of the United States in 1765 against Mr. McKelway's "ipse dixit" in 1900.

Reader, take your choice.

Here also in this deliverance of 1765, viz: "Yet will not forbid those to use the imitation of them (not hymns, but an imitation of the inspired Psalms) whose judgment and inclination lead them to do so," do we find the "permissive warrant" which was the entering wedge, the "camel's nose," or rather the trickling rivulet, which has gone on, with cumulative sweep and power, until the inspired Psalms have been swept out and supplanted, not by imitations of the Psalms, but by the dribbling rhapsodies of uninspired men.

Here we find the selection of songs of praise for the first time by "official act" left to the "judgment and inclination" of men.

And what has been the result? Why the "dyke" has gradually wasted and crumbled away before the encroaching tide of "human judgment and inclination" until not a vestige remains; the "breakwater" is gone and Mr. McKelway's church is at the mercy of every pious rhymester who comes along, as we shall see before we are through.

Compare the Presbyterian Church and its practice in

1765 with its practice to-day, and see how strikingly its history illustrates our argument in Part I. page 12, of "Ten Reasons Why," that whenever there is a departure from the law of Divine appointment "very soon that which was first regarded as the obligatory becomes the optional, while that which was at first claimed to be merely permissive, comes to be regarded as prescribed."

And also the point on page 13, that "whenever the Divine and the human are placed on the same level, whenever the Scriptures are supplemented by human inventions, more deference will be shown to the human than to the Divine,—the human will be exalted at the sacrifice of the Divine."

We furthermore call Mr. McKelway's attention to the fact that the deliverance of 1765 affirms that the singing of Inspired Psalms had been up to that time "the practice of the Christian churches." Nothing but Psalms in the Westminster Assembly in 1645; and nothing but Psalms in Mr. McKelway's own church until 1765, and then merely a permission to use, not hymns, but only "an imitation of the Psalms."

Hymns had not been authorized as late as 1787, for that year the following resolution was adopted: "The Synod did allow, and hereby do allow, that Dr. Watts' imitation of David's Psalms, as revised by Mr. Barlow, be used in the churches and families under their care."

Thus we see that hymns, not Psalms, are the innovation.

Mr. McKelway asks, "Why should the sentiments of a few thousand fallible men be any more conclusive than the sentiments of millions?"

Suppose we apply this "majority argument" to some other matters. What proportion of Protestant Christians throughout the world agree with the "Standard" in relation to the atonement of Christ, as that doctrine is set forth in the Confession of Faith and Catechisms to which the editor has solemnly subscribed?

How does Calvinism compare with Arminianism from the standpoint of numbers, the Methodists out numbering Presbyterians more than two to one? It might be enough to reply, that mere statistics settle no principle of moral or religious truth. Rome reasons in this very way. Few Christian communities have grown as rapidly as the Mormons or the Spiritualists. But there

is an old command, not in "measure and rhyme", but in plain prose, and therefore fully the word of God, "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil."

We stated in the outset that our sole appeal would be to the Scriptures and the standards of the Presbyterian Church as interpreting them, and that arguments derived from other sources would be regarded as unworthy of answer; but here comes the "Standard" in its first paragraph saying—"Come let us take a vote on this question—we have the majority on our side." Why not confine the argument to God's Word, the sole and sufficient arbiter on this subject?

The "Standard" informs its readers, with ill-concealed delight, that the membership of the A. R. P. church in 1899 was less than in 1897 and 1898, but it does not tell them that this apparent decrease arose from a rigid purging of the rolls, membership being made the basis of assessment, nor does it inform its readers that other churches show a similar decrease during the same period.

Here is an explanation given by the "Standard" itself. We clip from an article in its issue of March 14, signed "Clark" and headed, "Our Condition Serious."

The time has come for pious hearts to be burdened over the spiritual condition of our country. The Church is pushing her conquests at a slowing speed, and on some parts of the field her line is actually yielding. The rate of annual increase in the Presbyterian Church, North, has dropped from 40,908 in 1894 to 8,030 last year. To state it differently the Church made less than one-fifth the progress last year that it made in 1894, as measured by converts. The Methodist Church, North, dropped from 76,000 in 1895 to minus 3,700 last year—a difference in conversions of 79,700. The Presbyterian Church, South, dropped from 13,598 in 1895 to 8,613 last year. The Cumberland Presbyterian Church reported fewer members by 3,504 last year than in the year 1897.

The figures thus recited are sufficient to show a widespread spiritual declension. This declension has continued through several years. The rate of decrease has been almost uniform from year to year since 1895. The mercury is steadily dropping, having already passed below zero in two of the ecclesiastical thermometres, and apparently it is only a question of a short time when it will reach the freezing point throughout the whole communi-

ty. Is it not time for those who "fear the Lord to speak often one to another?"

What has the "Standard" to say to this—taken from its own columns? Was it because its own pious heart was burdened over the spiritual condition of a sister church that it gave birth to the pathetic figure of a "gradually subsiding island"? But we will give a comparison that may not be so gratifying to the "Standard's" vanity.

We have carefully compared the statistics of the Southern Presbyterian and Associate Reformed Presbyterian churches since the year 1888 and find the per cent of increase of the former to be about forty-one and the latter nearly forty. Not much room for boasting here!

But to relieve the subject of its apparent littleness in the eyes of some, we give the statement of a brother who recently made the investigation, Rev. C. E. Todd, that "no less than five hundred thousand Christians sing "the Lord's songs" to the exclusion of all human compositions."

(2nd.) Again,

It says that "Dr. Chalmers lays down with great pains his major premise. What is not commanded is forbidden. His minor premise ought to have been 'the singing of hymns is not commanded, &c.'" Here is the major premise as laid down in our articles. "The Doctrine, Government and Worship of the church are Divinely Authorized, Appointed and Prescribed by Almighty God,—so that we are required to show a plain command authorizing and prescribing both the manner and matter of our worship." The "Standard" admits this premise and is certainly logician enough to see that it operates positively to the inclusion of everything commanded in the Scriptures, and negatively to the exclusion of everything not so commanded. The Confession of Faith of Mr. McKelway's own church says God is not to be worshipped in "any other way not prescribed in the Holy Scriptures."

Then we followed this with our minor premise. "That the Psalms, hymns and spiritual songs contained in the Book of Psalms have been appointed, instituted, prescribed and commanded by God to constitute the matter of praise in the worship of his church, both public and private to the end of the world, and the statement that if any others are offered or employed, whether inspired or

uninspired, it rests upon those who offer or employ them to show the same or equal authority for their use, else they are excluded."

We deny that any other songs are commanded, and demand of those who claim authority for their use, that they show where they have been "appointed and prescribed" in the Scriptures.

The "prayer and praise" argument, and the Psalms, hymns and spiritual songs" argument of Eph. & Coloss. we have often heard urged in defense of human composition, and to these we replied in Part III of the discussion.

If any other arguments can be brought forward in support of hymns we would be glad to have them.

Our purpose in the argument was to show "why the A. R. P. church uses the inspired songs" not "why the Presbyterian church uses human compositions". Let the "Standard", or some one else, give the public the benefit of a series entitled, "Why the S. P. Church adheres to the Exclusive use of uninspired songs in her worship." That is their business, not ours. We say "Exclusive", for as a matter of fact, hymns are now used to the practical exclusion of Psalms. True Mr. McKelway says, "We can dismiss his whole contention about our duty to sing Psalms with two words, 'We Do'". But he fails to tell us how he does it. We recently had occasion to examine the hymnals in use in the First and Second Presbyterian churches of Charlotte, N. C.; in one we found two psalms, in the other less than half a dozen. This is the way "We do" sing psalms. "We don't" would be more in keeping with actual experience. Here is an extract from "The Soul Winner," a book by Rev. Edward O. Guerrant, D.D., pastor and evangelist of Mr. McKelway's own church, a man well known to many of our readers:

"Don't forget the inspired hymns of the church. I can remember when the psalms formed a precious part of the worship of God; and I am sorry to perceive they have been almost entirely ignored by our modern makers of singing books. The 23rd or 46th Psalm is worth a whole cartload of some of the new and fashionable church music."

(3rd.) Mr. McKelway speaks of songs other than Psalms, found in other parts of the Bible, such as the song of Moses, Deborah, &c. Does he not know that up to David's time singing of praise did not constitute any

part of the stated worship of Jehovah; that no book of Praise or Psalms had been provided, but that when the circumstances of divine providence called for a public expression of gratitude to God, some individual was raised up, who, under the direction of the spirit of God, furnished a song suited to the occasion, and that the songs were inspired by God's spirit?

Mr. McKelway finds some "poetic forms" in the writings of the apostle Paul and jumps to the amazing conclusion that Paul was quoting from some early Christian hymns. How does he know the passages referred to are "quotations" at all? Could not the great Apostle have put his own thoughts into "poetic form" if he had cared to? We understand that the editor of the "Standard" sometimes puts his own thoughts into "poetic form"—that he has even been "audacious" enough to compose a hymn! Why not concede as much at least to the Apostle, especially as Paul was writing under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost (something that we presume Mr. McKelway is not "audacious" enough to claim for his own production). But suppose Paul did quote from some early hymns, how does Mr. McKelway know these hymns were not inspired? He will not deny that the extracts given by Paul are a part of God's inspired Word. But what has become of the remainder of these hymns? Isn't it strange that they should all so utterly perish? A mere supposition, a mere guess, is all that can be claimed for these early hymns. But let us look at one of the quotations that Mr. McKelway gives from one of these early hymns.

"He who was manifested in the flesh,
Justified in the spirit,
Seen of angels,
Preached among the nations,
Believed on in the world,
Received up in glory."

Now Rev. A. T. Pierson, D.D., and other scholars, claim that this is a fragment of an original Apostle's creed, or "confession of faith," and that there are seven cases in the New Testament where these fragments of original confessions are found.

But who ever heard of anybody "Singing" the "confession of faith?" It would seem that Mr. McKelway does not even read his carefully, much less, sing it.

Again Mr. McKelway claims the example of the angels, who sang, not a psalm, but, mark you, an inspired song, on the occasion of Christ's birth as warranting him in singing a "spiritual song," which he informs us "is not an inspired song." Can the reader see any warrant here?

But if Mr. McKelway wants to follow the Angels rather than God's Word, we have no objection. We are informed that angels "neither marry nor are given in marriage." Why not follow that example too?

(4th.) Mr. McKelway urges as an objection to the inspired Psalter being the praise book of the ages that "some of the songs are prayers, not praises." But it is no valid objection to our reasoning to say that some of the psalms are termed prayers; that the language of prayer is employed throughout the psalms; and that in prayer we ascribe praise to God. All this may be true. In these particulars, and in others which might be mentioned, there may be a coincidence between these two exercises of religious worship. But still it remains true that prayer and praise are not only two different ordinances, but that God regards them as different; and has made provision to aid us in the performance of the duty of praise, which He has not furnished for our assistance in prayer.

But take the following as a specimen of Mr. McKelway's reasoning to prove that the psalms are not a book of praise. He says, "Prayer is communion with God." Praise is an element of prayer. God can be praised in spontaneous prayer. Therefore the psalms are not a book of praise."

We hope the reader sees the point. We do not.

Again he says: "If we can sing the 51st psalm why not sing the Lord's prayer?"

Mr. McKelway is certainly fond of singing. A while ago we had him singing the "confession of faith." Now he wants to sing the Lord's prayer. Soon we may have him singing his sermons and editorials.

As to the words Tehillah, praise, and Tephillah, prayer, "the prayers (or hymns) of David, the son of Jesse, are ended," writers differ, some rendering it "hymns."

The reader can see from the similarity of the words how easily a "copyist" could make a mistake. The weight of authority is in favor of the reading "prayers," though we regard the other reading preferable.

(5th.) Mr. McKelway seems amused at our citing from James, "Is any merry let him sing psalms", (psallo), as a command to sing the psalms. Does Mr. McKelway know that the Wesiminster divines put this very text in the "Confession" to enforce the duty of "singing psalms?" And if there was nothing for a man to "psallo" but psalms (and Mr. McKelway fails to show that there was) then if he "psallo" at all, he must of necessity "psallo" Psalms.

(6th.) Mr. McKelway says that "among the spiritual gifts of the disciples was that of hymn composer." But where is the proof? We deny it, and for proof refer the reader to page thirty of "Ten Reasons Why." But suppose we admit it, what then? According to Mr. McKelway's own statement it was a "special gift of the spirit" for that particular time, the hymnist was Spirit given, and how such a gift can be regarded as a precedent for any and everybody composing psalms at this late day is too absurd.

We are surprised at the text he cites in proof of his theory of a Spirit given hymnist—"Every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a revelation." 1 Cor. 14: 26. Does he mean that "every one" actually composed a psalm to be sung in praise, so that in an assembly of five hundred there would be five hundred psalms, just made to order, demanding a place in the service?

Oh, wonderful, amazing gift of song!! If the reader will only turn to this passage and read it in its connection he will readily see that the Apostle is rebuking a disorder that consisted in persons improperly obtruding the psalms, which they had selected from the book of Psalms, upon the assembly. The Apostle in this chapter does not merely reprove the irregular exercise of miraculous or extraordinary gifts, but all disorder. Their meetings in Corinth seemed to have been a good deal like meetings in some modern churches, where all is a Babel of confusion, some singing, some exhorting, some praying, and some crying "Glory!" all at the same time.

(7th.) Mr. McKelway has something to say about versions and actually makes the statement that the "Hebrew Psalter is the only inspired Psalmody," that is, we have no inspired psalms except in the original Hebrew.

Well, if this be true, then the Hebrew Bible and the Greek New Testament are the only inspired Bible, and consequently the English Bible in use is not the inspired word of God.

If the translated psalms are not the Psalms, then the translated Sermon on the Mount is not the Sermon on the Mount.

We knew that the editor had some advanced theories respecting the "Song of Solomon" not very popular with some of his readers, but we never expected him, in his zeal against the exclusive use of the Scriptural Psalms, to take away from the plain people of God the inspired word of God.

We shall not take time here to vindicate the claim of our Bibles, as they are in the hands of the people of God, to be, indeed, the word of the living God. This is part of our controversy as Protestants with the Popish apostasy, not with the "Presbyterian Standard."

If hymns can not be vindicated without disparaging the translated word of God and its claim to hold, when faithfully rendered, an incomparably higher place than the compositions even of the most enlightened and experienced Christians, their defense ought, by all means, to be abandoned.

In view of such utterances it is not strange that in our day we are called to fight the battle over again in relation to the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.

(8th.) Mr. McKelway says that the term "Psalms" includes Proverbs, Job, the Song of Solomon, Ecclesiastes. But is it not singular that when Christ and the Apostles quote from "Psalms" we always find their quotations in the "book of Psalms", and not in Job or Solomon or Proverbs? Surely Mr. McKelway can not mean that the commands, so frequent in Scripture, to "Sing psalms" mean "Sing Job," "Sing Proverbs," "Sing Song of Solomon"? Why the "Standard" recently criticised an honored minister of its own church for preaching a "gospel sermon" from a passage from the "Song of Solomon"; and can it be that it has so bitterly repented of its rashness as now to want to sing the "Song of Solomon" in praise to God?

(9th.) As to the many people converted to God in the Moody meetings through the "singing of simple spiritual songs, with a Bible text at the top," we might enquire if these "simple songs" were sung to the congregation, or in praise to Almighty God?

What about "My Trundlebed," referred to by Dr. Guerant, and which the writer heard Mr. Sankey sing in a Moody meeting? We commend to Mr. McKelway Dr. Cuyler's definition of a true hymn. He says:

"A true hymn is not a sermon in metre addressed to the congregation; it is the heart's impassioned address in the language of song to God himself, or to one of the Persons in the Divine Trinity."

The reader is asked to compare this definition with what we have said concerning the "nature of Praise to God" on page 21-22 of "Ten Reasons Why."

(10th.) As to what Mr. McKelway says about the "imprecatory psalms" not being fit to be sung, we could easily reply at length, but as Mr. McKelway admits that these songs are God's inspired Word, (at least in the Hebrew) — given by his Holy Spirit, and as he has failed to prove that God has appointed the use of any others in this dispensation, he must go to Headquarters with this difficulty which he finds and this objection which he raises.

(11th.) Mr. McKelway says: "We call attention to the reductio ad absurdum of Dr. Chalmers' own argument in which he classifies all the sacred hymns that have been the inspiration and the joy and the comfort and the very instrument of conversion for millions of God's saints, with operatic music and patriotic songs and the little ditties for amusement and entertainment."

We merely ask the reader to turn to page 20 of "Ten Reasons Why", and see if the language warrants any such construction. The only classification we made was between inspired and uninspired songs, and of course all but those found in God's Word must fall into the latter class. We suppose the "Standard" admits that the Bible is the only inspired book in the world—(at least in the Hebrew.) If so, then all other books are uninspired. But this is a "reductio ad absurdum," according to the "Standard," for under the latter classification you would have to include Calvin's Institutes, Thornwell's Works, Robinson Crusoe, Sappho, Tom Sawyer, and the "Presbyterian Standard." We would be glad to have the "Standard" tell us how it manages to wade into this vast sea of uninspired poetry and make a selection,—how it decides that some of these poems are "spiritual songs", authorized, commanded, and prescribed in God's worship, and others are not appointed? For example, "here is a disappointed lover. He had been encouraged to hope that the young woman would be his bride. He proposed marriage, but she said 'No.'" In place of blowing out his brains like Goethe's young Werther, he went home

and wrote a hymn. He was disappointed in love, so he wrote a hymn which became popular in the church.

"How vain are all things here below
How false, and yet how fair!"

Poor fellow! Everything here below is not vain. Everything here is not false and everything is not fair by any means. The girl you fell in love with and gushed over in your hymn was not at all fair when she was not fixed up for you!

But some hymn compiler comes along, picks up this poem, christens it "spiritual song" and thousands sing its sickly sentimentality in praise to God.

This has happened a thousand times. The "dyke" is gone, the floods have come in and the church is at the mercy of the waves.

In "Ten Reasons Why" not one syllable of criticism is made upon the character of the so-called Songs of praise now in use in churches allowing human compositions. Nor need we do so now. We prefer to let hymn-makers and hymn-singers chastise their own children, hence we append the following criticisms from well known and distinguished writers.

The reader will carefully note in these extracts the fact that the "dyke" is gone; that the importance of some check or "breakwater" is emphasized; and that hymn-singers are by no means agreed among themselves as to what is proper or permissible and what is improper or objectionable matter of praise.

Leave the selection and appointment to Almighty God and you have plain sailing; but leave it to the "judgment and inclination" of fallible men and you are cast adrift upon an unknown and dangerous sea.

Says the "Independent", of New York, in a criticism on "Our New Hymnal," "This is a far better manual of common songs than we get in the average of its class. It shows a reaction against the empty jingles which have been running for twenty years.

Evangelist Moody, at Charlotte, N. C., characterized many of the hymns as "empty twaddle."

Dr. Theodore L. Cuyler, in the "Evangelist" says: "A true hymn is not a sermon in metre addressed to the congregation; it is the heart's impassioned address in the language of song to God himself, or to one of the Persons in the Divine Trinity." Hymns, such as "Hold the

Fort, for I am coming," "Let the lower lights be burning," "More to follow," he says are "Pious doggerel, without either dignity or devotion."

Rev. E. O. Guerrant, D.D., of the Southern Presbyterian church, in the book already referred to, says, "Many of the recent fashionable songs are unfit for the service of the sanctuary, and some of them positively irreverent. What would you think of one dedicated to 'My Trundle-bed,' (found in a new and popular hymn book), or that other one, 'Hold the fort, for I am coming?' I am not sure but 'Satan leads on' all such sacriligious songs." This from the pen of a popular Presbyterian Evangelist.

But here is another criticism that will come even closer to the "Standard" from the pen of Rev. T. Dwight Witherspoon, D. D., L. L. D., Professor in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Louisville, Ky. In the "Presbyterian Quarterly" he says: "If it would not bear the appearance of subjecting to ridicule things of a sacred character, we would like to present our readers with some specimens of the so-called hymns which we have gathered together from various popular collections. As examples of the most vapid and puerile sentiment, expressed in the most wretched doggerel, they almost surpass our comprehension as hymns intended for religious worship, but, leaving these out of view, and confining ourselves to the collection of "Gospel Hymns Consolidated," now in such general use, and which must be admitted to be the very best of its class, you find this same sentimental, rhapsodic element largely predominating. Instead of hymns of faith and hope, hymns of inspiration and courage for life's conflicts and duties, you have such rhapsodies, as, "I am sweeping through the gate," "I brush the dews on Jordan's banks," etc., with such refrains as, "Pull for the Shore," "O, come, angel band, come and round me stand," "Oh, to be over yonder in that land of wonder," &c., &c."

And now we enter the very sanctum of the "Standard" and from its own editorial columns of March 7th, make a clipping that illustrates, alas too painfully, the fact that the "dyke" is gone.

We imagine there was considerable surprise, if not regret, on the part of many in a certain prominent Presbyterian church in one of our leading cities recently when their eyes lit upon the following in the printed programme

of the Sabbath exercises: "Anthem—'O, Lord God, Lord Jesus Christ, King of Glory, deliver thou the souls of all them that died in the faith of Jesus; from pains everlasting and the abyss unfathomable; from the mouth of the lion, lest the jaws of the pit shall swallow them, to lie in utter darkness; let holy Michael, leader of the hosts, bring them forward into thy Holy splendor.—Verdi's Requiem.'" This selection may be classic as a musical composition, but its spirit and teaching smack too much of Rome for a Presbyterian choir and congregation. Choirs must not teach one thing, and the pulpit another.

Think of a Presbyterian choir singing a Catholic prayer for the dead!! O for a "dyke!"

Having now passed under review "Dr. Chalmers' Failure" as viewed from the standpoint of the "Presbyterian Standard", is it uncharitable to say that we have found the article as innocent of argument as a turnip is of gold?

True there is in it a good deal of "swinging around the circle" and empty twaddle about "ignominious failure," "the very idea that all hymnology is a mischievous science," "the proposition wears its indictment on its face," "impregnable as Gibraltar," "a mountain seen from afar to be impregnable," &c., &c., but we are only too glad to refer the whole matter to our readers who are not going to mistake assertion for argument, loudness for logic, rhetoric for reason, or sound for sense. As a final specimen of the "impregnable Gibraltar" take the following: "The worship of the Jews," says Mr. M., "was prescribed even to the minutest details. But when Christ said, 'The hour cometh when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth,' that abolished 'forms of worship' forevermore."

But who admits that the Psalms were a part of the 'forms' abolished by Christ? To assume that they were, is to beg the entire question almost before stating it. The Psalms were not peculiar to, or written for the Mosaic dispensation alone. Few of them were written until it was four hundred years old, and it was a thousand years old before the book was completed. Mr. M. admits that Christ and the Apostles sung them; nor does he deny the plain commands in Ephesians and Colossians to sing them. Upon his own admission some of them were not abolished. He may be able to tell which were and which were not abolished. This is information God has not given in His Word.

But he goes on to say that "Worship that is spiritual is spontaneous."

Can worship be any more spontaneous when uttered in the language of Watts or More or Robinson than in the language of the Holy Spirit?

In conclusion we want to say that in "Ten Reasons Why" we have given the position of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church on the subject of Psalmody, confining ourselves to the Scriptures and Presbyterian Standards. If other songs, in addition to what we have proved to be given by Divine Appointment, are to be used in the ordinance of Praise, it rests upon those introducing them to show that they too have been divinely "authorized, appointed, prescribed and instituted" by Almighty God.

It must be shown that such compositions bear the direct and unmistakable impress of Christ's authority, an impress so clear that he who refuses to use them, limiting himself to the inspired Psalms, is guilty of despising an ordinance of Christ.

As to Mr. McKelway's utter failure to do this, our readers shall be the judges.

Mr. M. says that the A. R. P. Church might be at a more profitable business than teaching its people to sing Psalms. Well, we were engaged in other business until the "Standard" came to town with a "chip on its shoulder," and after taking a shot at almost every thing in sight, including even a distinguished divine of its own Synod, whose only mistake was that he took a text from the Song of Solomon, finally turned its big gun upon the little church just across the street, expecting doubtless, at such short range, to blow its very foundation from under it at a single shot.

It has also been intimated that there are those who think that the "Standard" "might be in a more profitable business" also than that of firing small shot at a sister church, a band of devoted, active, aggressive Christians, whose only fault, in its estimation, is their love for and loyalty to the inspired Word of God and Standards of the Presbyterian church as formulated by the Westminster Assembly.

So you see, kind reader, we did not begin this fight. But mark you, we are in it to a finish, our guns being still trained on the "Standard's" office, ready to reply at

(22)

any time, provided the editor will stick to the Word of God and the Standards of the Presbyterian Church.

"To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."—Isaiah, 8:20.

THE END.