

THE  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

VOL. II.]

JANUARY, 1844.

[No. 7.]

[For the Evangelical Repository.]

*Remarks on Philo's Answer to some Questions by Rev. John Anderson, D. D.*

MR. EDITOR,—I send you for publication some remarks written by the late Dr. Anderson, professor of theology for many years in the Associate Church. All that I have been able to ascertain respecting the history of this paper is, that some individual, whether a member of the Associate Church or not I cannot tell, sent to a presbyterian minister certain queries relating to psalmody, covenanting, communion, and testimony-bearing. Answers were written by this minister to the queries over the signature of Philo, and circulated in manuscript through the neighbourhood which embraced a portion of Dr. Anderson's congregation. A copy of these answers coming into the hands of the Doctor, he wrote the following reply over the signature of Philalethus, and circulated it in the same way. It has been said that Philo replied again, but his reply either did not find its way to Dr. Anderson, or he saw no occasion to continue the controversy. These things appear to have occurred near the close of the Doctor's life, and we have in these remarks his thoughts on some important subjects to which he had devoted much attention. Several of the objections which he answers are not the most weighty, yet as they are common, they should not be overlooked; and I hope a more extensive publication of the answers than they have had in a manuscript form may prove serviceable to the church.

Yours respectfully, T. BEVERIDGE.

“There is no one book of the Old Testament that is so often quoted in the New as the book of Psalms. David sung joyfully of the great things of Christ's redemption that had been the hope and expectation of God's church and people from the beginning of his church on earth; and others followed him in the same work, as Asaph, Heman, and others; for the book of Psalms was not all penned by David, though the greater part of it was. By this part of the inspired writing the light of the gospel, which had been gradually growing from the fall, was exceedingly increased. For, whereas before there was but here and there a prophecy given of Christ in a great many ages, now here Christ is spoken of by his ancestor David abundantly in multitudes of songs concerning his incarnation, life, death, resurrection, ascension into heaven, his satisfaction, intercession, his prophetic, priestly and kingly offices, his glorious benefits in this life, and in that which is to come, his union with the church, and the blessedness of the church in him, the calling of the gentiles, the future glory of the church near the end of the world, and Christ's coming to the final judgment. All these things concerning Christ and his redemption are abundantly spoken of in the book of

Psalms. Hereby God gave his church a book of songs for their use in that part of their public worship. viz., singing his praise throughout all ages to the end of the world. It is manifest that the book of Psalms was given of God for this end. It was used in the church of Israel by God's appointment, as appears from the title of many of the Psalms in which they are inscribed, *To the chief musician*, the man that was appointed to be the leader of the divine songs in the temple in the public worship of Israel. So David is called, *The sweet psalmist of Israel*. And accordingly we have an account that they were actually made use of in the church of Israel for that end, even ages after David was dead, as Hezekiah the king commanded the Levites to sing praises unto the Lord with the words of David and of Asaph the seer, 2 Chron. xxix. 30. And we find that the same are appointed in the New Testament to be made use of in the Christian church in their worship, Eph. v. 19.\*

These are the words of the venerable president Edwards in his History of Redemption. In his time presbyterians in general agreed to the judgment here expressed concerning the singing of the Psalms contained in the Old Testament, in public worship. But now it is a prevailing opinion, that there is no particular system of psalms appointed by the Lord Christ to be sung in public and solemn worship, but that any psalms or hymns expressing just views of scripture doctrine in a style of becoming dignity may be sung in that worship. There was lately handed about in this neighbourhood a manuscript with the signature of Philo, professing to answer a number of questions which had been sent to him. One design of the questions seems to have been to object against some of the pretended reasons that are commonly offered for the opinion of those who hold that other psalms or hymns are more proper to be sung in our public worship than those contained in the Old Testament.

The first question, as it is called, is proposed in these words: “*It is said that the Psalms hold forth our Saviour as yet to come.*”

To this question Philo offers three answers. In the first, he “supposes that if the inquirer meant the version that David Rouse† composed, the objection is true.” As if he might not have said so with equal justice of the original, or of the prose translation; or as if it were not obvious, that there is not a shadow of difference in this respect between these translations.

In his second answer, he wanders from the subject of the question proposed to another, namely, whether there are other parts of scripture which ought to be sung in public worship or not. Many agree with him in holding the affirmative, who allow the objection against singing the Psalms contained in the Old Testament on account of their holding forth Christ as yet to come, to be quite groundless and futile. So that this may be passed over here as serving only to divert the reader from the question under consideration.

Philo in his third answer offers to return to the question proposed. His argument, to which that question relates, against our singing what

\* The above quotation is from the History of Redemption, Period 1st, Part 5th, Section 4th. The whole of this section is deserving of a careful perusal by those who think that an attachment to the inspired Psalms can only result from narrowness of mind and prejudice. No cause should stand upon the wisdom of man, yet when such an acute, learned and pious divine as President Edwards took the same ground in respect to the Psalms, and defended it upon the same principles and by the same arguments with those who employ them as songs of praise, this should at least secure them from such charges as are frequently brought against them.

† Philo has mistaken the name. He means Sir Francis Rouse.

is contained in the book of Psalms required him to show, That the profession of faith in Christ which is made in singing the Psalms, is necessarily to be understood as a profession that Christ is not yet come in the flesh. He might have known that the defenders of the practice of singing David's Psalms maintain that though, under the Old Testament, Christ is viewed as yet to come, and under the New, as already come, yet the Psalms were given, and the singing of them appointed as belonging to the means of exhibiting the grounds of faith, and of promoting the exercise of it, common to both dispensations. This is the doctrine which Philo, in answering the first of these questions, ought to have considered, and refuted. But, instead of doing so, he turns off to another topic. He shows from several passages in the epistle to the Hebrews that all typical worship is abolished. But this is not disputed, and is nothing against the singing of the Psalms of David; unless the singing of these were proved to be typical worship. Perhaps he intends to prove this when he says, "The type is to be laid aside, and the antitype to be the medium through whom we are to pay our addresses to God. The types can never make the comers thereunto perfect. They give but a faint shadow of Christ; so that few would, if any could, have a suitable understanding of them. But the bringing in of a better hope, and the introduction of the Messiah and a gospel dispensation did that which the types could never do; *by which hope*, says the apostle, *we draw nigh to God*, namely, in all our addresses to God in praise and worship." Hence we have the strongest grounds to believe from the clear assertion of the apostle, that the primitive Christians in all their worship entirely laid aside the types, and approached to God immediately\* through the antitype." On the subject of which Philo here speaks it may be observed,—

That true believers under the Old Testament drew near to God by the same hope by which they draw near to him under the New, even by Jesus Christ, *who is our hope*. Though the hope by which believers draw nigh to God both under the Old and New Testament be substantially the same, yet it may be said to be better under the New, as it is brought in or exhibited to them more clearly and comfortably, without the practice of the legal ceremonies. Christ was the medium whereby they approached to God in prayer and praise then as well as now. The contrary supposition would imply, that since all their worship was included in *their drawing near to God*, it was no otherwise than by types, no other than typical. But this is absurd; for nothing is more obvious to a reader of the Old Testament than the fact, that they had moral as well as ceremonial worship. It is evident that the singing of the Psalms of David belonged to their moral worship. Neither the reading of the word of God, nor the singing of the Psalms or songs of it, which he had given for the edification of his church in all succeeding generations, ever belonged to the practice of the ceremonial law; a practice which was to be disannulled for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. The prayers or praises of Old Testament believers were not rendered typical worship by the mention of some things typical; any more than our prayers are rendered worldly by the mention of some worldly things about which we are called to perform some important duty. It is plain that the passages of the epistle to the Hebrews, referred to by this writer here, are nothing to his purpose. These passages serve to show that our

\* Some such words as those supplied appear to have been omitted in the copy from which this transcript is made.

religious worship ought not to be typical, or that the practice of the ceremonial law does not now belong to our religious worship. But this is nothing to the purpose of showing, that our singing of the Psalms of David is typical worship. Philo says, he did not fix his opinion without consulting the word of God. But it seems he has consulted it in vain with respect to the question about what psalmody we ought to use. For nothing would be more in vain, than to seek a proof of his assertion; namely, That the singing of the Psalms of David is typical worship, in such passages as these which he has quoted.\*

The second query is thus proposed: "*It is said, that there are some of the Psalms which no Christian can sing.*"

Philo, in his answer to this question, says, "That as it is lawful and right for Christians to use the prayers of the Old Testament saints as to substance, when such prayers are suitable to their circumstances; but not when their circumstances are the reverse, or when they are typical; and that the prayer of David against Gebel, Ammon, and Amalek would not suit a Christian at the present day; just so, in singing praise to God, which is as direct an approach to him as prayer, if we worship God through the type, we ought to do it also in practice. That in my solemn address to God, I should not promise to offer up to him goats and bullocks, or to sing unto him with the psaltery and harp, unless I do what I promise. But can a Christian do this without sin? I say no. Therefore the form of some of the Psalms in their present words cannot suit the New Testament dispensation. The expressions cannot be suitable for a Christian to use at the present day. As the antitype is already come, the divine stamp is taken away from the type, and it is therefore become a beggarly element."

Thus Philo attempts to defend his opinion that a Christian cannot sing all the psalms in the book bearing that title. But the contrary position, namely, that a Christian can sing all these psalms, may be justly maintained for three reasons.

The *first* is because the forms of psalmody are not restricted, like prayer, to direct addresses to God; nor is the subject of our songs limited to what respects our present or personal case. Though the scope or design of a form of psalmody is to celebrate the praises of God, yet it is not necessary that it should bear the form of a direct approach or address to God. If that were necessary, then a great part of the Book of Psalms could not have been a proper form of psalmody under

\* It might be well if objectors would take the pains of referring to those passages in the Psalms which "hold forth our Saviour as yet to come." The result of an inquiry after them might show that this objection is only imaginary. The Psalms, although written before the coming of Christ, most commonly speak of him as coming or having come. With a beauty and power almost peculiar to this part of the word, they introduce us into the midst of his sufferings and triumphs. The second Psalm sets before us the combinations of his enemies. We seem to hear their speeches, to witness their efforts, and rejoice in their defeat. In the twenty-second Psalm Christ is set forth crucified before our eyes; we hear his complaints and groans, and pleadings with the Father; we see his hands and feet pierced, his bones parting asunder, his life poured out. We see his enemies standing around, and hear their reproachful words. The scene is closed, and then behold the reward, in countless numbers of the nations coming to their crucified Redeemer. So in other psalms which relate to the ascension of Christ, the destruction of his enemies, the calling of the gentiles, and, in a word, the whole administration of his kingdom. He that would prefer to have these portions of the divine word changed into the comparatively cold and nerveless language of prose, as is done by Dr. Watts, leaving out of the question the reverence due to the Scriptures, would seem to be a stranger to the soul of poetry.

the Old Testament more than under the New. There are many of the psalms in which there is not one word formally addressed to God.\* This is the case with several of them that are eminently psalms of praise; such as the hundred and thirty-sixth, hundred and forty-seventh, hundred and forty-eighth, hundred and forty-ninth, and hundred and fiftieth. Many of them are in the form of addresses, or exhortations to men; such as the forty-ninth, and the seventy-eighth. There is, no doubt, such an approach to God in singing his praise as is common to all the duties of his worship when they are performed in faith; as, when we come to hear his word preached, or to receive the sacraments. But it is evident from the example of these psalms, that such a *direct approach*, or address to God, as is requisite to constitute the form of prayer, is not necessary in the form of psalmody. Prayer is only one of the forms in which the matter of praise is delivered to us in the Psalms; because the matter of praise is more extensive than that of prayer. What God did for his church and for her members according to their various cases in former ages, and likewise so far as it is revealed, what he will do for them hereafter is just as suitable matter of praise as what he is doing at present. But it cannot be said that the former and future exigencies or wants of the church and her members are as suitable matter of prayer, as their present felt exigencies. Hence it appears to be a good reason for adhering in our public and solemn praises to the system of psalms given by divine inspiration, that as all his works were known to God from the beginning, so it was his prerogative to select, and specify, as he does in the Book of Psalms, such and so many of his works, as would best answer the purpose of singing his praise in solemn and public worship. The works of God celebrated in the psalms declare his wisdom, power, holiness, mercy, and truth. On this account we are to sing the psalms concerning what the Lord did in the land of Egypt, and at the Red Sea; and concerning what he did in the glorious victories which David and Israel obtained over their enemies.

It is plainly an error to hold that we ought to sing no other words in solemn worship than such as we can consider our own words, and applicable to our present condition. According to this opinion the system of psalms given by the Holy Spirit could not have been sung (as they certainly were) even by the Jewish church. It is not supposable that every member of a worshipping assembly under the Old Testament dispensation could have sung the following words as applicable to his own case: "My tears have been my meat, day and night: I am troubled that I cannot speak: I will divide Shechem, and mete out the valley of Succoth: I have been young, and now am old: Hitherto I have declared thy wondrous works: I have more understanding than all my teachers: My zeal hath consumed me: Princes have persecuted me without a cause: We sat by the rivers of Babylon, &c."

In the *second place*, a true believer under the New Testament can sing all these psalms in solemn worship; because he may understand and apply them to his own case, and to that of the church, so as to attain the spiritual ends of edification and comfort for which this ordinance was appointed. He may attain such an exercise of faith, love, repentance, and other graces of the Spirit as is in some measure answerable to the infallible pattern of that exercise in the Psalms. So when a Christian sings such words as these: "The Lord is my Shepherd: I

\* There is no formal address to God in the 1, 2, 23, 24, 37, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 78, 81, 91, 95, 98, 100, 101, 105, 107, 111, 112, 113, 114, 116, 121, 122, 124, 127, 136, 146, 147, 148, 149 and 150th Psalms.

will love thee, O Lord, my strength: I will grieve for my sin:" it is his concern that the exercise of his heart may be what the words express. Again; believers may find the design of the Psalmist applicable to their case in passages where expressions are used respecting the peculiar rites of the Old Testament. Thus, though we use no instrumental music, no altars, no sacrificing of beasts, yet we may have the same resolution which David intended to express, when he says in Psalm lxxi. 22. "I will also praise thee with the psaltery, even thy truth, O my God: unto thee will I sing with the harp, O thou Holy One of Israel:" that is, in singing these words, we may express our resolution to exert ourselves with ardour in praising God. So our desire and our hope that there may be signal manifestations of God's favour towards his church; that her ordinances may be preserved pure and entire; that they may be attended by multitudes offering up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ; may be expressed in singing the words of David in Psalm li. 18, 19, "Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion: build thou the walls of Jerusalem. Then shalt thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with burnt-offering, and whole burnt-offerings; then shall they offer bullocks upon thine altar." We may pray for the blessing of God on our ministers in the words of the hundred and thirty-second psalm; "Let thy priests be clothed with righteousness:" for according to the scope of that passage, it is evident that the psalmist there speaks of the priests not as typical of Christ, but as office-bearers of the church, answering to our ministers. What our Lord declares in John v. 39, to be the design of the Old Testament scriptures in general, that is, *To testify of Christ*, is particularly the design of the Book of Psalms. This consideration must be of great use for our attaining the right understanding and application of the Psalms. Thus Christ is often signified in expressions relating to the usages of the ceremonial law. When we sing the words of the fiftieth psalm, describing the saints as those who have made a covenant with God by sacrifice; we sing of the sacrifice, the atonement, or righteousness of Jesus Christ, on which believers rely as the only proper condition of the covenant of grace, and which was typified by every sacrifice offered in the tabernacle or temple. So, in singing these words in Psalm li. 7, "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow;" we express our persuasion that the conscience is purged from guilt by the blood of Christ, the blood of sprinkling. Many parts of the psalms are applicable to Christ alone, as Psalm xl. 7, "Lo, I come: in the volume of the book, it is written of me." Psalm xxii. 16, 18, "They pierced my hands and my feet. They cast lots upon my vesture." Psalm lxix. 21, "In my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink." Psalm cxxxii. 10, "For thy servant David's sake turn not away the face of thine anointed." The name David is here given immediately to Christ, as in Jer. xxx. 9; Ezek. xxxiv. 23, xxxvii. 24; Hos. iii. 5. The name David signifies the beloved, as Christ is called in Eph. i. 6. *Not to turn away the face*, signifies, not to disregard or reject the person or prayer of any sincere worshipper. *The anointed one*, here may signify Solomon, if we consider this as Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple. But the expression is applicable to any Christian; for a believer is called a Christian from his relation to Christ, the anointed one; or from his being anointed with the Spirit.\* There are many parts of the psalms, which, though in an inferior and subordinate

\* It is a prayer that the Lord would not deny the Christian his grace.

sense, they be applicable to the type, yet in the most proper and full sense are applicable to Christ alone. Thus, though the words in Psalm lxxviii. 18, "Thou hast ascended on high," &c., may be referred to the bringing up of the ark as the type; yet we are sure that in their most proper and sublime sense, they are to be applied only to the ascension of Christ. To the same purpose many passages may be produced from the lxxii. the lxxxix., and other psalms. With respect to such passages it is evident that we cannot rest in the application of them to the type, without disregarding the design of the Holy Spirit in the expression he uses, or even without imputing to him the use of language which tends to mislead.

In singing the psalms we sing of our communion with Christ in his sufferings, as in the lxxixth psalm; "O God, thou knowest my foolishness, and my sins are not hid from thee." Here, he who knew no sin, speaks of his sins; that is, the sins of his people which were imputed to him, and for which he suffered. In singing the psalms, we sing of our communion with Christ in his exaltation; as in the words of the sixteenth psalm, "Therefore is my heart glad, and my glory rejoiceth: my flesh also shall rest in hope. Thou wilt show me the path of life." In singing the psalms we sing many promises which are applicable both to the Head and to the members. Psalm lxxxix. 26: "He shall cry, Thou art my Father, my God, and the rock of my salvation." Psalm xxxiv. 20, "He keepeth all his bones, not one of them is broken." Hence in Luke xxiv. 44, Christ speaks of the things concerning himself in the psalms, as well as in the law of Moses, and in the prophets.

Another consideration which tends greatly to a right understanding and application of the psalms in singing them is the unity of the church. As believers are all members of one body; so, if one member suffer or rejoice, all the members suffer or rejoice with it. Hence we may understand how we are to sing the praises of God in the language of some of the psalms which may not be applicable to our present case, but are so to the case of other church members. When we sing these words; "My heart is fixed; O Lord, my heart is fixed;" though we cannot say that we have already attained such fixedness of heart as others of the Lord's people have attained; yet we may praise God for what he has done in this respect for the souls of others, in the hope that by his grace he will fix ours also. When we sing these words; "I am troubled; I am bowed down greatly; I go mourning all the day long;" we are to be exercised in trusting, that the Lord will glorify himself by appearing for the deliverance of any of his people, who are in such distress, and as to ourselves that he will prepare us for such trouble as may hereafter be measured out to us. Again; on account of the unity of the church, every believer, whatever his personal case may be, ought to sing of the public state and affairs of the church as if they were his own. Observe how we are directed to sing concerning the public welfare of the church amidst the deepest personal sorrows, namely, the examples which we have in the fifty-first and the hundred and second Psalms. Farther, while the church under the Old and New Testament dispensations is only one church, every believing member has such an interest in her ancient sufferings, deliverances, privileges, and victories, that so far as grace is in exercise, he will be disposed to sing of these subjects as manifestations of the righteousness, mercy and faithfulness of God in his conduct towards her. If believers under the Old Testament dispensation had fellowship with us in singing of the privileges that were to be granted to the church under the New Testament, it is reasonable that we should have fellowship with them in singing the psalms which cele-

brate the wonders which God wrought for them according to his promise. In praising the Lord for his great goodness to the house of Israel, we should consider ourselves as one body with them. So the Jews acknowledged the instances of the Lord's kindness to their ancestors many ages before, as benefits bestowed upon themselves. Psalm lxxvi. 6, "There did we rejoice in him." Hosea xii. 4, "He found him in Bethel; and there he spake with us." On the principle of the unity of the church, believers cannot be at a loss to see their interest in any part of the Book of Psalms. It may be added, concerning the application of the psalms in singing them, that while there is not one of them which does not afford suitable matter for praising God, there is such a rich variety of them that any person acquainted with the Book of Psalms, whatever his case may be, may easily find a psalm adapted to it: and the same thing may be said of any worshipping congregation, or any worshipping family.

In the *third* place, Christians can sing all the psalms given and collected in the book bearing that title under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit; because these have various advantages as forms of psalmody, not only over human compositions, but even over other parts of scripture which have been versified and used in solemn worship. With regard to the advantages which the psalms or songs contained in this book have, as forms of psalmody to be used in public and solemn worship, over human compositions; the first is, God's having appointed them for that purpose. This appointment is evident both from the delivery of them by the inspired penman to be sung in public worship, and also from the approved example of the actual use of them in that worship. Hence in singing the Scripture psalms or songs, we have a ground for faith, which we cannot have in singing any other. Another advantage is, that the very frame or structure of each of the psalms is infallibly adapted by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit to the purpose of being sung in solemn worship. A third advantage of the scripture psalms is, that they are absolutely pure, and free from error. "The words of the Lord are pure words; as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times." The writers of some hymns may have been in general pious, sound in the faith, and possessed of poetical genius. But they did not write, like David, and the other penman of the psalms, under the immediate and infallible inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The representations in the psalms of faith, love, repentance, and other graces of the Spirit; and, also, the representations in ~~them~~ of the corruptions of the human heart, are infallibly correct. So far as our spiritual exercise is conformable to the pattern exhibited in this book, we may certainly conclude that it is pleasing, and glorifying to God.

But we say farther, that the psalms in the book, or collection of them made under divine inspiration, have great advantages as forms of psalmody to be used in solemn worship, even over other parts of scripture turned into verse for that purpose. One of these advantages is, that they were peculiarly given and appointed to be sung in divine worship. This appears not only, as has been already mentioned, from their being delivered by the penmen to be used in public worship, and from the example of their having been actually used as the public psalmody; but likewise from the titles and form by which they are distinguished from other parts of scripture. Sensible of this, the versifiers of other parts of scripture for the purpose of being sung in public worship, find it necessary to alter the language, and the arrangement of the matter, to add, and leave out, as they think fit, in order to give a pas-

sage the form of a song, a form which it has not as it stands in the Bible. To call a composition of this sort a scripture song, or a song to be found in the place of scripture quoted at the head of it, seems to be a great abuse of words.

Another of these advantages is, that unity and fellowship with the Old Testament church is better expressed by singing the psalms than by singing other portions of the scripture which it does not appear were used under the Old Testament in that part of worship.

A third advantage of the psalms as forms of psalmody over other portions of scripture, particularly of the New Testament, is, that the subject of our praise is more enlarged as exhibited in the former, than in the latter. In the psalms, for example, when our spiritual redemption by Jesus Christ is celebrated under the representation of the temporal deliverance from Egypt or Babylon, we celebrate both the typical event, and the spiritual salvation which that event was designed to adumbrate. The remembrance of the former assists our meditation on the latter; and we give God the glory of his mercy, and faithfulness both in granting his people spiritual salvation by Jesus Christ, and also shadows and pledges of that salvation in many wonderful temporal deliverances which he wrought for them. In singing the psalms, we add the ancient celebrations of his extraordinary providence, which watched over Israel, to God's appearances in behalf of the New Testament church; and combine in one song, the glory of his past and present operations. In singing the psalms, we celebrate the works of God therein specified as parts of one great plan, which he has been carrying on in all ages, and according to which he has promised to act till the end of time.

The more that these poetical compositions present to our view particular events, or particular dispensations of grace and providence, as parts of that great plan, the more they are adapted to enlarge our conception of the perfections of God, which are the great subject of our praises.

On the whole, it is evident, that while the objection against singing some of the psalms on account of the references in them to the typical rites, proceeds on the false supposition, that what we sing ought always to bear the form of an address to God applicable to our present state or case, these references belong to the perfection of the scripture psalmody as comprehending the praises due to God for what he has been doing in and for his church all along from the time of her first creation, as well as for what he is now doing, and will do. The record in scripture of the use which the people of God made of the types as directing them to Christ, has still the same stamp of divine authority that it ever had, as it belongs to what was before written for the church's instruction, and for the matter of the praises to be given to God in her solemn worship.

The third question is proposed in the following terms:—*It is said that our Saviour's name is not mentioned in the psalms.*

Philo seems to admit that he had made this objection against singing the Old Testament psalms; but observes, "That though he did not deny that his name is mentioned in some way or other in these psalms; yet the form in which, for the most part it is mentioned in them, is by a type; which it is improper to use in worship in our addresses to God under the New Testament dispensation. Thus his name is mentioned under a type, Psalm lxxxix. 3, *I have sworn unto David my servant: and as Christ is evidently intended by the type, the antitype ought to be used instead of the type in worship, as appears from Heb. vii. 12, 18, 19. But by his name Jesus he was not known under the Old Testament.*"

Here it is proper to observe what is granted by Philo, that Christ's name is truly mentioned in the psalms; and particularly, that Christ is evidently intended by God's servant in Psalm lxxxix. 3. So that Philo grants that if we sing the psalms according to their true, and even their evident meaning, we do mention our Saviour's name. "But," says Philo, "the form in which, for the most part, it is mentioned is by the type, which it is improper to use in our addresses to God under the New Testament dispensation."

But what does Philo mean when he says that the name of Christ is mentioned by the type? If he mean designations of Christ which allude to the usages of the ceremonial law, he ought not to have said, that it is now improper to use such designations, either in speaking to God or of him. Because such designations of Christ are frequently used in the New Testament, as when he is called our Passover, our propitiation, our high priest, our altar; names which plainly refer to the ceremonial institutions.

It has been already observed that the consideration of Christ and his benefits in connexion with the types of them serves to enlarge the sphere of our praises, and to preserve in our minds the sense of our fellowship, as members of the same body of Christ with his ancient people. It is true that the ceremonial rites are beggarly elements in respect of the burdensome practice of them under the Old Testament; in respect of the obscurity of the manner in which they conveyed instruction, while their meaning was not unfolded by the New Testament; and also in respect of the abuse of these rites by legalists, who relied on their practice of them instead of relying on the righteousness of Christ for justification and salvation. But no metaphors, or similes are fitter than such as are taken from these usages, to illustrate the spiritual things of which they were types: they having been chosen by infinite wisdom for this very purpose. In this respect they are no beggarly elements, but belong to the means by which God judges proper to teach his church unto the end of the world.

But Philo insists, that "the apostle, Heb. xiii. 15, teaches Christians to lay aside typical expressions in their praises, and to offer our sacrifice of praise through Christ, expressing his name as the fruit of our lips." In this passage, however, the apostle shows no such aversion, as Philo seems to have, to metaphorical expressions borrowed from the ceremonial usages; while he calls our exercise of faith through Christ our offering a sacrifice. Philo asks, "What is the fruit of our lips but the words we speak?" But surely this fruit is not the mere sound of the words, but the import of them, or what we intend by them. Now Philo does not deny, that in this respect the name of Christ is mentioned in the psalms. And, indeed, it cannot be denied that he is mentioned under the name of God's Anointed, or his Christ, his chosen One, the Man of his right hand. If it then be the real import of our singing the psalms, that we praise God for Christ, and through him, it certainly follows, that we offer the fruit of our lips by him, whether we use the sounds or syllables of the name Jesus or not. Philo's insisting on the verbal mentioning of the name Jesus is too much like the superstitious custom used by some episcopalians of bowing at that name, but not at his other names, such as Jehovah, Christ, Immanuel, or, (what the name Jesus means) the Saviour; as if these other names were not to be equally revered. Philo, in order to make this text answer his purpose, says, "That the last clause may with propriety be rendered, *making mention of his name.*" But I am assured that the translation given in the mar-

gin of our Bibles is its most usual signification in the New Testament; and that it is a different Greek word which signifies, *To make mention*; as in Rom. i. 9, Eph. i. 6, 1 Thess. i. 2, Heb. xi. 22. Mr. Thomas Scott gives the sense in these words: "Acknowledging his abundant loving-kindness towards them." The name *Jesus*, as to the sound of letters, is not used in the song of Mary, Elisabeth, Zachariah, and Simeon,\* or in what is commonly called the Lord's prayer. I suppose that Philo could not deny, that these passages in a literal verse translation might warrantably be sung in solemn worship; and that persons in singing them might be said to call on the name of the Lord Jesus. We only desire him to use the same candour with regard to our singing the psalms of the Old Testament.

The fourth question is: *Why should uninspired books be introduced into the church, when the books of the Apocrypha are rejected in the Confession of Faith.*

It was one of the reasons why our forefathers of the presbyterian persuasion refused to conform to the church of England; because, according to her Liturgy, the reading of some parts of the Apocryphal books was introduced into public worship: whereas, while the public worship was preserved pure, nothing was read as a part of it, but what belonged to the scriptures given by divine inspiration. It was urged that the reading of the Apocryphal books in public worship tended to promote the erroneous opinion of their divine authority; an opinion held by the popish church. Similar to this is the introduction into our public and solemn worship of the singing of songs of human composition instead of the songs which are given us in the sacred scriptures; as it tends to advance the former to a place which belongs peculiarly to the latter. As we have no approved example in scripture of the *reading* of human compositions in the ordinary and stated worship of the church, so we have none of the *singing* of such compositions in that worship.

But Philo insists, "That some of these books of hymns that are termed uninspired, if they contain the true substance of scripture, (and none other should be admitted) may be considered as setting forth the mind and will of God; and, therefore, may be sung in the church as well as uninspired prayers are offered unto God as far as agreeable to his will. And God hath countenanced such worship: what therefore God hath sanctified, let us not call common or unclean; lest we be found fighting against God." In these hymns we do not intend to make or account them as a part of the word of God, but as what is agreeable thereto."

Philo here repeats the common objection against our adhering to the scripture forms of psalmody, from our not using set forms of prayer, an objection which the defenders of the scripture psalmody have often answered sufficiently by showing that the case of singing in solemn worship is different from that of prayer. They have shown from example, that some prescribed form is necessary in the former, but not in the latter; that we have a promise of the Holy Spirit to help, and direct us what to pray for as we ought; but we have no such promise of his help in composing psalms or hymns to be sung in solemn and public worship: that God has given us a book of psalms, but not likewise a book of prayers; that prayer requires in its form an express and direct address to God, but that such an address is not necessary in every form of

\* See the first and second chapters of Luke.

psalmody, as is evident from the example of several psalms in the book bearing that title.

It may be added, that in this respect we are adhering to the testimony of our forefathers against the church of England. Mr. Calderwood, in his work entitled "The Altar of Damascus," observes, That the inspired psalms and songs, while they are to be read and interpreted in common with the other parts of the sacred scripture, have this peculiar to themselves, that they are to be sung. But considered as they are sung, they are not prayers; for singing is not properly praying. The singing of psalms, though in these there are prayers mixed with doctrines, prophecies, and doxologies, is not properly prayer; but the celebration of the divine praises. They who hold that the Lord's prayer is to be ordinarily sung as a prayer, are chargeable with confounding the distinct exercises of praying to God and singing his praises. Our divines have justly censured the popish worship, because they sing the lessons taken out of scripture, and their prayers which ought not to be sung. Jerome, one of the most learned of the ancient fathers, says, "It does not become a person to sing while he is praying." (See the eighth and ninth chapters of Calderwood's Altar of Damascus.)

We adhere to the testimony of our forefathers against the church of England in this matter; because herein they followed Christ, and adhered to the rule of his word. So far we are bound to follow them, Heb. xiii. 7.

Philo defines the uninspired hymns which he thinks may be warrantably sung in public worship, to be "Such only as contain the true substance of scripture, and set forth the mind and will of God." If he had said that the substance of some books of hymns of human composition is contained in the scripture, the assertion might pass without censure. But that the substance of the scripture, or even of a few verses of scripture is contained, or adequately set forth in any hymns which are not literal translations of the scripture songs, is an assertion which Philo will not maintain, when he considers the infinite superiority of the scriptures to the writings of men; and when he considers the depth of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God included in the substance of the scripture.

If by speaking of the mind and will of God as set forth in these books of hymns, Philo meant only that they expressed some truths contained in the scriptures, it may be observed, that something more still is necessary to render them psalms fit to be sung in the public and solemn worship of the church; even that they should be suitable to the purpose of celebrating the divine praises, and as suitable, too, as those which God has given us in his word expressly for that purpose. But how can any hymn of human composition be pretended to be as suitable, without impious presumption.

Philo adds, "That God hath sanctified such worship; what, therefore, God hath sanctified, let us not call common or unclean, lest we be found fighting against God." To this it may be answered, that there is no fighting against God but what is a fighting against his word, and what may be proved to be so. The reason why we reckon the singing of uninspired hymns in the solemn and public worship of the church common or unclean, is, that we cannot find that God hath sanctified, or appointed such hymns for that use in his word. Nor have we any ground to believe that God will countenance with his presence and blessing any other than those which he has appointed. Does Philo suppose that we may admit any thing as a mean of divine worship upon the ground of the relations which men give of their inward experience

in the use of it? Would not such a rule of judgment open a door for the introduction of manifold superstitions into our religious worship?

The relations which men give of their experience in the use of such means may be a motive to inquire after the warrant for them in the word of God, but they cannot constitute that warrant.

Philo next reproaches those who refuse to sing the hymns termed uninspired, in public worship, with partiality. He asks, "Are no parts of scripture to be versified, and sung but the book of psalms?" We answer, that we do not know that the singing of any other part of scripture is warranted, as the singing of the psalms of that book is, by the express command of God, or by any approved example recorded in the scripture. Nor is there in any other part of the inspired writings a collection of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs. It is obvious, that although the other songs contained in the scriptures are profitable for our farther instruction, reproof, or consolation, yet it does not necessarily follow that they were given for the purpose of being sung in the public and solemn worship of the church. There may be songs which were never designed to be sung in the public and solemn worship of the church. Thus the lamentation of David over Saul and Jonathan is a most beautiful piece of divine poetry; and yet we have not heard of any church that has admitted it into her psalmody.

Again, Philo asks, "Why is the Song of Solomon called, by the Holy Ghost himself, The Song,—The song of songs, a song above all other songs? no doubt, because in the nearest strains to gospel language, the mystical marriage is celebrated between Christ and his church. This, therefore, I take to be a rule of worship fully equal to the psalms of David. And the Holy Spirit seems to prefer this by styling it, The song of songs."

In answer to Philo, we may ask, what he means here by a rule of worship? The whole scripture is our rule of worship. But the different parts of scripture are distinguished by the different purposes for which they serve. Thus the books of Moses exhibit the laws which God gave the Israelites when they became a nation. The following books show their national prosperity and adversity under their successive rulers. The prophetic books display the perfect foreknowledge and providence of God as to the affairs of the world, and especially as to those of his church. But the book of psalms is the only system of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs which God hath given to be sung in the ordinary, solemn worship of his church. We are far from denying the superior excellence of the Song of Solomon as a representation of the spiritual marriage union, and communion between Christ and believers. But we do not at all detract from its excellence when we say, that it does not appear to have been given like the songs in the book of psalms to be sung in the public and solemn worship of the church. There are two things which may be observed in this song, on account of which it seems not so suitable for our public worship as the songs in the book of psalms. One is, that it is wholly allegorical. The meaning of it is no doubt certain and determinate, and much of it may be understood according to the ability which a person has to compare it with the other parts of scripture: but in itself, or in its literal form, it is not, like the psalms, apt to suggest the object of worship, and spiritual truth to every capacity. There is, indeed, a beautiful allegory in the eightieth Psalm; but it is short, and the verses which go before, and which follow it, direct us to the right understanding of it. The other thing obser-

vable in regard to the form of this song is that of a dialogue; and several speakers are introduced; and, therefore, it might be supposed that it ought to be sung alternately, or by the singers answering one another; which seems hardly suitable to the plain and simple manner of our worship. It is true the twenty-fourth Psalm is supposed by some commentators to be partly in the form of dialogue. But the first part of the psalm is not so; and the exclamations and questions in the latter part may be considered as belonging to the figurative manner of speaking usual in the animated style of poetry. Besides, the forty-fifth Psalm has not, without good reason, been called a compend, or abridgment of the Song of Solomon.

Philo asks, "Why did Habakkuk direct his poem to the chief musician on my stringed instruments?" It may be answered, that though it were granted, that this and some other songs were added to the system of psalms, it would not prove that the psalms in the book bearing that title were not delivered as such a system, any more than God's delivering some rules of the public worship to Israel in the time of David would prove that the five books of Moses were not delivered to Israel as the system of their laws. And additions made to the psalms by the divine author of them himself, are far from being a warrant for the introducing into solemn worship additions made by uninspired men. Besides, we have no certain account of the singing of this song of Habakkuk in the ordinary solemn worship of the church.

Philo asks, "Why Isaiah prophesied of a time approaching when this song should be sung; *Salvation hath God appointed for walls and bulwarks?*" It is answered, that the word song, in Isa. xxvi. 1, may be used for the matter of the church's song. In this sense God is called the song of his people, as in Exodus xv. 2; Ps. cxviii. 14. Their deliverance and prosperity are signified by their singing, or having a new song put in their mouth, Hos. ii. 15; Ps. xl. 3. This song of Isaiah is not more evangelical, or more in the language of the New Testament, than the songs in the book of Psalms. Nor is there any matter, any privilege, or attainment of the church, or her members, for which they might praise God in the words of this song; for which they might not praise him equally in singing the words of the book of psalms. There are many psalms, like this song, concerning the deliverances of the church, and the judgments of God on her enemies; such as the forty-sixth, forty-eighth, seventy-sixth, hundred and twenty-fourth, and hundred and twenty-sixth.

Again, Philo asks, "Why did the four beasts, and the four-and-twenty elders sing in the time of Constantine the Great, Glory, and honour, and strength to him that sat on the throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever? Why were all the people, and nations, and languages called upon after the downfall of the whore of Babylon to sing a new song of praise? And why did they in obedience to this command sing, *Hallelujah, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth: let us be glad, and rejoice in him; for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready?*" To these questions it is answered: 1st. That in singing the psalms, we sing the praises of the Lamb, as has been shown; we sing the Lord's victory over both the pagan and popish enemies of his church, as in Psalms hundred and tenth, hundred and twenty-fourth, and hundred and thirty-seventh. Secondly: It is not necessary to understand a new song of a form of psalmody newly composed; for a song may be called new on account of the excellency of the matter of it; and

on account of the new occasion for, and the new motives to the singing of it. In this sense our Lord calls the commandment to love one another a new commandment, which the apostle John tells us was also an old commandment.

Philo concludes this part of his subject with declaring his "sincere belief, that we may sing in worship any hymn that is in substance agreeable to scripture, and if sung with suitable desires in faith, God will accept it. For," adds he, "I am well satisfied that we are not bound to use the words of scripture in singing any more than in prayer."

It may be answered, that Philo's dissatisfaction here intimated with the reasons given by president Edwards and others for their holding that God gave his church the book of psalms to be used in the public singing of his praise throughout all ages to the end of the world, should have led him to state and refute their reasons, in his manuscript: a thing which, so far as we know, has not been fairly done as yet by him, or by any of his coadjutors.

In the mean time, they whom he opposes judge it to be their duty to testify against a scheme which not only introduces something, namely, the singing of human compositions into the solemn and public praises of God, which has no warrant in any precept or example of his word; but also tends to set aside altogether the singing of the psalms, which certainly has that warrant. We say, to set it aside altogether; for if these hymns be once admitted to the same place in our singing the praises of our God in solemn worship, with the inspired psalms, whilst we have no rule determining what proportion in that worship should be allotted to the hymns, and what to the psalms; no person, family, or congregation, could be blamed for singing the former only, and not the latter in that worship. How can we believe that such a scheme will be pleasing to God, which allows those psalms given and collected by him in a large book for the express purpose of being sung in his public and solemn worship, to be excluded altogether from being sung in that worship? a scheme, also, which confounds two distinct ordinances of his worship, singing psalms and prayer; promoting ignorance of their distinguishing properties, and thus leading persons to substitute the one for the other.

Another ground on which Philo attacks those who hold that the church is bound to sing in public and solemn worship the psalms given by inspiration of the Holy Spirit, is an assertion "That every version of psalms and hymns now extant, might be, and is rejected from the canon of Scripture." He does not except the prose version in our English bibles. But this cannot well be supposed to be his meaning; since he might as reasonably reject all the other books in that version, as the book of psalms, from the canon of scripture; and since he afterwards calls the words of the prose translation, the words of inspiration. Indeed, some advocates for the new psalmody have said, that the words of scripture, when translated, are no more the words of the Holy Spirit than Greek is English. This is directly contrary to those passages of the New Testament which call the words quoted from the Old Testament, the words of the prophets; as in Acts xv. 16, and in many other places; though the Greek words in such passages are no more the Hebrew words which the prophets spoke and wrote than the words of our English translation. How absurd, how shocking is it to represent, as this supposition does, the generality of Christians, because they are ignorant of the Hebrew and Greek languages, as having no other ground of their faith and hope than the words of men! But probably Philo

meant to limit his assertion to translations in verse or metre. But it is unreasonable to suppose that, while the words of the prose translation are allowed to be the words of the Holy Spirit, the same words retained in a metre version are not the words of the Holy Spirit, but the words of men. It has been observed by some authors, that it is the test of genuine poetry, that it will be poetry still, into whatever language it is translated. So the words of the scripture will still be the words of God, into whatever language they are faithfully translated, whether the translation be in prose or in verse.

But there is one verse translation against which Philo levels the severest censure, namely, Rouse's translation, which, he says, "is human composition, and neither given by divine inspiration, nor a true translation of David's psalms; as is evident," he adds, "from the errors which are found in it," errors which he calls "fundamental."

The first of these fundamental errors is in the first two lines of it.

"That man hath perfect blessedness, who walketh not astray."

"The Holy Ghost," says Philo, "does not speak in the first psalm of perfect blessedness belonging to any man while on earth; nor of any man that walketh not astray. Mr. Rouse's version here opens up a way for men to believe in a sinless perfection being attainable. The words of the Holy Ghost are, *Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly.*"\*

In answer to this censure, it may be observed, that those who understand the original tell us, that the Hebrew word rendered *blessed* in the prose translation is what the grammarians call a substantive noun in the plural number. So that the most literal translation is, *Blessednesses to the man who walketh not, &c.* It is supposed that this must be obvious to every one who reads the original. The meaning is, all sorts of blessedness, temporal, spiritual, and eternal, are the portion of the man here described. So that it appears to have been an attempt to convey the import of the original more exactly than the prose translation does, that led to this expression, "That man hath perfect blessedness." It is evident from the following part of the psalm that the blessedness here described to the godly man is not only present, but future and everlasting blessedness, which he shall have when he shall stand in the judgment; a blessedness which shall abide, when the way of the ungodly shall perish. If the word *is* in the prose translation led Philo to limit this blessedness to the present time, he might have observed that the

\* The imitation of the psalms by Dr. Watts has often been extolled as containing an interpretation of their meaning. We have a very singular example of it in the very first line of the imitation, where he has mistaken the word *counsel*, advice, for *council*, an assembly, and accordingly instead of informing us of the blessedness of the man who shuns the *instructions* of the ungodly, he gives us this interpretation:—

"Blest is the man who shuns the *place*  
Where sinners love to meet."

In the fourth verse of the same psalm we have a green leaf introduced as the figure of extraordinary lustre:—

"Green as the leaf, and ever fair,  
Shall his profession shine."

It would be an easy task to point out hundreds of such instances of poetic beauties, but it would only serve to draw away attention from the true ground of the controversy. In the *English Biographical Dictionary*, the author of which had no respect to any controversy on this subject, Dr. Watts, although a dissenter, is spoken of in the most respectful terms as a prose writer, but when his biographers come to speak of his poetry, they sum up their judgment by saying: "He is at least one of the few with whom youth and ignorance may be safely pleased." *Biog. Dict.* vol. 12, p. 456.



word is a supplement: though believers are said to have as theirs, even at present, the blessedness which they are to enjoy hereafter. He that believeth on the Son hath already everlasting life. All things are yours, things to come as well as things present. Believers are to be considered as having nothing, and yet possessing all things; having nothing in themselves, but possessing all things in Christ: a distinction which, while it is directly contrary to the doctrine of perfectionists, sufficiently justifies the expression which Philo censures.

What Philo says about the word *astray* is a mere cavil. It is here used, like many supplements in the prose translation, for explaining the sense of the original expression. In this supplement the translator seems to have had respect to the evil tendency of the general tenor of the counsel of ungodly men; for as to a particular counsel suggested by an ungodly man, instead of leading astray, it may be salutary; such as Joab, an ungodly man, gave David against numbering the people. It is an attainment which the Lord promised to his people, that they should not go astray, as they had done in the defection from the purity of his worship, Ezek. xiv. 11. The Lord delivers his people from going astray as they formerly did, Ps. cxix. 67.

Again, says Philo, "The Holy Ghost speaketh not thus:"

"If the foundations be destroyed, what hath the righteous done?"  
 "But the words of inspiration are those which follow:" "*If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?*"

In answer to this censure, it is asserted by those who have read this passage in the original Hebrew, that the words, *What hath the righteous done?* is an exact, literal translation of the Hebrew words; and that they are so rendered in the old English, in the Geneva, in the French, and in some of the best Latin translations. It is probable that in this and other instances, the metre translation is more correct than the prose one. This may be reasonably inferred from the history of this translation; according to which, it was diligently compared both with the original text, and with former translations, both by the members of the Westminster Assembly, and those of the General Assembly of the church of Scotland,\* many of whom were men whose names, for their singular piety, their deep researches in theology, their thorough acquaintance with the scriptures in the original languages, and their undaunted faithfulness in the cause of God and truth, will be eminently honoured in the church of God to the end of time. An acquaintance with their writings and characters might have taught Philo to hesitate, and examine the matter with care, before he brought such a heavy charge against them as that of approving and publishing a false translation of the book of Psalms. Philo, therefore, ought not to have called the words of the prose translation, in opposition to the metre one, the words of inspiration; for neither of these translations are so, any farther than as they agree with the Hebrew. The sense of the words of the metre translation is agreeable to their connexion with the first and second verses. David had all along professed, as he does in the first verse, to put his trust in the Lord. But now, some whom he here addresses, said to his soul, "Flee as a bird to your mountain," intimating that he was not likely to be safe in the way of trusting in the Lord, and that he should speedily make his escape; for his enemies were crafty and powerful. In the third verse, David replies, that such speeches subverted or destroyed the foundations of the righteous man's trust, implying that

\* It should be noticed that the metre translation is later than the prose one.

the course he had taken, or what he had done in trusting in the Lord, was not likely to be of any avail for his safety: such speeches shame the counsel of the poor, because the Lord is his refuge. Or, if we consider the upbraiding speech of some pretended, but temporizing friends of David continued in the third verse, still it may be understood according to the words of the metre translation, as meaning, that if the foundations of law and good government be destroyed, then what the righteous man hath done, his former innocence and services will be of no avail for his preservation. So, there appears to be no necessity to depart, as the prose translation does, from what we are assured is the literal, or verbal signification of the original words.

Again, says Philo, "Mr. Rouse asserts that Christ was forced to fulfil the law which he had not broken. His words are these:—

—"So what I took not, to render forced was I."

"The Holy Ghost makes Christ active in it, *So I rendered what I took not away.* Whereas Mr. Rouse makes him entirely passive."

In answering this censure of Philo, it is not meant to condemn the prose translation. But it has been observed, that several excellent translators, among whom are Junius and Tremellius, have rendered this expression as in the metre version; while they considered this text as teaching us, that though the death of Christ on his part was most voluntary, yet in the intention of his enemies, and as it was in its nature a violent death, it might be said to be the effect of force and cruelty.\*

In the Hebrew language, it is usual for a word which signifies to do a thing, to be so changed by the addition of a letter or two as to signify, to cause another to do that thing, as is the case here. The word here used signifies, to cause to return. Hence in the prose translation, it is rendered, to restore. But as the primitive word sometimes signifies, to restore, as in Job xlii. 10, "The Lord turned, or made to return;" Ps. lxxxv. 1, "Thou hast brought back, or madest to return;"—so, when a letter is added, as in the original here, it may signify, to cause to restore. Hence the translators before mentioned, and others, have rendered the text under consideration, "I was forced to restore." This translation agrees well with the preceding part of the verse: it is manifestly applicable to David, the type, as meaning what his enemies compelled him to, and it is no less applicable to Christ, the antitype, in the sense already mentioned.

Philo is blameable here, as before, for attempting to pass the prose English translation of the psalms upon his reader for the original; whereas, it has no more authority than another translation which is equally agreeable to the original. He calls the words of the prose translation, in opposition to the metre one, without any reference to the Hebrew copy, the words of the Holy Ghost. One of the many translations of the Old Testament scriptures is not to be tried by another translation, but every one of them by the authentic Hebrew copy.

Philo represents Mr. Walker as saying, "That Christ was voluntary in his undertaking; but there was something involuntary in the performing." Mr. Walker indeed expresses it as his opinion, that the causal form of the Hebrew verb here used, which he thinks not sufficiently marked in the prose translation, has respect to Christ's voluntary undertaking from eternity, and his being found in time under the obligation of the broken law in the place of his people. Having cited the

\* The Ethiopic version renders the words in exact conformity to the metre translation, "Quod non obstuli reddere cogunt me." "*What I took not they force me to restore,*" (cited by Michaelis in *Hagiogr.*)

expression of the metre version which Philo condemns, he has these words: "This, far more emphatically than the prose, declares the compelling power of the law as a covenant of works under which Christ was born; while it was, no doubt, a voluntary act of Christ to agree from eternity to be made under the law: but having entered into that pactional agreement, he was bound by it; and when in the fulness of time he was made under this law, the covenant of works used its force; its language was, *Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, and against the Man who is my fellow.* Nay, the law refused him legal justification until he paid the uttermost farthing. His resurrection was his justification in the Spirit."

This is the passage of Mr. Walker's sermon to which Philo refers. Mr. Walker in these words teaches that in consequence of Christ's eternal undertaking in the covenant of grace, his sufferings were necessary according to the law and justice of God; a plain truth which our Lord taught, when he said, "Ought not Christ to have suffered?" In this sense, as a pious writer observes, the words which his enemies uttered in the way of derision were strictly true. "He saved others; himself he could not save;" that is, exempt himself from suffering. Though such was the force of the law under which Christ suffered, yet he suffered as well as undertook to suffer most freely and voluntarily. He was always saying, "I delight to do thy will, O my God." Mr. Walker's words, which Philo ought to have given his reader, will not bear another meaning, and by no means that which Philo imputes to him. The truth is, that neither the force or violence in the intention of Christ's enemies, and in the kind of death which he suffered, nor the force arising from the demand of the law upon him as our surety, detracted in the least from the voluntariness of his suffering.

Such are Philo's instances of error in the version of the psalms commonly used. In the mean time, he cannot be ignorant that the common prose translation of the Psalms, and almost of every other book of the Bible has been censured by learned men with more candour and justice than he has been able to show in censuring our common metre version of the Psalms. Translation, like every other work of man, is imperfect. But while the word of God is preserved pure and entire in the original languages, it is preserved in any translation which has been honestly made, in such a measure as is sufficient to regulate the faith and practice of Christians, to make them wise to salvation.

After all, this discussion about the version of the Psalms serves only to amuse the reader, and to divert the attention from what is really the matter in dispute, which is, whether the book of Psalms be the only collection or system of Psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs which ought to be sung in solemn and public worship. Philo cannot but be sensible that the annihilation of Rouse's version would do nothing at all to settle the matter in dispute, which is, whether God has given us in the book of Psalms, a system of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs sufficient for the use of the church in one part of her solemn worship, the singing of his praise.