

religion without the substance. And what good would such a religion do any one? Supposing all were to embrace it, would the world be any the better? No. For no man can serve two masters—he cannot serve God and mammon. May the love and Spirit of Christ constrain us all to a hearty compliance with this apostolic admonition, “And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God.”

THE HYMNOLOGY OF THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

I.

IN discussing such a subject as this, it is necessary to act as Nehemiah's workers did, every one of whom “with one of his hands wrought in the work, and with the other hand held a weapon.” And like these patriotic builders, the historical student is often cumbered with “much rubbish.” In the devoted band of hymn-singers, Dr. H. Bonar has long held a conspicuous place, by his ardent attempts to prove that the Reformers of Scotland used human hymns in the public worship of God. In considering this question therefore, it will not be amiss to examine pretty carefully what such a veteran champion has advanced; though, perhaps, it may be thought presumptuous for one, who marches in the rank and file of Presbyterianism, to criticise the utterances of the Moderator of the Free Church Assembly. But the highest dignitaries—not excepting the Pope of Rome—are just as fallible as the greatest geniuses, and the best of scholars, and neither of these claim to be beyond criticism. Dr. Bonar, however, stands head and shoulders above most of his contemporaries in a far better sense, to wit, in vital godliness. Well does the writer of this article remember hearing him commending Christ to a crowd of people near the Heart of Mid-Lothian more than a dozen years ago. His countenance and especially his eyes seemed lit up with the reflection of his Master's glory. And not only are we assured that “the secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him,” but, *that*, “a good understanding have all they that do His commandments.” Yet Paul says, “Be ye followers of me, *even as I also am of Christ*,” and Dr. Bonar will ask no more. Moreover, if an attempt were made to count heads, it might be rather difficult to say on which side of the hymn-question most of Christ's earnest followers have been ranged.

In the appendix to his very interesting and valuable reprint of the *Catechisms of the Scottish Reformation*, published in 1866, Dr. Bonar makes some very sweeping statements about the attitude our Reformers maintained to the hymns, which stand sadly in need of proof. He has, however, expressed himself with more fulness in *The Christian Church* for December, 1881, in a paper entitled “The Hymnology of the Scotch Reformation.” That paper he has reproduced, with a few slight alterations, on the cover in which the *Free*

Church Monthly is supplied to his own congregation, with this introductory paragraph :—

"I think it right to publish my views on Hymnology, for the benefit of the Congregation. They are views which I have always held, ever since I began to read Scottish Church History. The opposite views are not consistent with our Reformation History, but are departures from the sentiments of Knox, Melville, Craig, and Henderson—innovations, in short, upon Reformation principles.—[Signed] Horatius Bonar, 26th October, 1883."

The alterations he has made are in the direction of putting a bolder front on the matter ; this, no doubt, has arisen not from any desire to over-awe the gainsayers, but from the ever growing conviction that he is in the right. While wielding his pen, he would think that he was honouring those Reformers whom he so highly esteems ; yet others will look on his paper as an attempt to traduce worthy men who are not here to answer for themselves. But their works still live, and by these they being dead yet speak. As the cover of the *Free Church Monthly* is only semi-public, I shall deal with the paper as it appeared in the *Christian Church*. The title under which he there wrote did not lead him into the Scriptural argument, for or against hymns, nor will it lead me except in the briefest manner. Though, of course, the ultimate appeal must always be "to the law and to the testimony," for it is "the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy" God. Those who wish to know the bearing of Scripture on human hymns as matter of God's worship should read the two excellent little treatises, respectively entitled, *The True Psalmody*, and *The Public Worship of God*, the first of which is an American publication, and the other was penned by the late Dr. Gibson. It is enough to state here that the Psalms are as much superior to uninspired hymns as God's Word is to man's word, and we ought to serve God with the best ; that there is no warrant for worshipping God with human hymns, and therefore we have no ground for hoping that such praise will be accepted ; and, further, while admitting that metrical translations of other portions of the Bible are not to be compared with mere human hymns, the fact of God's having gathered the Psalms, Songs and Hymns of various inspired writers into one Book of Psalms, seems conclusively to show that that Book alone was meant to serve as our manual of praise. Christ specially referred to "the Book of Psalms," and Paul, quoting the words, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," says they are "written in the *second* Psalm," thus indicating that they were then arranged in their present order. There must be some reason why the Prayer or Psalm of Moses in the 90th Psalm found a place in that Book, though his Song in the 15th chapter of Exodus did not ; why David's Psalm of thanksgiving, when the ark was brought to Zion,¹ is reproduced in the 105th, 96th, and 106th Psalms ; why the 14th and 53rd Psalms are almost exactly the same ; and why the 108th Psalm is embodied in the 57th and 60th. The reason given above seems the most satisfactory.

Neither did Dr. Bonar's title lead him necessarily into the hymnology of the continental churches, unless it had been to trace the

¹ Luke xx. 42.

² Acts xiii. 33.

³ 1 Chron. xvi. 8-36.

connection between it and that of the Scottish Reformation. This connection he has not attempted to trace, save in the most vague and general way possible; and yet nearly one half of his paper is taken up with the hymnology of other churches! In these digressions we need not follow him far. He says:—

“In 1540 we have the Dutch Psalter, in which there are many Scripture songs; and in 1543 we have Luther's spiritual songs. In 1533 we have the ‘belles et bonnes chansons’ of Vingle, published at Neuchatel; and in 1546 Beaulieu's 160 hymns. After that, on to the end of the century, we have nearly forty different volumes—small or great—published in France and Switzerland, containing in all some six or seven hundred hymns of various kinds. No doubt there were more, but these are all that have been preserved to us. They show the vast range of French hymnology in that Reformation age, and the earnestness with which the French and Swiss Reformers, with Calvin and Beza at their head, adopted not only the Psalm, but the hymn and spiritual song as the vehicle for proclaiming the Gospel, and for the worship of God, both in private and in the congregation.”¹

Exception must be taken to the dubious honour thus conferred on Calvin, for Professor Mitchell admits that “he was, perhaps, over-anxious to confine the service of praise to those songs of Zion which the inspired volume had provided, and especially to the Psalms of the Hebrew poets.”² Objection must also be taken to his remark, that Coverdale prefixed to his small volume, entitled, *Goostly Psalmes and Spirituall Songes*, “a most beautiful introduction in defence of the singing of hymns and Psalms.” Though this statement is true, it is rather misleading, for care is not taken to point out that Coverdale evidently meant his hymns to be sung, not in the church, but by the people at their work. No doubt Dr. Bonar quotes this sentence from Coverdale: “Would God that our minstrels had none other thing to play upon; neither our carters and ploughmen other thing to whistle upon, save Psalms, hymns, and such godly songs as David is occupied withal.” Even that solitary sentence shows pretty plainly what Coverdale was driving at; but if the next one had been also given, it would have been still plainer: “And if women, sitting at their rocks, or spinning at the wheels, *had none other songs to pass their time withal*, than such as Moses' sister, Glehana's wife, Debora, and Mary the mother of Christ, have sung before them, they should be better occupied than with *hey nony nony, hey trolly loly*, and such like phantasies.”³ The noble Reformer was anxious to change the “foul and corrupt ballads into sweet songs and spiritual hymns of God's honour.”

As few of our readers may have seen Dr. Bonar's paper, and as it will be fairer to him, we shall quote the principal portions of it, although they are pretty long:—

“The Psalter used in the Scotch Church was of Genevan origin, compiled for the English congregation in Geneva when John Knox was its minister. Dr. McCrie in his ‘Life of Knox’ thus writes:—‘What has been called Knox's Liturgy was the Book of Common Order first used by the English Church at Geneva.’ The ‘Psalter’

¹ In a foot-note to another paragraph, he confesses: “Perhaps I should not name Calvin so confidently as a hymn-writer. The one hymn which he is said to have written is still somewhat doubtful as to authorship.”

² Catholic Presbyterian, vol. i. p. 173.

³ Coverdale's Remains, Parker Society, p. 537.

in this volume was of gradual growth. It first contained only a small number of Psalms. To each new edition there were added more, and in 1560 several hymns also, such as the Benedictus, the Magnificat, Nunc Dimittis. The Geneva Psalter thus advanced to completion, step by step, according as material was furnished by the psalm-translators and the hymn-writers. In 1565 the whole 150 Psalms appear in the edition, printed by Lekprevik, at Edinburgh, for the use of the church in Scotland. Again in 1575 we have another advance, and the edition printed that year in Edinburgh by Bassandyne contains several spiritual songs, such as 'Veni Creator' and 'The Lamentation of a Sinner.' The General Assembly of this year (1575) was one of the most faithful and uncompromising character, containing a long and most minute Act as to the dress of ministers, prohibiting ornament of every kind as unbecoming. We may be quite sure that if they had disapproved of hymns in public worship they would have said so, and not allowed this edition of their old Psalter to come forth with four of them. There is no Act of Assembly sanctioning this edition expressly; but their *allowance* of it, if there was nothing more, is sufficient to indicate their mind. This was the edition which the Parliament in 1579—no doubt at the instigation of the Assembly—ordered to be possessed by every householder. (See Dr. Lee's Memorial.)

"In 1587 another edition was published, of which I have examined two copies, nearly perfect. In it the number of hymns is increased to eleven; and the General Assembly during the sitting at which it came forth was that of which Andrew Melville was Moderator: a sufficient security that everything pertaining to the worship and order of the Church would be cared for and watched over.

"There were many subsequent editions, in one or two of which there are no hymns; but in most of them the eleven above noted are to be found. This continued till the Psalter was superseded by the Westminster Assembly. Thus from 1575 to 1649, when the General Assembly sanctioned the present version of the Psalms, there were hymns in the Church of Scotland.

"In the preface to 'The Book of Common Order' reference is made not only to the Psalms, but to those of Moses, Hezekias, Mary, Zacharias, 'who by songs and metre rather than in their common speech and prose gave thanks to God.' It is uncertain whether this preface was written by Knox or by his colleague, Whittingham. But the title of the Scotch edition, to which I have already adverted, is a striking one: 'The Book of Common Order, or the Order of the English Kirk at Geneva whereof John Knox was minister, approved by the famous and learned man, John Calvin; received and used by the Reformed Kirk of Scotland, and ordinarily prefixed to the Psalms in metre.'

Before replying to the foregoing, it may be well to give a brief account of the origin of the *Order of Geneva*, of the Psalm-book bound up with it, and of the various editions through which they passed.

Those ministers and others who, having fled from the persecution of Bloody Mary, formed themselves into a congregation at Frankfort, agreed, in July, 1554, that in worship they would "*sing a Psalm in metre in a plain tune*, as was and is accustom'd in the French, Dutch, Italian, Spanish, and Scotch Churches." As there is good reason to believe that *Wedderburn's Psalms* were published in or before 1546, it was probably those which were sung at this early period by the Scottish Church. It was on the 24th of September, 1554, that Knox was called from Geneva to be minister of the Frankfort congregation; and, after his arrival, he, with Whittingham, Gilby, Fox, and Cole, drew up an "Order meet for their state and time," which was "very well liked of many, but such as were bent to the Book of England could not abide it."¹ In March, 1555, Knox returned to Geneva; but in July he obtained leave of absence to visit Scotland. It was on the 1st of November following that "the English church and congregation at Geneva was erected," and in his absence Goodman and Gilby were appointed its pastors. The Scottish Reformer returned to Geneva

¹ Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort; Phenix, vol. ii., pp. 47, 70, 71.

on the 13th September, 1556, and on the 16th November, "when the first yere was ended, then the whole congregation did elect and chuse John Knox and Christopher Goodman to be ministers."¹ The *Order* drawn up by Knox and his four coadjutors at Frankfort was adopted by the English congregation at Geneva, and so has come to be known as the *Order of Geneva*,² though it is also well known as the *Book of Common Order*, and is sometimes called *Knox's Liturgy*. The first edition was printed at Geneva in 1556, and is dated "the tenthe of February;" but as it is uncertain whether the year is to be understood as beginning on the 1st of January or the 25th of March, it is doubtful if Knox was in Geneva at that time; yet the facts remain that he was one of its compilers, and it was used in the congregation at Geneva of which he was a minister. It contains "one-and-fyftie Psalmes of David in metre," and a metrical version of "The Ten Commandements," by Whittingham; and the edition of 1558—of which no copy is known to exist—is believed to have been a literal reprint. Thirty-seven of these Psalms are said to have been "made by Thomas Sterneholde," seven by Hopkins but considerably altered, and the other seven by Whittingham.³ In the edition of 1561, which was also printed at Geneva, there were "fourscore and seven Psalmes," and besides the "Ten Commandements" there were three versions of the Lord's Prayer, and one version of the Song of Simeon.⁴ All these, it will be observed from their titles, are passages of Scripture thrown into metre, and not mere human hymns. David Laing, who, as Dr. Sprott says, "knew more of the subject than any other person," gives the further information, that "there were two if not three distinct editions of these eighty-seven Psalms printed in the year 1561."⁵ The edition of 1562, printed at Edinburgh by Lekprevik, does not seem to have contained any Psalms at all.⁶ Perhaps this is the edition reprinted in the second volume of *The Phenix*, and which the editor characterises, in his preface, as "A grave demure piece, without either responses, or Psalmes, or hymns, without fringe or philactery; but terribly fortify'd and pallisado'd with texts of Scripture, which we suppose to be all right, and *secundum artem*." The only known copy of the 1564 edition is preserved in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, but, with the exception of the date, it is "identically the same" as the edition of 1565, in all the copies of which "the date 1564 occurs on the title-page of the Catechism."⁷ In speaking of the editions of 1564 and 1565, Livingston says, "These two impressions are found to be entirely alike, so that they may be regarded as forming one edition, which is herefore designated that of 1564-5. . . . On comparing the Scottish with the English Psalter [of 1562], important differences appear. . . .

¹ Laing's Knox, vol. iv., pp. 146, 147; and vol. vi., p. xxxii.

² It must not be confounded with the *Order of the Genevan Church*, which was used by the Church at Geneva of which Calvin was minister.

³ Laing's Knox, vol. iv., pp. 148, 166; Livingston's *Scottish Metrical Psalter*, Diss. p. 10.

⁴ Laing's Knox, vol. vi., p. 280; *Scottish Psalter*, Diss. iii. p. 33.

⁵ Laing's Knox, vol., vi. p. 285.

⁶ Ibid. vol. iv., p. 156.

⁷ Laing's Knox. vol. vi., pp. 279, 280.

The English is accompanied by about twenty hymns, *while the other at this stage has no such appendage.*"¹ And, again, "In the Genevan publications of 1556-61 . . . a few Spiritual Songs are appended to the Psalms ; *but in the first issue of the complete Psalter for Scotland in 1564-5 these are all left out, and nothing is found but the Psalms themselves.*"² It is in this edition that William Stewart's sonnet to the Church of Scotland is found :—

"Thou litle Church, to whom Christ hath restorde
The cleare lost light of His Evangel pure :
Thy God doth with all diligence procure
That with His Worde, thou maist be atil decorde.

"Thogh thou have long His wholesome trueth abhorde,
Yet His great mercies did thy blindnes cure,
Submitting thee unto the careful cure
Of suche Pastours, as truly teache His Worde.

"Out of whose hands (with great thanks), now receive
All David's Psalmes set foorth in pleasant verse :
A greater gift of them thou couldst not crave,
Whose endles frute my pen can not rehearse :
*For here thou hast, for everie accident
That may occurre, a doctrine pertinent.*"³

The General Assembly, which met in December, 1564, evidently referred to this edition when they ordained "that everie minister, exhorter, and reader, sall have one of the Psalmes bookes latelie printed in Edinburgh, and use the order conteaned therin, in prayers, marriage, and ministration of the sacraments."⁴ Livingston, in his very elaborate and valuable work so frequently referred to, says that this edition "is executed with great accuracy, both in the literary and musical divisions."⁵

In the General Assembly on the 7th of July, 1568 :—

"It was declared and fund, that Thomas Bassendie, printer in Edinburgh, printed ane book, intituled the Fall of the Roman Kirk, nameing our King and Sovereigne supream Head of the primitive Kirk. Also, that he had printit ane Psalme Book, in the end whereof was fund printed ane baudy song callit Wellcome Fortune; whilk books he had printed without licence of the magistrat or revising of the Kirk: Therefore, the haill Assembly ordained the said Thomas, to call in againe all the foirsaid books that he has sauld, and keep the rest unsauld untill he alter the foirsaid title, and also that he delait the said baudy song out of the end of the Psalme Book; and, farther, that he abstaine in all tyme comeing from further printing any thing without licence of the supream magistrate, and revising of sic things as pertaine to religione be some of the Kirk appointit for that purpose."⁶

No copy of Bassandyne's edition, of 1568, is known to survive; but in his 1575 edition, there are the following spiritual songs: "The Lord's Prayer, the X Commandments with the prayer following them, and the Second Lamentation; also Veni Creator, separate from the others. *This is the earliest appearance of any of these songs in the Scottish Psalter, so far as yet discovered.* Another originality is a 'Conclusion' to Ps. 148th, which is placed at the very end of the

¹ The Scottish Psalter, Diss. ii. p. 13.

Laing's Knox, vol. vi., p. 334.

² Scottish Psalter, Diss. ii., p. 13.

³ Booke of the Universall Kirk, 1839, pp. 100, 101.

⁴ Ibid. Diss. i. p. 4.

⁵ Calderwood's History, vol. ii., p. 284.

book."¹ This edition, the first with these few songs and its solitary doxology, it will be observed, was not issued until three years after Knox's death. "It is very significant," says Mr. Balfour, of Holyrood, "that the sonnet of William Stewart, prefixed to the Psalms in the edition of 1565, in which he speaks of them *as suited to every case*, is omitted from the edition of 1575 and all later editions to which hymns were subjoined."² The true reason, however, why Stewart's sonnet was omitted, seems rather to have been that he was burned—justly or unjustly—for "certane crymes of witchcraft, nigromancye, and utheris crymes committit be him."³ In the edition of the Psalms printed by Vautrollier, at London, in 1587, the "Conclusion" of 1575 is retained; and the number of spiritual songs is increased to ten, these being: "The X Commandements," with the "Prayer" following; "The Lord's Prayer;" "The XII Articles;" "Veni Creator;" "The Hymble Svte of a Sinner;" "The Lamentation of a Sinner;" "The Complaint of a Sinner;" "The Lamentation of a Sinner" [this is *ane vther Lamentation*]; "The Song of Blessed Marie, called Magnificat;" and "The Song of Simeon, called Nunc Dimittis." There was an edition, with Latin titles to the Psalms, published in Middleburgh, by Schilders, in 1594, which contains the same spiritual songs as that of 1587. In 1596, the *Book of Common Order* was printed at Edinburgh, by Charteris, but the Psalms are dated 1595. This edition contains the same spiritual songs as the two preceding, and also "for the first time, so far as appears, the set of Metrical Doxologies termed 'Conclusions,' one adapted to each form of metre; the intention being that each Psalm should be terminated by one of these formulas."⁴ "Subsequent editions are not uniform in this matter. The ten [songs] are continued in the Middleberg of 1602, but in that of Smyth, 1599, there is only the second Lamentation. In the small 1611 there is none, and in Raban's Bible edition of 1629 only the two Lamentations."⁵ "The Conclusions disappear from the editions of 1611 and 1615, but are restored in that of 1633."⁶ The "Song of Moses" appeared for the first time in the edition of 1615, and was thus introduced, by the printer to the reader:—

"Beeing in conference with a Godlie Brother (Christian Reader), I shewed vnto him that I was minded to print ouer againe this Booke of the Psalmes, who saide vnto me that he marueled that the Song of Moses was neuer yet insert therein, the which contained an abridgement of all Doctrine meete for the glorifying of God, and edifying of his Church: And therefore, moste finellie set forth in verse, by the Spirit of God, for memories cause, dited to Moses word for word, and expresselie commanded to bee put into the mouthes of all sortes of people, to bee a witnessse for the patience of the Lord against their sinne and vnthankfulnesse, to iustifie him, when his judgements should bee extreamelie powred forth for the same. The which doctrine and purpose of the Holie Svirite, remaining in register, is as needfull in this declining estate of the Gospell, and taking away of so manie faithfull Messengers of God, as it was at the departure of Moses and more. I requested him, therefore, that I might haue it put into Meeter, who accorded, and sent mee the same to bee insert in this new Edition, and recommended carefullie to the Church of our time and land: The which I pray

¹ The Scottish Psalter, Diss. ii. p. 13.

² The Psalms versus Hymns, p. 6, footnote.

³ Laing's Knox, Vol. vi. p. 692.

⁴ The Scottish Psalter, Dis. ii. p. 14, and App., p. iv.

⁵ Ibid. Dis. iii. p. 34.

⁶ Ibid. App. p. ix.

God may by her bee vsed fruitfullie for preuenting of the horrible plagues so long threatned, & comfort of Her elect children when the same shall be powred out, amen." ¹

In his reprint of the *Catechisms of the Scottish Reformation*, Dr. Bonar quotes the foregoing preface, but does not state in what edition it first appeared. Indeed, a casual reader of the appendix, in which he gives it, would naturally infer that if it was not actually in Knox's life-time, it must have been very soon after his death, and would never dream that it was 43 years after he had gone to glory. It may be uncharitable to say so, but we cannot help thinking that the date was purposely suppressed; and this is borne out by the similar fact that in the long passage, already quoted from the *Christian Church*, he gives no hint whatever that the edition of 1565 contained no hymns. And so even good men are constrained to hide awkward facts that cannot be squared to suit their pet theories!

While the act of the General Assembly, in 1568, shows that there was at least one unscrupulous printer of the Psalms, it also proves that the Assembly were ready to pounce upon any outrageous offender. It might even have been supposed from that act that nothing concerning religion was allowed to be printed without the sanction of the church; but this preface of 1615 seems to show that printers exercised and enjoyed a good deal of freedom.² And there is much force in Livingston's remark, that although several spiritual songs had been printed in the editions of 1575 and 1587, "this does not affect the question of their use in public worship."³ For not only can no formal sanction of them, *for any purpose*, be produced; but there is no evidence of their having been used in the services of the sanctuary. Moreover, it appears from an act of the General Assembly, which met in August, 1574, that the committees appointed "to visite and oversee all maner of bookes or workes that are offered to be printed," were instructed "to give their judgement thereof, by their subscription and hand-writt, for benefite of the reader."⁴ But even although this had not been the case, Dr. Bonar's argument, that, because the Assembly of 1575 did not condemn the addition of spiritual songs to the Psalter, therefore they approved of hymns in public worship, is entirely fallacious, for it proceeds on the assumption that these songs could not possibly be in the Psalm Book unless they were meant for public worship. He should just have assumed the whole thing at once, and sent it out with authority from the Moderator's chair. He says, however, that the Psalm Book of 1575 "was the edition which the Parliament in 1579—no doubt at the instigation of the Assembly—ordered to be possessed by every householder;" and in support of

¹ The Scottish Psalter, app. p. iv. James Melville is said to have been the author of this Song of Moses.

² "George Withers, who published hymns in 1623, speaks as if the additions to the English Psalter were very much in the hands of the booksellers. 'My booke of hymnes being allowed by authority, are as fit, I trust, to keepe company with David's psalmes as Robert Wisdome's *Turke and Pope*, and those other *apocryphal songs and praises which the stationers add to the psalme booke for their more advantage*.'" Scottish Psalter, notes, p. 61.

³ Ibid. p. 60.

⁴ Calderwood's History, vol. iii. p. 338.

this he says, "See Dr. Lee's Memorial." But Dr. Lee says:—"The Psalm Book here referred to might be either that which was printed by Bassandyne, in 1578, or that which Arbuthnot received licence to print for seven years after the 1st of April, 1579."¹ Can Dr. Bonar say where there is a copy of any of these editions, or can he affirm that any of them contained songs or hymns? So much for his reference to Dr. Lee. The Society of Antiquaries of Scotland possess a copy in black-letter, which wants the title-page, but which is believed to have been printed, in or about 1578, by Lekprevik or Ross; it only contains one song, however, of six stanzas, namely the Lamentation, "O Lord in Thee."²

"In the preface to 'The Book of Common Order,' " says Dr. Bonar, "reference is made not only to the Psalms, but to the hymns of Moses, Hezekias, Mary, Zacharias, 'who by songs and metre, rather than in their common speech and prose, gave thanks to God.'" One cannot help wondering why Dr. Bonar, in mentioning the worthies named in the "preface," should have left out Judith and Debora. It would have done no harm to his cause to cite Debora, but then Judith would have been left alone in the cold, and so would have been more conspicuous; and unfortunately she is an apocryphal worthy! It is also remarkable that he has not quoted the first part of the sentence which runs thus:—"There are no songes more meete then the Psalmes of the Prophet David, which the Holy Ghoste hath framed to the same use, and commended to the Church, as containing the effect of the whole Scriptures, that hereby our heartes might be more lyvelie touched, as appeareth by Moses," &c.³ Twice he refers to this "preface," and on both occasions speaks of it as written by Knox or Whittingham, though Laing says it is usually ascribed to Whittingham. In his second reference, he describes it as "the preface to the Genevan Service-book of 1556;" but as he had previously called it simply "the preface to 'The Book of Common Order,'" he might surely have vouchsafed the information, that it was omitted in all the editions printed in Scotland.⁴

Probably Dr. Bonar did not intend the "striking" title of the *Book of Common Order*, which he cites from Dunlop's Confessions, to prove that hymns were sung in the Scottish Church, or he would have given some hint as to how it affects the question. It is as difficult to see why he has dragged in the 1560 edition of the Psalter, with its "several hymns," since it can only be described as Genevan "in a qualified sense as compared with those of 1556 and 1561," and the only copy known is bound up with the English Liturgy of 1560.⁵ Why, it may well be asked, has Dr. Bonar ignored the Calendar and the Fairs which appear in so many editions of the *Book of Common Order*? Was it because they savour of Prelacy, and so might have destroyed his argument by proving too much?

¹ Lee's Memorial, 1824, p. 41, footnote.

² Scottish Psalter, Diss. ii., p. 15; Sprott and Leishman's Book of Common Order, 1868, p. 237.

³ Laing's Knox, vol. iv., pp. 165, 166.

⁴ Ibid. p. 157.

⁵ Scottish Psalter, notes, p. 63, and Diss. iii., p. 25.

Here is the impartial and cautiously stated opinion of Livingston:—

“There seems to be good ground for the conclusion that they [i.e., the spiritual songs appended to the Psalms] were used only for private purposes. (1.) In the directions for public worship, baptism, marriage, &c., which precede the Psalter, the singing of Psalms is repeatedly prescribed, but in no instance is the existence of any other composition for such purpose hinted at. (2.) Amongst all the examples of congregational singing mentioned by the historian Calderwood, and others, no case of hymn singing appears to occur. (3.) There is reason to think that three of these pieces, at all events, were intended chiefly for the instruction of the young. The following is found in Calderwood (1608), as part of a group of overtures prepared for the General Assembly of the Church:—‘That it be of new enacted, that all ministers examine young children of the age of six yeeres, and try that they have the Lord’s Prayer, and Articles of Belief, with the Commandements. In the which their parents shall be holdin to instruct them before the said yeeres, together with some short forme of grace before and after meate, as also some short morning and evening prayer.’ The phrase, ‘of new,’ implies the existence of an early enactment, and the title, ‘Articles of Belief,’ being that of one of the spiritual songs, renders it probable, though it may not be altogether certain, that the reference is to the documents in the versified form. (4.) The editions of Smyth, 1599, and Hart, 1611, small, both intended evidently for the common people, have no hymns; but they could not thus be dispensed with if in general use. Even the larger edition of 1611 has only three, and the Song of Moses is introduced in 1615 in such terms as to indicate that publishers considered themselves warranted to exercise some amount of discretion in these matters, notwithstanding the warning afforded by the case of Bassandyne.

“It must be remembered that singing of compositions relating to religion—some more strictly devotional and doctrinal, others levelled at the abuses of Popery—was a conspicuous feature in the Reformation movement. But the distinction between use in worship and private ends seems to have been generally recognised. Even in Germany, where hymns abounded, only a limited selection was admitted into the books prepared for the Church. The ‘Godly Ballates’ may be regarded as including specimens of both sorts of material. This distinction being understood, it is not surprising that a few things intended for private instruction and edification should, for convenience sake, be appended to the Psalter.”¹

Dr. Bonar, in short, is singularly illogical in holding that because certain songs or hymns were published with various editions of the *Book of Common Order*, therefore “there were hymns in the Church of Scotland.” He might as well insist that the Alphabet and Multiplication Table are in the Church of Scotland now, because they have so long been printed with the Shorter Catechism!

In the next paper the “Gude and Godlie Ballates,” and also the “Conclusions” will be discussed.

D. H. F.

OUR FOREIGN MISSION.

THE subjoined letter from Mr. Anderson will be read with interest, and cannot fail to awaken deep concern for the people amongst whom our Missionaries carry on their labours. With the commencement of another year, we would earnestly ask all the members and adherents of our Congregations to remember in prayer our two brethren and their assistants, who are seeking the advancement of Christ’s Kingdom in Central India. The prayers of the church at home may be answered in the conversion of some in that distant land. And such an exercise, while dutiful and profitable to those who engage in it,

¹ The Scottish Psalter, Diss. i. p. 4.

strangers, and among others Calvin for some time found shelter there. This conduct brought down on the duchess the wrath of Rome, the confessor of her family, her connections in France, and even that of her own husband. The duchess was not to be moved. She valued the cause of Christ more highly than any earthly crown, or even life, and she was enabled to stand by it to the end.

At that time a young girl, Olympia Morata, was being educated at Ferrara. At the age of six, she gave evidence of extraordinary powers in acquiring languages, and in other branches of learning. At thirteen, she was selected by the duchess as companion and co-pupil to her eldest daughter, Anne, who became duchess of Guise. Olympia had been carefully trained in Bible principles by her father, and although exposed to many temptations at court, she was sustained and guided by the Spirit of all grace in the paths of virtue. In learning, she had no equal. Her knowledge of Latin and Greek were marvellous. She wrote poetry and prose freely in these languages, and took part in academical discussions in them, with the most learned men of the time. Her companion, Anne, was removed to France, but carried with her some of the good seed; and Olympia was the means of sowing it in the hearts of others. In our pages for January 1872, we gave an account of this remarkable young woman, and to which we would refer any who may feel an interest in it. Here we can only add that she had to flee from Ferrara to escape persecution, and at the age of thirty, though she died in bed, in reality earned the martyr's crown.

Ferrara stands about a couple of miles from the Este railway station. With much regret we could not break our journey to visit it; we have done the next best thing in our power, by marking it as one of the brightest spots in Italy.

THE HYMNOLOGY OF THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

II.

ACCORDING to Bishop Guthry, when Laud came to Scotland, with Charles the First, in 1633, he taxed the Scottish bishops with their lack of a liturgy, to which the old bishops replied: "That in King James's time there had been a motion made for it, but that the presenting thereof was deferred, in regard the articles of Perth, then introduced, proved so unwelcome to the people, that they thought it not fit nor safe at that time to venture upon any farther innovations, and they were not yet without some fear, that if it should be gone about, the consequence thereof might be very sad."¹ Maxwell,

¹ Guthry's *Memoirs*, 1748, p. 18.

Sydeserfe, and others, however, thought there was no danger in getting a liturgy, and the result is well known. The draft liturgy which was completed in the time of King James is preserved in the British Museum, and was printed by Dr. Sprott in 1871. In its *Order for Evening Prayer*, it provides that "the chaptors of the Old and New Testaments set doune in the table shalbe reade, and after ye first chaptour, the song called (Magnificat) and after the second, the song of Simeon called (Nunc dimittis) is to be sung."¹ And, as might have been expected, *The Booke of Common Prayer for the use of the Church of Scotland*, printed in 1637, is not behind it; for it orders that at morning prayer, "at the end of the *Venite*, so also at the end of every Psalme throughout the yeare, and likewise in the end of *Benedictus*, *Magnificat*, and *Nunc dimittis*, shall bee repeated, *Glory be to the Father, and to the Sonne: and to the Holy Ghost*. And the people shall answer, *As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen*. Every one standing up at the same." And, "after the first lesson, shall be said or sung *Te Deum laudamus* in English, daily throughout the whole year," or the 23rd Psalm. The Creed also was to be "said or sung," and so were anthems on easter-day, and the *Gloria in excelsis* was set down for the Communion. The difference between these two liturgies and the *Book of Common Order* is very marked in this respect, as well as in others. Of course, it would never have done for Dr. Bonar to produce such witnesses, though, as will be seen from the following quotation, he is content with very poor proofs.

"The great Glasgow Assembly of 1638, which set itself to overturn all that was obnoxious and evil in the Church, did not touch the eleven hymns. It left them where they were. Alexander Henderson was not the man to pass over a blemish or a sin. It is clear that he and all his noble coadjutors had no objection to their hymnal additions.

"Let us take the tunes that the people know and fit the sacred words to them, until we get more elevated music. Let us lose no time in putting 'Psalms and hymns and spiritual songs' into our people's lips; and by doing so in connection with the well-known melody we shall not only imprint the new doctrine indelibly, but we shall dissociate the old sentiments from the music and neutralise the evil influence which the profane song has so long exercised.

"So reasoned the reformers; not in one land, but in all lands; Calvin, in Switzerland; Coverdale, in England; Luther, in Germany; and Knox, in Scotland. The occasional incongruity between the words and the music was, after all, an inconsiderable matter, provided the new truths, now struggling not only for liberty but for existence, could be made to permeate the nation. These ancient tunes, ready-made, were at hand. The nations took them up and sang them to holy words. They could not afford to wait till new ones were produced; and besides, many of these profane pieces were the very gems of melody. Ought they to be set wholly aside, and left in degraded association with war and wine and lust, or at the best with mere earthly love? The priesthood had nothing to offer in the shape of counteracting hymns or melodies."

¹ Scottish Liturgies of the Reign of James VI. p. 31.

² Dr. Bonar must have overlooked the following:—"An old MS. music book, still preserved in the British Museum, and bearing the date 1530, discloses the fact, that the Roman Catholics in Britain, as well as in Germany, had not disdained to spiritualise popular songs, and had preceded Wedderburn in thus treating the plaintive old ballad, 'My love morneth for me.'" The Wedderburns and their Work, 1867, preface, p. v.

"In the 'Prologue' to the 'gude and godly ballads,' sent forth about this time when the Reformation was gathering strength in Scotland, there is the following allusion to the sacred songs which were sung by the people. 'Pavle writand to the Coloss. in his thrid Chap. sayis, "Let the word of God dwell in zow plenteouslie in all wisdome; teiching and exhorting zour awin selfis with Psalmes, & Hymnis, and Spiritual sangis, quhilkis¹ haue lufe to God, & fauouris his word." We haue heir ane plane Text, that the word of God incressis plenteouslie in vs, be singing of the Psalmes, and Spiritual sangis, and that speciallie amang zounge personis, and sic as ar not exercisit in the Scriptures: for thay wil soner consaue the trew word, nor quhen² thay heir it sung in Latine, the quhilks thay wait³ not what it is. Bot quhen thay heir it sung in their vulgar tounge, or singis it thame selfis, with sweit melodie, then sal thay lufe thay Lord God, with hart and minde, and cause them to put away baudrie & vnclene sangis. Pray God. Amen.'"

"We do not know which of our Reformers penned the above brief but vigorous prologue. Whoever he was he understood his mission and appreciated the power of these songs which he was sending abroad over Scotland. He recognised the full breadth of the Apostle's exhortation in the passage on which he found his sentences. These Psalmes and hymns and spiritual songs he publishes as the threefold form of the message which he was proclaiming to his countrymen; not David's hymns merely, nor certain hymns of praise, but songs as well; embodying Divine truth and condemning error in such a way as would reach the heart of peer or peasant. The verse is rough, the metre unmusical, the words homely; but the songs are full of power; written by one in earnest, and sent out by one who loved the truth of God. These 'Psalmes and Hymns and Spiritual songs' are not the same as those afterwards embodied in the Scottish Psalter. They were the first efforts of our Reformers to use verse and music for the promotion of the Gospel; and were, in the course of a few years, superseded by other hymns somewhat less rude and peculiar. But not the less do they show the mind of our early Scotch Reformers as to the influence of sacred song.

"After the Westminster Assembly had done its work, our General Assembly took up the subject of hymns, and several Acts of Assembly stand on record as to this. The days of the Commonwealth and then of the persecution followed, arresting all work; but when the Assembly again met it betook itself to the improvement of Psalmody by the addition of hymns."

After what has already been said, there is no need of dwelling on the argument that, because the Assembly of 1638 did not condemn the spiritual songs, therefore Henderson and all his noble coadjutors approved of them. And as for the statement that, "after the Westminster Assembly had done its work, our General Assembly took up the subject of hymns, and several Acts of Assembly stand on record as to this," it goes for nothing, unless it can be shown that the General Assembly *intended* to sanction *hymns* for God's worship; but this Dr. Bonar has not even attempted to prove. No doubt the Minutes of the Commission of the Assembly, as well as the printed Acts of the General Assembly itself, from 1647 to 1650, refer to the Paraphrasing of the Scriptural Songs by Zachary Boyd, David Leitch, and Robert Lowrie;⁴ yet, as Livingston has said, "it may still have been the understanding that these songs, though they were considered susceptible of improvement, were to be used for private purposes."⁵ The Commission of Assembly, on the 23rd of November, 1649, authorised the present version of the Psalms "to be the only paraphrase of the Psalmes of David to be sung in the Kirk of Scotland;" and discharged "the old paraphrase, and any other than this new

¹ Quhilkis, i.e., which.

² Nor quhen, i.e., than when.

³ Wait, i.e., wot.

⁴ As there are several typical errors in Dr. Bonar's quotation of the "Prologue," the above is given from Laing's Reprint of "The Gude and Godlie Ballates."

⁵ Baillie's Letters and Journals, Laing's Ed., vol. iii. pp. 544-555.

⁶ Scottish Psalter, Diss. i. p. 4.

paraphrase, to be made use of in any congregation or family after the first day of Maij in the year 1650.”¹ Regarding it, David Laing has said :—“To a modern critic it will no doubt appear destitute of poetical sentiment or felicity of expression. Fidelity, however, was the great object aimed at ; and mere elegance was sacrificed to a close adherence to the original. In accomplishing this object, frequent use was made of former translations.”² Dr. Sprott holds that “all the hymns in the old Psalter appear to be even yet of ‘public authority’ in the Church. . . . The hymns were not superseded with the Psalms.”³ But according to Dr. Bonar’s theory, that because these songs were issued with the old Psalms, they were authorised with them,—then they must have been abolished with them too. And the fact remains that no hymns, songs, or conclusions were appended to the present version. Dr. Sprott, though a great authority with many, is not always reliable ; for example, in his *Introduction to the Book of Common Order*, he simply says : “The Psalter consisted of the 150 Psalms, with hymns and conclusions—renderings of Gloria Patri to suit the great variety of metres into which the Psalms were translated.”⁴ Would it not be naturally inferred from such a statement that the various editions, late and early, all contained hymns and conclusions ? And yet that is not the fact ! In the same way, Dr. MacGregor, of St. Cuthbert’s, has said : “That for the first hundred years of its existence the Reformed Church of Scotland had a richer and more varied service than it has ever had since. It had . . . its service of praise with hymns as well as Psalms.”⁵

In 1669, Gilbert Burnet published, anonymously, a small volume of dialogues, from which it appears that the Presbyterians of these days at least, would not use human-hymns in God’s worship. He makes his Conformist say :—“I could never comprehend why you will allow the Spirit to be restrained in praising, as to words, and not in praying, since both are duties equally spiritual.” And to this he gives us the Non-conformist’s answer :—“Because the Psalms are a collection of praises dictated by the Spirit of God.” In such a work, the Conformist was of course allowed to vanquish his opponent, the reply in which he does so being filled with the same sort of arguments as hymn-singers still urge, and with triumph he exclaims :—“What kind of reason can you have, who plead so much for a liberty in prayer, and yet allow none in making of hymns ?”⁶ But the Nonconformist was not permitted to be silenced thus ; for M’Ward, who was then in exile, wrote a lengthened reply, in which Gilbert’s objections to the Psalms, and pleas for hymns are thoroughly refuted. From some of his expressions it may be inferred, that personally he was not opposed to the use of the other songs of Scripture, though they were not used by the Presbyterians. A single sentence will at

¹ Baillie’s Letters, vol. iii. p. 548.

² The Book of Common Order, 1868, p. 250.

³ St. Giles’ Lectures, first series, p. 371.

⁴ A Modest and Free Conference betwixt a Conformist and a Nonconformist, 1669, pp. 72, 73.

⁵ Ibid, p. 549.

⁶ Ibid, p. lx.

once show his own opinion regarding "human-odes," and how he defends the practice of his beloved church. "Seing the Lord hath provided us with a plentiful variety of Psalmes and Hymnes; and besides, hath allowed us as full a liberty of praising in prose, as of prayer. I think it doth fully remove all that is here by you objected, and abundantly warrant us, both to abide content with God's institutions, and refuse a superfluous mixture of humane odes with these Divine Psalmes, which He hath appointed for the matter of our more solemne praises."¹ Burnet published a Vindication in 1673, in which he returns to the Doxology—for, as will yet be seen, it was also dealt with in this discussion—but he says no more about the hymns.

Dr. Bonar would like his readers to believe that immediately "after the Westminster Assembly had done its work, our General Assembly took up the subject of hymns," and that their work was only arrested by "the days of the Commonwealth, and then of the persecution," for "when the Assembly again met it betook itself to the improvement of Psalmody by the addition of hymns." Put, though the persecution was ended in 1688, the General Assembly did not move in the matter until 1705, and then, as in 1647, it was Scripture-songs not human-hymns which were contemplated.² The renderings of these Scripture-songs, which the Assembly, in 1706, recommended the Presbyteries "to endeavour to promote the use of . . . in private families . . . according to the recommendation of the late Assembly," are said to have been by Patrick Sympson of Renfrew.³ And Hew Scott gives as the name of the book so recommended—*Spiritual Songs, or Holy Poems, a Garden of True Delight, in six books*, Edinburgh, 1685-1686, 12mo.⁴ This little volume has become so rare that at the sale of Laing's Library a copy realised £4 16s. Whether Pardovan and Scott are right or not as to the versifier, it is certain that the Assembly was anxious that the songs should be diligently compared with the original text, and further amended, "keeping always to the original text," before authorising them for "the public use of the Church."⁵ But little came out of the movement at that time, for it seems to have slumbered from 1708, when the commission was empowered to emit them after examination,⁶ until 1741, when an overture was referred to the Commission "about turning some passages of the Old and New Testament into metre, in order to be used in churches as well as in families."⁷ According to David Laing, "in 1745 a collection of such paraphrases was published, and being remitted by the Assembly to the several Presbyteries, it came to be used in churches in public worship. The Assembly in 1775 appointed a committee to revise that collection; and it was again published, with considerable alterations and additions, and retransmitted for the consideration of Presbyteries, 1st June 1781; and *meanwhile* it was

¹ The True Nonconformist, 1671, p. 278.

² Acts of the General Assembly, Church Law Society, ed. p. 392.

³ Pardovan's Collections, book 2, title 1, par. 27.

⁴ Scott's Fasti, vol. ii. p. 234.

⁵ Acts of Assembly, pp. 393, 419, 430.

⁶ Ibid. p. 430.

⁷ Morren's Annals of the General Assembly, vol. i. p. 26.

allowed 'to be used in public worship, in congregations where the minister finds it for edification.'"¹ This seems to be all the sanction which the present collection of paraphrases can boast of; and in one respect, at least, the authority of the Free Church Hymn-book is somewhat similar; but, to borrow the closing words of Dr. Bonar, "this belongs to another chapter of Scottish Church History."

Dr. Bonar's conjectural reasons why *The Gude and Godlie Ballates* were set to so-called secular tunes, are very likely correct; but in the absence of all proof, he should not have said so decidedly that Knox so reasoned in Scotland. With candour, he acknowledges his ignorance respecting the authorship of the Prologue; and he might likewise have confessed that he did not know when it was written, instead of ascribing it to the time "when the Reformation was gathering strength in Scotland." The oldest known copy was "Imprentit at Edinburgh," in 1578, "with augmentation of sindrie gude and godlie Ballatis not contenit in the first editioun," but when that first edition was published is still unknown,² and, for aught that Dr. Bonar knows, it may not have had that Prologue at all. An imperfect copy, which is believed to have been printed in or about 1567, has been lately described in the *North British Advertiser and Ladies' Journal*. It, however, has neither title-page nor Prologue; but it contains a song of five stanzas, entitled *Welcum Fortoun*, which certainly does not deserve the severe epithet bestowed by the General Assembly, in 1568, on the song of the same name, which Bassandyne imprudently printed with the Psalm Book, and it may be quite different, or merely a part of it. Many of Wedderburn's songs are translations of German hymns; but very little is known of those "prophane sangis" on which he moulded some of his other "godlie sangis." As this *Welcum Fortoun* bears an unmistakable resemblance to his *Welcum Lord Christ*, it is extremely likely that it may have served as his model. The first verse of each is subjoined:—

"Welcum Fortoun, welcum againe,
The day and hour I may weill blis,
Thou hes exilit all my paine,
Quhilk to my hart grait plesour is."

"Welcum, Lord Christ, welcum againe,
My joy, my comfort, and my blis,
That culd me saue from hellis paine:
Bot onlie thou, nane was, nor is."

That this imperfect volume is not the book condemned by the Assembly is evident; because, although the *Gude and Godlie Ballates* were known as *Dundee Psalms* and *Wedderburn's Psalms*, they were never dignified as *The Psalm Book*. That name was reserved for the Psalter proper, which was completed in 1564, and generally bound up with the *Book of Common Order*, and which is commonly known now as *Knox's Psalter*. Dalzell has said that several of Wedderburn's Psalms appear in *Knox's Liturgy*,³ but this is a mistake, for, though he paraphrased more than a score, not one of these was admitted to *Knox's Psalter*. The only one in which a resemblance can be traced is the 83rd; and the version of it in the Psalm Book is attributed to Pont,

¹ Baillie's Letters, vol. iii. p. 555.

² Preface to Laing's Reprint of the *Gude and Godlie Ballates*.

³ Scottish Poems of the Sixteenth Century, 1801, p. 37.

though it appears anonymously in Bannatyne's MS.¹ Neither were any of Wedderburn's songs ever adopted, although he has renderings of the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, Nunc Dimittis and Magnificat. But the Lamentation, "O Lord, in Thee is all my trust," which appears in the 1578 edition of the *Godlie Ballates*, immediately after the almanack, and which was omitted in the later editions, is in nearly all the editions of the Psalm Book from 1575 to 1644. Whittingham is thought, however, to have been its author.

The earliest reference to the *Gude and Godlie Ballates* seems to be that of James Melville, in 1570, who mentions "a post that frequented Edinbruche and brought ham Psalme buikes and ballates," and, who, he says, first showed him "Wedderburn's Songs."² Hill Burton is no doubt right in saying, that the reason why old copies of the book are so extremely rare is, "not because few copies were printed, but, because the book was so popular and so extensively used that the copies of it were worn out."³ For Robert Smyth, who printed an edition in 1600, had on hand, when he died three years later, 1034 copies.⁴ Knox relates that George Wishart before retiring to rest at Ormiston that night he was arrested—that is the night preceding the 16th of January, 1546—said, "'Will we sing a Psalme?' And so he appointed the 51st Psalme, which was put in Scotishe meter, and begane thus:—

"Have mercy on me now, good Lord,
After Thy great mercy, &c."⁵

These are the first two lines of the second verse of the 51st Psalm, as given in the *Gude and Godlie Ballates*, and therefore some of the Psalms were probably printed by that time. And this does not seem unlikely for, in 1543, "were sett furth workes in our language, beside those which were brought frome England, wherin the pride, craft, tyrannie, and abuses of the Roman Antichrist were disclosed."⁶ Dr. Mitchell expresses the opinion that "the Wedderburns' collection of hymns and songs, in its most rudimentary form, must have been published before John [Wedderburn] was obliged to leave his native country in 1546. This is the conclusion," he goes on to say, "arrived at by Drs. M'Crie and Lorimer, two of the most cautious and accurate of our ecclesiastical historians; and Lord Hailes and others so far concur with them as to admit that it must be considered as one, at least, of the collections prohibited by the Canon of the Scottish ecclesiastical Council of 1549."⁷ Dr. Bonar is quite entitled, therefore, to say that these Psalms and hymns and spiritual songs "were the first efforts of our Reformers to use verse and music for the promotion of the Gospel;" but, he is altogether inexcusable in adding

¹ *Gude and Godlie Ballates*, 1868, p. 239.

² *Ibid*, p. 217.

³ *Melville's Diary*, Wod. Soc. pp. 22, 23.

⁴ *Hist. of Scotland*, 1876, vol. iv. p. 352.

⁵ *Bannatyne Miscellany*, vol. ii. p. 234. In Livingston's *Psalter*, Diss. ii. p. 9, the number is given as 1234, which is evidently the result of a typical error.

⁶ *Laing's Knox*, vol. i. p. 139.

⁷ *Calderwood's History*, vol. i. p. 158.

⁸ *The Wedderburns and their Work*, pp. iii. iv. 13, 21.

that they "were in the course of a few years superseded by other hymns somewhat less rude and peculiar;" for an edition was published in 1600, and another in 1621.¹ As Dr. Mitchell has said, "nor did the range of their circulation diminish after the triumph of the reformed faith had been secured, but for considerably more than half a century they continued to be treasured in the hearts of the people and *sung in their households*."² This leads to the inquiry—In what relation did the *Gude and Godlie Ballates* stand to the Church of Scotland? To this question David Laing's answer is brief and pointed:—"It neither was authorised by the General Assembly, nor was it known to have ever been employed in the public services of the Church."³ The object which the book was intended to serve is indicated on the title-page. "Ane Compendious Buik of godlie Psalmes and spirituall Sangis collectit furthe of sindrie partis of the Scripture, with diueris vtheris Ballattis changeit out of prophane sangis in godlie sangis, for auoyding of sin and harlatrie." A similar purpose was more fully stated by Alexander Hume of Logie, who, in 1599, published a volume of *Hymnes or Sacred Songs, wherein the right vse of Poesie may be espied*, with Dr. Bonar's favourite verse on the title-page:—"But be full filled with the Spirit, speaking vnto yourselues in Psalmes, and Hymnes and spirituall songs, singing and making melodie to the Lord in your hearta." In treating of this period, Dr. McCrie has said:—"Among those who devoted themselves to sacred poetry, Alexander Hume possesses the greatest merit."⁴ Unfortunately his work has become excessively rare, but it has been re-printed by the Bannatyne Club. In his prefatory epistle "to the Scottish youth," Hume thus explains his object:—

"In princes courts, in the houses of greate men, and at the assemblies of yong gentlemen and yong damesels, the chiefe pastime is, to sing prophane sonnets, and vaine ballats of loue, or to rehearse some fabulos faits of Palmerine, Amadis, or other such like raueries; & such as ather haue the art or vaine poetike, of force they must shew themselves cunning followers of the dissolute ethnike⁵ poets, both in phrase and substance, or else they shall be had in no reputation. Alas for pittie! Is this the right vse of a Christian's talent, to incense the burning lustes of licentious persons by such euill examples and allurements? . . . Why shuld thou not then (aspiring youth) rather bestowe thy gude gifts to the right vse, to wit, to the glory of God, and to the weil of thy brethren? which thow sall do when, by thy poesie or prose, thow declares the mercie, the iustice, the power, the providence, the wisdom, the holines, the gudeness, or wondrous works of thy God vnto the world: whereof thow may haue so large a field in the Scriptures, that al thy pithie words, thy figures of rhetoricke, thy subtille argumentes, thy skill in physicke, metaphysicke, mathematicke, or morall philosophie, shal not be sufficient to expres the dignitie thereof. Would thou intreat of prodigious miracles? luke the bookes of Genesis and Exod., or the workes of our Sauour, of the prophets and apostles. Would thow haue a subiect of valiant deids of armes? read the buikes of Iosua and the Iudges, and of the kings of Israel & Iudah. Wald thou haue store of wise sentences? read the Prouerbes and Ecclesiastes. Walde thou haue a subiect of loue? looke the Song of Songs, of the loue betuixt Christ and His kirk.⁶ Would thow reioyce or lament,

¹ *Gude and Godlie Ballates*, 1868, pp. 213, 215.

² *The Wedderburns and their Work*, p. 5.

³ *Gude and Godlie Ballates*, preface, p. xliii.

⁴ *Life of Melville*, 1824, vol. ii. p. 437.

⁵ Heathen.

⁶ It was probably a mis-reading of this sentence which led Campbell to write:—"Hume had imbibed so far the spirit of his times, as to publish an exhortation to the youth of Scotland . . . to read no other books on the subject of love than the Song of Solomon." *British Poets*, 1819, vol. ii., p. 239.

praise or dispraise, comfort or threaten, pray or use imprecation? imitat the ald Hebrew David in his Psalmes, as a paterne of all heavenly poesie. In a word, the high & holy mysteries, & felicitie of the life to come, contained in the Auld & New Testament, may be a more noble and worthie subiect, wherevpon the hole cunning and eloquence of mans loftie spirite should be employed, nor vpon these trifles & sensuall villanies. . . . Heirefore, I haue heere set downe before thee, a few spirituall songs, begun in my youth, and prosecuted in my wraslings with the world, and the flesh. . . . Thus much haue I written in rude Scottish and hask verses, to prouoke the more skilfull in that art to flee higher, and to encourage the meaner sort to follow. To the effect, that the spirits of men in all their actions may be applyed to the right end, euen to glorifie God."

Hume was a musician as well as a poet, and the three last verses of his Recantation show still further the object of his art:—

- " Lift vp mine hart, my lips disclose,
My tendered tung vntie,
Then sall my singing saull reioyce,
And flee aboue the skie:
Blis thou my work, be my support,
My teacher, and my guyde,
Then sall my mouth thy praise report
Through all the world so wide.
- " Then sall my sacred pen delite,
Induring all my dayes,
Thy wondrous works in verse to write,
Fieue hundred diuers waies;
Euen on my iolie lute, by night,
And trimling trible string,
I sall with all my minde and might
Thy glorie gladlie sing.
- " Then they that sall thy puissance heir,
And tender clemencie,
Sall moued be with luife and feare
To praise and worship thee:
Zee when my spirit is past away,
Among the godlie goutes,
Yet sall the reader sigh and say,
Blist be the Lord of hostes."¹

The references to his "jolly lute," and "trimling trible string," are not mere figures of speech, for in his "latter will" he mentions his "luit" and his "other musical instrument."² With these, no doubt, he oft had cheered his weary hours, and yet, like the hymns and sacred songs he loved so well to pen, they were kept in their own place. For not long before he died, he addressed *Ane afold Admonitioun to the Ministerie of Scotland*, in which he says:—"Althoght idoles be demolysched, and the Pope's authoritie be rejected in the realm of England; yit the hie places are not put away, that is, the preheminance of byschopes, their surplus, *their organes*, their lightis, their observing of feistis, their fasting in the tyme of Lent, &c. whiche resemble the cicatrices of ane evill-cured wound."³

But, to return to the *Gude and Godlie Ballates*, Dr. M'Crie has said that:—"The title sufficiently indicates their nature and design. The air, the measure, the initial line, or the chorus of the ballads most commonly sung by the people at that time, were transferred to hymns

¹ Hume's Hymns and Sacred Songs, Ban. Club ed., pp. 5, 6.

² Scott's Fasti, vol. ii, p. 735.

³ Hume's Admonitioun, appended to his Hymns and Sacred Songs, p. 13.

of devotion. Unnatural, indelicate, and gross as this association appears to us, these spiritual songs edified multitudes in that age.¹ Possibly there may have been differences of opinion then, as well as now, as to the advisability and results of such a method. Here for example is Hill Burton's opinion to contrast with M'Crie's :—" We cannot speak with precision from the experience of the present day on the influence that certain agencies may have had three hundred years ago, but surely we may believe that religion lost more than it gained by this operation."² Nevertheless, as Dr. Mitchell has said, "a great moral and religious triumph was secured," when Wedderburn's ballads superseded those which had gone before; the change was, "almost as from darkness to light, from filth and ribaldry to comparative modesty, refinement, and earnest religious principle." "True there are stanzas in them, just as there are sentences in Knox's history, which betray the coarseness of the olden time," but "the authors of these ballads wrote in the very crisis of a life and death struggle between truth and error, between purity and debauchery, to support and cheer those who were contending even unto bonds, imprisonment, and death, for the simplicity and purity of the Gospel."³ And, as Dr. Lorimer has said, "Many of them are marked by extraordinary power of satire; and many more, by fulness of evangelical doctrine, and fervour of religious feeling."⁴ Here is one satirical specimen.

"Gie God was maid of bittis of breid,
Eit ze nocht ouklike sax or seuin,
As it had bene ane mortall feid,
Quhill ze had almaist heryit heuin :
Als mony Deuillis ze man deuoir,
Quhill Hell grow les.
Or doutles we dar nocht restoir
Zow to your Mes."⁵

"If God was made of bits of bread,
Eat ye not weekly six or seven,
As it had been a mortal feud,
Till ye had almost harried heaven,
As many Devils ye must devour,
Till Hell grow less.
Or doubtless we dare not restore
You to your mass."

Perhaps the following is the strangest example of how a profane song was turned into a spiritual one.

"Johne, cum kis me now,
Johne, cum kis me now;
Johne, cum kis me by and by
And mak no moir adow,
The Lord thy God I am,
That Johne dois thé call;
Johne representit man,
Be grace celestially.

¹ Life of Knox, 1861, p. 399.

² History of Scotland, 1876, vol. iv. p. 351.

³ The Wedderburns and their work, p. 38.

⁴ The Scottish Reformation, 1860, p. 174.

⁵ Page 184.—Those who are acquainted with the old spelling, will understand this.

"My Prophetis call, my preicheouris cry,
 Johne, cum kis me now,
 Johne, cum kis me by and by,
 And mak no moir adow.
 Ane Spreit I am incorporate,
 Na mortall eye can me se,
 Zit my word dois intimate,
 Johne, how thou must kis me."¹

The Pope is described as a "pagane full of pryde," and a "cursit fox," and his pardons as "remissioun of sinnis in auld scheip skinnis,"² while the priests and preachers are called "cankerit carriounis" and "rottin stakis," "stangand edderis" and "poysound snakis."³ No doubt there are hymns and hymns, and although some of these old ballads lack refinement, there is a homely vigour and pathos in them which contrasts strongly with the "feckless" trash so popular in the present day. A hymn-singing friend thus writes:—"I abhor the stuff we often have to sing, so weakly sentimental, a kind of religious valentine poesy; the reading of it is not good, but to sing it deliberately word for word!"

Notwithstanding the merits—and they are many—of the *Buik of Gude and Godlie Ballates* as a whole, it contains some things which would have rendered it impossible for the Church of Scotland to sanction it. One hymn or song bears the title:—"Exampillis takin out of the Bybill;" yet one of the examples, that of Judith and Holofernes, is taken from the Apocrypha.⁴ But in the 18th article of the *Confession of Faith*, which was drawn up in 1560, the "written word of God" is said to be "the books of the Old and New Testaments," "these books we mean, which of the ancients have been reputed canonical." Besides four of the pieces which may fitly be described as Christmas songs or carols,⁵ another has this heading:—"Ane Ballat of the Epistill on Christinmes Euin."⁶ Now, in the very first chapter of the *First Book of Discipline*, which was prepared in 1560, the observance of Christmas is expressly mentioned as one of the things which ought "utterly to be abolished from the realme." And Calderwood has shown that from the beginning of the Reformation to 1618, the Kirk of Scotland in divers ways condemned the observance of all holy-days except the Lord's day.⁷

Any one looking over the volume will at once see that much of it, besides the "graces to be sung, or said, befor or efter meit," must have been intended for private purposes. For example, it may be safely affirmed that, despite the curse which enforced celibacy had proved, no Protestant minister would have asked his flock to sing the song, beginning:—

"God send euerie Preist ane wyfe,
 And euerie Nunne ane man."⁸

¹ Pages 138, 140.

² Pages 178, 153.

³ Pages 191, 192.

⁴ Pages 43, 45, 61, 66.

⁵ Page 163.

⁶ Page 63.

⁷ Perth Assembly, 1619, pp. 63, 64.

⁸ Page 165.—Those who wish to know more about *The Gude and Godlie Ballates* should consult Laing's reprint, with its admirable preface and notes, and also Dr. Mitchell's valuable little monograph on *The Wedderburns and their Work*.

That the Reformation was greatly helped by the influence of poetry is quite certain;¹ and therefore the mere fact, that, notwithstanding this, our Reformers did not sanction any human hymns, ballads, or Scripture songs other than the Psalms, surely shows that they did not approve of uninspired productions being used in God's worship.

The remarks on the "Conclusions" must be held over till the next number.

D. H. F.

OUR FOREIGN MISSION.

THE following paper, descriptive of village preaching, has just been received from Mr. White for publication. It is written in a graphic style, and will be read with much interest both by old and young. Mr. White anew asks the sympathy and prayers of our people on behalf of the Missionaries, that the Lord may sustain them and make them successful. In his letter, dated the 31st December, Mr. White says: "The school is now closed for the holidays, and we are very busy preaching in the different bazaars and villages around. Sometimes we preach in three different places in one day. Four students from our school appeared at the Entrance Examination. They think they have done well; but the results are not yet known." Three of the boys attending our school have been successful in passing the Middle School Examination, and two of them have been awarded scholarships. Some of the others presented failed in only one subject.

From recent letters received from India, it is evident that both Mr. Anderson and Mr. White are energetically employed in the important work to which they have been appointed, and, although they meet with much to discourage them, we may confidently anticipate that their labours in preaching and teaching will not be in vain in the Lord.

The concluding Missionary Meetings designed for this season have been held at Kilwinning and Perth, and like the others have been most successful. A brief notice of these meetings appears in another part of the *Magazine*.

JOTTINGS FROM SEONI.

BAZAAR PREACHING.

Early on the morning of the 9th November we set out for Korni, a large and rather important village situated a little to the east of the Nagpore high road, at a distance of about 21 miles from Seoni. The day was calm and clear, not the smallest cloud visible, not a breath of air—an agreeable change from the dark, tempestuous, rainy weather which we had experienced during the dreary months of the monsoon. The road was good, our bullocks brisk, and our chariot rolled along rapidly, so we soon left Seoni far behind. The first 14 miles of our journey lay through an open and partly cultivated country—if the

¹ See Row's *History*, Wod. Soc. pp. 6-8; and M'Crie's *Life of Knox*, note K.

n much. He requires it of the youngest of us. On catching the sight of the Mamelukes drawn up in line of battle, on the banks of the Nile, in view of the Pyramids, Bonaparte riding before the ranks, cried, "Soldiers! from the summit of yonder Pyramids forty generations are watching you. Forty generations look down upon you." But, from a greater and an everlasting height, God is now as if calling upon the young to be faithful in the service of Christ, "thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life."

THE HYMNOLOGY OF THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

III.

ALTHOUGH it is proverbially safe to have two strings to a bow, it can be good policy to support a proposition by two arguments which mutually destructive. Yet, while Dr. Bonar's paper proceeds on the assumption that the attitude of the Church of Scotland towards church-hymns was unaltered, from the beginning of the Reformation after the Revolution at least; he alludes, in a foot-note, to the diversities which arose about Psalmody, and the meaning put upon the words, "Psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs," after the Westminster Assembly, and says:

English Puritanism was working strongly, and setting aside or reversing many both ecclesiastical and theological, which the Reformation divines maintained. He has told much upon Scotland and her church usages. The latter half of the eighteenth century was in many more respects than is generally thought a new theological and ecclesiastical era. Several of the things which we now call innovations are returnings to the Reformation platform. The real 'innovations' date a middle of the seventeenth century."

to harmonise arguments so discordant would be too difficult a task for their author. No doubt he might have safely asserted that conclusions or doxologies were cast off through Puritanical influence; but he knew too well that there is no proof of their having been used in Knox's time, nor till long afterwards, and therefore he has said cautiously says:—

more, towards the end of the sixteenth century certain 'conclusions,' as they were called, were introduced in metre to be sung with each Psalm, and this continued at the Westminster Assembly. Here is one of them:—

"O God that art the strength and rock,
Of all that trust in Thee;
Save and defend Thy chosen flock
That now in danger be."

Gloria Patri was also in common use; and our readers may perhaps regret the long defence which Baillie makes of it, and the somewhat impatient which he treats the objectors."

At the end of the imperfect copy of the *Godlie Ballates*, printed in 1567, there are said to be several doxologies; but the first of the Psalm Book, so far as known, which contains a doxology printed by Bassandyne in 1575, and it only has one for the Psalm, and that one is not placed immediately after the Psalm, but at the very end of the book. In Vautrolier's edition of

that conclusion is appended to the Psalm "in the same type as if a part thereof."¹ No advance beyond this seems to have been made until 1595, when Henrie Charteris printed a Psalm Book at Edinburgh, containing more than thirty "conclusions," one adapted to each form of metre; "the intention being that each Psalm should be terminated by one."² Livingston quotes them all in full in his appendix. They disappear from the editions of 1611 and 1615, but re-appear in the edition of 1633, and those suited for common metre are in the edition of 1635.³ Few people will be inclined to lay much stress on the solitary doxology of 1575 and 1587; and as little can really be laid on the multifarious collection of 1595, for various reasons. The printers of those days, as has been already shown, took a good deal upon them; and Charteris seems in this edition to have eclipsed them all. For it not only contains the set of metrical doxologies, but also "ane prayer eftir euerie Psalme, agreing with the mening thair of."⁴ And the calendar is enriched with a quaint verse for each month. Unfortunately the copy in the British Museum wants a few leaves, and the friend, who kindly transcribed these verses for me, was therefore unable to supply those for January, February, and March; but the others are curious and sensible, and doubtless the missing ones were of the same nature. Those for May, October, and December are given as specimens:—

" Ryse airle now this moneth of May,
And hant the fieldis quhillk ar sa gay;
From surfetting se thou refraine
For sone it will procure thy paine."

" Warm claitthis man now preparit be,
Alsua warm meitis ar gude for thee;
Haif gude regaird thy feit be dry,
Thou sall avoid great harme thairby."

" Now cald December is cummit in,
And puir manniss back is clothed thin;
Feid and cleith him then as ze may,
The Lord will it threefold repay."

Must it be understood that because these verses are in the Book of Common Order they were sanctioned by the Church? The Catechism and other prose documents are all dated 1596, and the volume is arranged differently from the previous editions, as the "prenter" informs "the discreit reader," in consideration of

"The eis of men in travel, and being from thair hame, quha glaidlie wald carie ane thin buik (as this of the prayers is) that can not esilie carie the hail Psalms. . . . Besides, that ilk puir child can not attein to the bying of the hail Psalms, he may haif the samin with ye Catechisme of esie price."⁵

¹ Livingston's Psalter, Diss. iii. p. 36.

² Ibid. Diss. ii. p. 14.

³ Ibid. i. p. 4, and app. p. ix.

⁴ There is some reason to believe that these pithy and excellent prayers had previously been printed by themselves. Perhaps they may have been intended for the use of the Readers or for family-worship. Livingston has given them all. Raban, in his 1625 edition of the Psalm Book, erred on the other hand, by omitting from two of the prayers certain clauses against Popery! For this he was reproved by the Assembly of 1640. Peterkin's Records, p. 169; Gordon's Scots Affairs, Spalding Club, vol. iii., pp. 238, 239. And because of the Kirk's "great prejudice . . . these years bypast," the Assembly of 1638 forbade the printing of any treatise concerning the Kirk, without the written authority of the Clerk. Acts of Assembly, 1639, p. 43.

⁵ Livingston's Psalter, Diss. ii. p. 14.

a special title-page of the Psalms runs thus :—

the Psalms of David in Metre. According as they are sung in the Kirk of Scotland. Together with the Conclusion, or Gloria Patri, efter the Psalme: and alsua efter eir eirie Psalme, agreing with the mening thair of."

These words seem to imply that the Kirk of Scotland had not *usually*, at any rate, used either the conclusions or prayers. It further be inferred that the printer was alone responsible for additions; and this is borne out by the omission of the conclusions from so many later editions, and the prayers from all others. It is not reasonable to suppose that the printers would have left out conclusions, if they had been in general use; and therefore it may be that they were afterwards adopted—perhaps gradually—as they grew strong in the land. William Cowper was made Bishop of Exeter in 1612, and soon after wrote the *Seven Dayes Conference*, in which he has given the fullest description which we now have of the service of the Church of Scotland in those days. He refers several times to the singing of Psalms, without the slightest reference to conclusions or doxologies. After explaining the service conducted by the minister, he thus describes that of the Preacher :—

When he will conceiue a prayer, at the which the people humble themselves: when he reads his text of Holy Scripture, this the people heare with reuerence; when he falls to the preaching, which some heare with their heads couered, some (in that you may doe as your health requires.) The preaching being ended, the minister falls all with a thanksgiuing, after which there is a Psalme sung by the whole congregation, and then the minister blesseth the people in the name of the Lord, and saith to them: *you will see no other thing here.*"

It may be understood from the last clause that nothing was sung but the Psalms. But, the conclusions must have been introduced afterwards, for they, or, rather, one of them appears to have been in common use at the beginning of the Second Reformation. It is said to have speedily taken a wonderful hold; but in the words of Scott and Leishman,—“Novelties are very soon accepted as things of long standing.”¹ Accordingly, when the leaders of the movement met, immediately before the Assembly of 1641, “for accommodation of feared differences” about private meetings for prayer, they considered, what was their mind as to the novations? Mr. Ramsay [one of the Edinburgh Ministers, and Moderator of the General Assembly] could enumerate such as, omitting *Glory to God*, kneeling in the pulpit, discountenancing read prayers, and so forth.² Some members of these praying-societies had imbibed radical and Independent notions; and some of the ministers, like Calderwood, dreaded a repetition of the extravagances of the Anabaptists in Holland. At the Assembly of next year, Baillie says, “they were feared for a storme about novations,” and they were keenly engaged in a committee, where, “for feare of scandall [i.e. offence] we were passing for the tyme all acts, and wryting a letter by the

¹ Cowper's Work's, 1626, p. 682.

² Book of Common Order, p. vi.

³ Baillie's Letters, vol. i. p. 362.

moderator to the Presbyteries troubled with novations." This letter was drawn up by Baillie, but was altered for the better after the Assembly dissolved,¹ probably by the Commission which soon entered on its duties, and sent such a letter to these Presbyteries.²

Burnet professes to know about this letter and thus expatiates upon it:—

"When some designers for popularity, in the western parts of that Kirk, did begin to disuse the Lord's Prayer in worship, and the singing the conclusion or doxologie after the Psalm, and the minister's kneeling for private devotion when he entered the pulpit, the General Assembly took this in very ill part, and in a letter they wrote to the Presbyteries, complained sadly of a spirit of innovation [which] was beginning to get into the Kirk, and to throw these laudible practises out of it, mentioning the three I named, which are commanded to be still practised; and such as refused obedience, are appointed to be conferred with in order to the giving of them satisfaction: and if they continued untractable, the Presbyteries were to proceed against them, as they should be answerable to the next General Assembly. This letter I can produce authentically attested. But is it not strange, that some who were then zealous to condemn these innovations, should now be carried with the herd to be guilty of them?"³

Bishop Sage, after quoting nearly all this extract from the work of his brother bishop, adds, "I doubt not he found it amongst his uncle Warriston's papers, who was scribe to the rampant Assemblies from the year 1638 and downward." Sage jumps to the conclusion that,

"Our Reformers . . . never used to conclude their Psalms without some Christian doxology. The Gloria Patri was most generally used. In the old Psalm Book it is turned into all the different kinds of measures into which the Psalms of David are put, that it might still succeed, in the conclusion, without changing the tune."⁴

Though this Prelatical champion lived two centuries ago, perhaps his blundering should be excused, as early copies of the old Psalter were getting scarce even then, and no one had thought of collating them. But, what can be said for those who wilfully fall into the same mistakes now? Yet, Dr. Sprott—who seems to have drunk at Sage's well, for he, too, after quoting Burnet adds that he "was nephew of Warriston," and "is supposed to have had access to his papers"⁵—unhesitatingly affirms that "the use of the . . . doxology . . . had been usual in the Church since the Reformation!"⁶ And, again, "besides the Psalter, of which large sections were sung in a great variety of metres, *always concluding with the Gloria*, the Church provided metrical versions of the Magnificat, the Veni Creator, and other hymns!"⁷ Can Dr. Sprott have forgotten, while he was preparing these lectures, what he had stated fourteen years before? Then he wrote:—

"One of these conclusions is given in the edition of 1575, the full set in that of 1595. Some of the later editions have part of them, some the whole, some none; but the use of Gloria Patri in some or in all the metres was universal in 1638. Baillie speaks of it as the 'constant practice of our Church.'"⁸

¹ Baillie's Letters, vol. ii. pp. 46, 51.

² Stevenson's History, 1840, p. 504.

³ Vindication of the Authority, &c. 1673, pp. 182, 183.

⁴ Sage's Works, Spottiswoode Society, vol. i. pp. 357-359.

⁵ Book of Common Order, p. xx.

⁶ Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland, 1882, p. 5.

⁷ Ibid. pp. 32, 33.

⁸ Book of Common Order, p. 249.

It is therefore quite clear that Dr. Sprott once knew when the doxologies first appeared, that he once knew that the early editions did not have them, that some of the later editions had only part of them, and some editions none at all; although, in his "lectures delivered at the Universities of Aberdeen, Glasgow, St. Andrews, and Edinburgh," he ignores all this knowledge. Can it have been his desire to enable the Scottish people to distinguish between "the opinions of the Reformers, and of the Westminster Divines," and those "'sectarian conceits' which were imported from England, and which infected the party that was responsible for the Disruption of 1651," which led him to put his light under a bushel? His modesty wrongs him, and has long done so. For, although, in reprinting the Book of Common Order in 1868, he "followed Hart's larger edition of 1611, collating it with other copies, and modernising the spelling,"¹ he did not tell his readers that it did not contain a single doxology! Of course they would intuitively know that the six which he gave in his reprint were taken from some other edition! Did he not do well when he mentioned that the X. Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, Veni Creator, Nunc dimittis, the XII. Articles, and Magnificat—which he prints under the heading of "Hymns"—were taken from the edition of 1615? In one respect he has not been so reticent as Dr. Bonar, for he freely says that "The Scottish Psalter, as printed in 1564, gave only the Psalms." But he has also added that "Bassandyne's edition of 1575 has five spiritual songs; that of 1587, and many others, have ten; while some of the later editions have fourteen."² After being so explicit, he could not be expected to vainly parade his knowledge by further adding that the edition which he reprinted only contained "the Ten Commandments, the Prayer thereafter, and the Lord's Prayer;"³ still less, by saying, that the small edition also printed by Hart in 1611, has neither hymns, songs, nor conclusions; and therefore he has not done so. Some other cause than modesty, however, must have led him to supplement Burnet's account of the letter of 1642, in the following manner:—

"After 1638, a party arose in the Scottish Church which sympathized with many of the notions of the fanatical sects which then began to flourish in England. This party, which was destined to have a great and disastrous influence, commenced with 'scrupling the three nocent ceremonies' as they were called—viz., the ministers bowing for private devotion, the singing of the doxology at the end of the Psalms, and the use of the Lord's Prayer. The leading clergy, such as Henderson, Baillie, and others, 'expressed themselves passionately against these conceits,' and the Church, as a whole, had such an aversion to them, that the Commission of the Covenanting Assembly of 1642, of which the famous Robert Douglas was Moderator, threatened with deposition some ministers in the South and West, who had given up these laudable customs—gave orders that none should forbear ordinarily to practise them—and issued injunctions to Presbyteries 'to take heed that every one received into the ministry should be free both in their judgment and practice from the foresaid novations.'"⁴

He has not thought it worth while to give any authority for these

¹ Book of Common Order, p. lxvii.

² Ibid. p. 249.

³ Livingston's Psalter, App. p. iv.

⁴ Worship and Offices, pp. 18, 19.

statements, nor even to say where his quotations are taken from. No doubt, Baillie has said that "Henderson vented himself, at manie occasions, passionatlie opposit to all these conceits,"¹ and this very passage has been quoted by Dr. Sprott in a similar connection before.² But though Henderson was a host in himself, he should not have said that "the leading clergy" thus expressed themselves; for although the words quoted above are immediately followed in Baillie's letter by these:—"We fand among ourselves great harmonie of judgment," it appears from the remainder of the sentence that even Leckie "was found to differ from us in nothing considerable." And what was it that they differed about? What were the conceits? Neither bowing in the pulpit, Lord's Prayer, nor doxology, are mentioned in the whole passage, which treats almost entirely of private meetings! Dr. Sprott can only have emphasized the fact that Douglas was Moderator in order to throw the weight of his name into the same scale as the doxology. But, as Moderator of that Assembly, Douglas signed a letter of the Commissioners to their brethren of the ministry of the Kirk of England, in which it is said:—"In the beginnings of our late Reformation, when we were assembled at Glasgow against the Prelacie, the ceremonies, and the Service-Book; a great part of the Assembly intended no such alteration in the form of worship and Kirk-government, as they were moved unanimously to consent unto in the end." And, it is added, in words which seem almost prophetic of the early casting aside of the doxology, "When the time of Reformation cometh, the wisdome and Spirit of God in His servants cannot be resisted by the wit and power of man."³

Some of the brethren in the Presbytery of Irvine were so much exasperated at the use made of the Commission's letter, that Gabriel Maxwell, with the consent of Nevay, Mowat, Adair, Cockburn, Hutcheson and Fullarton, drew up, Baillie says—"a full treatise, in a verie bitter and arrogant straine against the three nocent ceremonies, *Pater Noster*, *Gloria Patri*, and kneeling in the pulpit; proving by a great rabble of arguments, both particular and generall, which goe farr beyond these three particulars questioned, the unlawfulness of our Church practises." It was rumoured that they were confident of carrying their tenets by argument in the face of any Assembly, and if oppressed, were willing to suffer persecution. It was resolved to bring the matter before the Assembly. Henderson, Dickson, Blair, Rutherford, George Gillespie, and Baillie, met in Douglas's chamber. When Dickson and Baillie "made to them a true and a full relation of the businesse, they were all exceeding grieved." Baillie was careful to get Rutherford, Blair, Gillespie, Warriston, and Calderwood, to promise to write answers to their papers, which Dickson had already done.⁴ In writing to Spang towards the end of next month, Baillie says:—

"These who promised to wryte did all fail. In a conference we had, Mr. Samuel

¹ Baillie's Letters, vol. i. p. 249.

² Book of Common Order, p. lxiii.

³ Humble Petition of the Commissioners, &c., 1643, p. 12.

⁴ Baillie's Letters, vol. ii. pp. 69, 70.

therfurd] and Mr. George Gillespie were so scrupulous in the poynt of scandall, sh to Mr. D. [Dickson], Mr. Robert Blair, and me seemed most clear, that we no will these two should conferre with the dissenting brethren, lest in that poynt should harden them. Mr. David and Mr. Robert had two or three conferences with the young men, bot for no purpose. Mr. Hendersone and sundrie would have these things miskend till we be at a poynt with England."¹

The Assembly met on the 2nd of August 1643—a week after the receipt of Baillie's letter—and, although Henderson's proposal was gain-ground, there was, in the "privie meetings," "much debait anent the troublesome evill of novations. All the noblemen, especially the nobles of the border, were much displeased with the favorers of it." The sbyteries of the Synod of Glasgow had so managed that none of the obnoxious brethren were sent as commissioners, "yet most of them came to the toun."

Being called to the Moderator's chamber, Mr. John M'Lellane and Mr. John Neve, most did propone their reasons for their judgement. Mr. Samuel Ruthford and Mr. D. [Dickson] did answer. All heard with disdaine [what] Mr. John Neve's reasons were against the Lord's Prayer: after one hour's jangling, we left it nothing to be said; I found manie inclined, especiallie Mr. Samuel, though he professed it to be to answer satisfactorie all their arguments, for peace cause, to passe from the use of the conclusion, and bowing in the pulpit especiallie if we agree with them; however, we agreed to draw up some act for satisfieing in some measure

an act was accordingly drawn up by Henderson, and although Baillie—who had done what he could "to sett all instruments on foot for the quenching of that fyre"—was dissatisfied with "some parts of it, as putting in too great an equalitie the novators and their opposits," yet he submitted to Henderson "who was much wyser," than himself.⁴ And so the "Act for preparing the Directorie for the worship of God" was passed unanimously; forbidding, until the next meeting, "all disputation . . . about different practices in such things, as have not been formerly determined by this Assembly, and all condemning one of another in such lawfull things as have been universally received, and by perpetuall custome practised by the most faithfull ministers of the Gospell, and opposers of corruption in this Kirk, since the first beginning of Reformation to these times."⁵ Perhaps it was not expedient to be more explicit. Yet, it may be truly said that the Lord's Prayer had been used since the beginning of the Reformation. And it had not been "formerly determined," formally, whether the doxology should be used or not; at least, it had not been expressly condemned; for though it occupied a prominent place in King Edward's Liturgies, Knox had largely ignored it. The Directory, proposed by this Act of 1643, was not required, as the Westminster Assembly did that work to be. But Baillie had opponents in his own flock as well as among fellow-ministers. Livingston has printed an undated paper of which was evidently written about this time, and which has this interesting:—"The summe of my conference yesterday with three or four yeomen of my flock who refused to sing the conclusion." It is

Baillie's Letters, vol. ii. p. 76. ² Ibid. p. 94. ³ Ibid. p. 71. ⁴ Ibid. p. 95.

⁵ Acts of Assembly, 1643, p. 14.

too long for quotation, but its substance is briefly this. That giving over "anie part of the publict worship of God," without stating their reasons, was disrespectful to his ministry. And there was a great danger, of which he forewarned them. "The rejecting of the conclusion is one of the first linkes of the whole chaine of Brunisme. We have oft seene, from this beginning, seducers, in this land, have drawne on there followers to scunder at and reject our whole Psalmes in meeter, and then to refuse our prayers, then our sacraments, then our preaching, then at last our church, our covenant, and all." He asks them to consider also that:—"The matter of that conclusion is nothing but the paraphrase in meeter of this one sentence, Glory be to God for ever. There is onlie two words paraphrased into it, God and EVER. That the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is a good paraphrase of the word God, none will doubt but hereticks, who deny the Trinitie. That the naturall paraphrase of EVER is, what was in the beginning, what is now, and what shall be, even these hereticks doubt not, nor anie other who have wit to conceive of eternitie. Or, if anie should doubt of this, yit Revel. i. 8, would resolve them, which expresses the eternitie of Christ in this paraphrase, who is, who was, and who is to come." Brownists rejected all paraphrasing and "meetering of Scripture," but his yeomen abhorred such folly; and therefore he gives a long string of texts to show that the matter of "the controverted conclusion," was scriptural. He also tries to satisfy them that their objection to it, as "an humane Popish invention," is ill-founded; and denies that it was repeated too frequently." Livingston has well said that, "Possibly the 'yeomen' addressed by Baillie may have represented a considerable portion of the Scottish people who entertained scruples respecting this usage, and this portion would probably be larger at an earlier period."²

In one of his letters to Spang, Baillie thus informs him of the proceedings at Westminster Assembly:—

"As for the changes in our church, I had laboured with my colleagues to have eschewed them all, and found Mr. Henderson not much from my mind; bot others were passionate for them, and at last carried, first Mr. Hendersone, and then me, to their mind. The belief in baptisme was never said in England, and they would not undergoe that yoke All, both they and we, would gladly have been at the keeping still of readers; for we foresaw the burthen which the removeall would bring on the ministers back; but, after all our studie, we could find no warrand for such ane officer in the church About the conclusion of the Psalme, we had no debate with them; without scruple, Independents and all sang it, *so farr as I know*, where it was printed at the end of two or three Psalmes. But in the new translation of the Psalmes, resolving to keep punctuallie to the originall text, without any addition, we and they were content to omitt that whereupon we saw both the Popish and Prelatical partie did so much dote, as to put it to the end of the most of their lessons, and all their Psalmes."³

Readers had been recognised in the First Book of Discipline, but several assemblies, preceding 1581, concluded their office "to be no ordinar office in the Kirk of God;" and in April of that year, "The Kirk, in ane voyce . . . votit and concludit farther, that in no tymes

¹ Livingston's Psalter. Diss. iii. pp. 36, 37.

² Ibid. Diss. i. p. 4.

³ Baillie's Letters, vol. ii. pp. 258, 259.

neing any reader be admittit to the office of reader."¹ It is therefore a very suggestive fact that readers were only parted with at the second Reformation, because "a clear warrand of the Word" could be found for them. This helps to explain how an innovation like doxology could take such a hold, and to show the truth of Gillespie's remark, that the Scotch Commissioners did not go to Westminster "presuming to prescribe anything," but "willing to give as well as to offer light, and to debate matters freely and rely from the Word of God."² Neither the conclusion, nor bowing the pulpit, are mentioned in the Directory; but, the English ones wrote to the General Assembly, that they trusted, that none would be "so tenacious of old customs not expressly forbidden, or so far from good examples although new, in matters of lesser consequence, as to insist upon their liberty of retaining the one, or sing the other, because not specified in the Directory."³ Anderson, Rutherford, Loudon, and Maitland also wrote to the General Assembly desiring them to lay aside any differences "passed in silence in the Directory, and yet hinted at in the letter from [Westminster] Assembly."⁴ Baillie and Gillespie, who attended General Assembly in 1645, were instructed, before they left London, "to make particular" the "generall courteous clause" in these letters. They managed so well that the Directory for public Worship was adopted on the 3rd of February of that year. Brethren from whom "most fasherie" was expected being easily satisfied, and "all did lovinglie condescend to the alterations." Ramsay "exceeding impertinent" with his antiquity, and Calderwood "oft fashious with his very rude and humorous [*i.e.*, ill-natured] position," but they too were at last contented.⁵ Writing in 1731, Wodrow says:—

have been told by ministers who lived in those days, that an act of Assembly was proposed for laying aside the Lord's Prayer, the old forms of prayer, and only the doxology also; but Mr. Calderwood, and some other old ministers, said it, that is, the laying them aside by a formal act; and so they were insensibly led into disuse."⁶

Wodrow, in his Life of Blair, partially contradicts Wodrow, for he says the Lord's Prayer, and the creed at baptism "were never laid aside by any act of the General Assembly, as the singing of the doxology and bowing in the pulpit were."⁷ That bowing in the pulpit was formally laid aside—while declared "a lawful custome in this Kirk" a few days after the Directory was adopted is quite certain.⁸ But Gillespie's *Notes* show that Wodrow was wrong regarding the doxology, for the date of next day—8th February 1645—he says:—

concerning *Gloria Patri*, Mr. D. Calderwood cited *Basilius ad Amphilochem*.

¹ Booke of the Universall Kirke, p. 219.

² Aaron's Rod Blossoming, 1646, Epistle Dedicatory.

³ Acts of Assembly, 1645, p. 5.

⁴ Ibid. p. 3.

⁵ Baillie's Letters, vol. ii. pp. 259, 260.

⁶ Wodrow Correspondence, vol. iii. p. 494.

⁷ Blair's Life, Wodrow Society, p. 426.

⁸ Acts of Assembly, 1645, p. 18.

saying, That hymn was used from the days of the Apostles, only the Council of Nice added these words, 'As it was in the beginning,' against the Arians. He cited also a canon of *Conc. Tolet.* 4, against some who would not sing any songs made by men, namely by Ambrose and Hilarius, the canon objects, Why, then, sing they *Gloria Patri*? So that, as precise as they were, they sung that song."

Gillespie adds :—

"But the canon saith, *Respuunt igitur*, which imports they did not sing that song. "It was thought good, to make no act about this, as there is made about bowing in the pulpit, but to let deuetude abolish it."¹

Calderwood's opposition has been told in a more dramatic way by Robert Edward, the conforming minister of Murrois, who, with the object of "healing and helping home of the wandring sheep," published in 1683 a pamphlet of fully a hundred pages entitled *The Doxology Approven*, which bears that—

"When it was mentioned by the Moderator of the General Assembly to be laid aside, Mr. David Calderwood, an aged man, a minister of great experience, and of unquestionable integrity, as to these times, spoke to the hearing of the whole Synod, Moderator, *I intreat that the doxologie be not laid aside, for I hope to sing it in heeven*, to which speech he received no satisfactory answer; and I doubt not but many in that Synod by their silence did approve his saying, as a sound and seasonable testimony in favours of the doxologie; and I do not remember that the doxologie was laid aside by a formal suffrage of the whole Synod, by calling of the roll; only some next the Moderator gave their consent."²

It is with evident delight that Dr. Spratt cites the pathetic appeal thus ascribed to Calderwood, "who," he says, "had spent his youth and manhood in fighting against Prelatical innovations, and his old age in fighting against those from an opposite quarter."³ But Gillespie was able to show that, with all his stores of ecclesiastical history, he was sometimes wrong in point of fact.⁴ And Dr. Spratt has also caught him tripping;⁵ had his works, however, been published in Calderwood's day, they might have been the occasion of great sport to the Philistines. Edward says that it took place in August 1649, that is four and a half years after the Directory had been adopted, instead of five days as stated by Gillespie. This is not the result of a mis-print, for he dwells on it several times, saying, that, "for all that importunity from England," the General Assembly would not lay it aside sooner.⁶ Perhaps, Calderwood's "very sharp protestation" against the Act of 1649, for the election of ministers, may have misled him in the date. Yet Dr. Spratt has given Edward's date, in preference to Gillespie's which is clearly the correct one. Edward even tried to show that the laying aside of the doxology was contrary to the National Covenant, and also the Solemn League and Covenant, and so incurred the guilt of perjury.⁷ But Dr. Spratt has not borrowed this argument. Edward reasoned in this manner—In the National Covenant, the General Assembly granted that religion, as reformed in 1560, was Christ's

¹ Notes of Debates, 1846, p. 120.

² The Doxology Approven, p. 70.

³ Worship and Offices, p. 84.

⁴ See Baillie's Letters, vol. ii., p. 505.

⁵ Book of Common Order, pp. l., li., foot-note.

⁶ The Doxology Approven, p. 70. See also p. 85.

⁷ Ibid. pp. 64, 70, 71.

true and perfect religion, and promised to adhere to it all their days; and, as the doxology was in the old Psalm Book, all the people in Scotland are engaged to it! There could be no confuting of his premises, for he says the Psalm book "is yet extant, printed at Aberdeen, *cum privilegio*, in *Anno Dom.* 1638!!"¹

Instead of giving this somewhat minute account of the laying aside of the doxology, it might have been enough to have quoted Laing's briefly expressed opinion that it seems "to have been disallowed as a Prelatic innovation;"² but, as a good deal of misunderstanding exists on the point, I have gone into these details. It is evident that human-hymns were not used in God's public worship at the Second Reformation, for those who opposed the doxology would also have objected to them, and so they would have been specially mentioned.

OUR FOREIGN MISSION.

MR. ANDERSON has sent to the Convener the following letter referring to the religious observances of the Mohammedans, and it is published in the belief that it will prove of some interest to the readers of the *Magazine*. As a full report of the year's operations in the Mission field will appear in the next issue, we postpone any details that have recently come to hand till the meeting of Synod. The evening of Tuesday 6th May is the date on which reports both on Home and Foreign Missions will be submitted to the Synod. The proceedings begin at half-past six o'clock, and the attendance of all interested in our missionary work, who can conveniently come, will be welcomed on that occasion.

In a former letter I gave you some account of a Hindu festival called the Diwáli, in which I showed the utter want of spiritual religion which characterises Hindu observances. They are distinguished by as little solemnity as are the sports which are sought after by the most worldly people in Scotland. I shall now briefly describe a Mohammedan observance—I hardly know whether to call it a fast or a festival, as it partakes more or less of the character of both—which proves the great body of the Mohammedans to be equally destitute of spirituality. In an age like the present, when the religion of the false prophet is so much extolled, and when its followers are so much praised for their zeal and earnestness, it is of some importance to know what are really the facts of the case. Many Mohammedans in their daily devotions—five times a-day—show a measure of solemnity which is not often to be seen in Hindus engaged in their worship; but it is generally a mere form, if we are to judge of sincerity in religion by purity of life. Pride, self-righteousness, and hypocrisy are as marked characteristics of the more religiously inclined Moham-

¹ The Doxology Approven, p. 65.

² Baillie's Letters, vol. iii. p. 529.

THE HYMNOLOGY OF THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

IV.

By D. HAY FLEMING, St. Andrews.

"AFTER the Restoration of Charles the Second (but previous to any change in regard to the Church), notice is taken in the *Mercurius Caledonius* of a minister, who, preaching before Parliament on the 27th January, 1661, 'restored us to *Glory to the Father*, to be sung at the end of the Psalmes,' and this, it is said 'has been a great stranger to our Kirk these many years.'"¹ The change in the Church came soon after the Restoration, and the Diocesan Synod of Edinburgh, at its first meeting in October 1662, resolved that the doxology should be again revived and sung.² The bishops are said to have brought it in, at this time, with greater devotion than ever.³ Skinner, in describing the worship in Scotland after the Restoration, says that all "the Episcopal clergy . . . uniformly concluded their prayers with the Lord's Prayer, and their singing with the doxology, both which the zealots of the other side decried, as superstitious and formal."⁴ But the practice was not universal even among Episcopal congregations, for in 1666, the Diocesan Synod of Fife required moderators to take notice of the uniformity of ministers in singing the doxology.⁵ And Bishop Honeyman, writing in 1669, says, that, "now, some would rather run away from the blessing, than stay to magnifie the blessed Trinity, or will sit as if they were stricken with a dumb spirit."⁶ While Edward, twenty-three years after the Restoration, has to complain, not only that the doxology has been forgotten, "in the wandring conventicle at the hill-side or in the den," but, that while in one Parish Church "you may hear the doxology Christianly sung," in the next there is no mention of it. Yea, and too often both in city and country churches "when it comes to the closing of the Psalm, some sing the doxology decently, others sitting by who did sing the Psalm instantly turn silent at the doxology, yea, some are worse, deriding and scoffing the singers of it."⁷ These admissions about those who had, at least partially, conformed to Prelacy are worth noting, as well as the practice of the Covenanters. In 1664, Walter Pringle was summoned before the High Commission for declaring among other things that he could not join "in singing the conclusion which is now brought in;"⁸ and, in 1685, when people were prevailed on to swear the oaths then imposed, they had to promise to stand at the singing of the doxology.⁹ Yet even in those days it was not sung after every Psalm, but "only before pronouncing the blessing."¹⁰

¹ Baillie's Letters, vol. iii. p. 529.² Wodrow's History, 1828, vol. i. p. 281.³ Lawson's Episcopal Church of Scotland, 1844, p. 734.⁴ Skinner's Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, 1788, vol. ii. p. 467.⁵ Lawson's Episcopal Church, &c. p. 766.⁶ Survey of Naphtali, part 2, p. 226.⁷ The Doxology Approven, Preface.⁸ Select Biographies, Wodrow Society, vol. i, p. 453.⁹ Wodrow's History, vol. iv. p. 339.¹⁰ Meno Tekel, 1705, pp. 9, 10

Burnet makes his Nonconformist say that the Presbyterians do not use the doxology, "because it is not in the Scripture, and is but a device of men." And his Conformist answers,

"Are not your meeter Psalms a device of men? and they recede from the text, as I can trace it in an hundred places, as much as the doxology doth from Scripture-words . . . Besides, since the mystery of the S.S. Trinity is not so clearly in the Old Testament, nor in any Psalm, why may not the Church use an acknowledgment of it in the end of their singing, as well as in the end of prayer? . . . What difference can you pretend betwixt singing and saying?"¹

To which M'Ward replies,

"Our meeter Psalmes are no device of men, seing they are the same in substance and sense, with these in prose, without any greater variation then the application of the command of singing to us Scotsmen doth both require and warrant. . . . We close our prayers ordinarily with praise and glory to the *Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*; because it is warrantable from Scripture-practice, to wit, in blessing; and agreeable to the truth and liberty of Gospel-worship; and yet we refuse it in singing (marke it, not in praising) because, for that exercise, the Lord having instructed us with a sufficient plenty of Divine composures, we think it neither needfull nor acceptable, that we should gratifie an arbitrarie imposition, in receiving the supplement of an human addition: It is true the words are Scriptural, but can you say that the Scripture beares any such allowance for their use in singing, as it doth for the Psalmes of David?"²

Among other reasons for using the doxology, Edward urges the appointment and practice of the Universal Church; its being a guard against Arianism and Socinianism; the command of the king; and its Scriptural nature—being chiefly founded, he says, on Matt. xxviii. 19, and Rom. xi. 36. The doxology has had strange champions, for even Sir James Turner—who has been described as a "bloody executioner of illegal tyranny," and as one who had "renounced all humanity and compassion"³—entered the lists in its defence; but, this portion of his manuscript has not been published. It would have been interesting to know, whether he was anxious for its use as a preservative against Socinianism, or as a symbol of obedience to the will of his royal master. Perhaps some enthusiastic lover of the doxology will be able to settle this point. But Thomas Forrester—a very different man from Turner—regarded the doxology as a Prelatic innovation.⁴ Its value against anti-Trinitarian heresies was a favourite argument in the days of old, and is accordingly insisted on in a pamphlet, published in 1704, entitled *Vindication of the Address made by the Episcopal clergy to the General Assembly of 1692*. And, yet, of the Chinese it is said, that, "The Trinity, as believed in by us, is not conceived by them. The same man who will repeat to you a doxology most glibly, in which the three Persons only are glorified, will, if you question him, declare that Christ and Tien-wan, being uterine brothers are equal."⁵ Five and twenty years after the Revolution, an Episcopalian thus expostulates with the Presbyterians, "Ye offer up no praises to God, but such wherein a Jew will joyn, all

¹ Modest and Free Conference, pp. 73, 74.

² The True Non-Conformist, pp. 279, 280.

³ Jus Populi Vindictum, 1669, p. 350.

⁴ Rectius Instruendum, 1684, part iii. p. 15.

⁵ C. G. Wolsley's Narrative of the War with China in 1860, cited in The Historians of Scotland, vol. v. p. 318.

the hymns in the Gospels are exploded your worship, and the *Gloria Patri* is no more to be heard in your religious assemblies."¹

Livingston is inclined to infer, from Baillie's words, that even when the doxology was in so great repute in his day, the usage was confined to this single verse :—

“Glorie to the Father, to the Son,
And to the Holy Ghost.
As it was in the beginning,
Is now, and ay shall last.”²

In the foot-note, which has already been referred to, Dr. Bonar says :—

“That the ‘Psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs,’ so specially characterised by Paul in his Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians included human compositions, was taken for granted by the Reformers and their successors. Boyd, of Trochrig, in his famous Latin folio on the Ephesians, shows this at length ; and James Ferguson, of Kilwinning, in 1656, thus writes :—‘The Psalms of David, and other Scriptural songs in the Old Testament, may and ought to be sung in this part of Gospel-worship’ (on Col. iii. 16). Calvin gives the same interpretation, and all the early critics and divines. After the Westminster Assembly, when controversies arose about Psalmody, we find one or two writers confining the three words above to the Psalms exclusively.”

This might be answered in several ways. Perhaps, the simplest plan would be to deny emphatically that the Reformers of Scotland and their successors took for granted that the words “Psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs” included human compositions, and to insist upon proof. Or, for argument's sake, it might be given that they took for granted that these words embraced human hymns, and that it was only after “controversies arose about Psalmody” that the meaning was confined to the Book of Psalms. But, when the Duke of Argyll tried to prove that, because the Free Church views, about the independent jurisdiction of the church, were not brought out prominently by the first Reformers, there was therefore strong presumption, at least, that these views were not really derived from Scripture or sanctioned by its statements, Principal Cunningham's reply was ready and conclusive :—

“This notion has no solid foundation to rest upon, and is indeed contradicted by the whole history of the church. A very large experience has fully proved that doctrines which can be shown to be taught in Scripture have been overlooked or disregarded by the church in general, until events in Providence brought them out—pressed them upon men's attention—and led to a more careful examination and a more accurate apprehension of the Scriptural statements which relate to them. Indeed, it might almost be said that scarcely any of the doctrines of Scripture has ever been brought into due prominence—has been fully explained and illustrated—and has been stated and defended with perfect precision and accuracy, until events occurred which made it the subject of controversial discussion ; until contradictory opinions concerning it were propounded, and were discussed between men of learning and ability taking opposite sides.”³

This might have been answer enough had Dr. Bonar only referred to his unnamed, and unnumbered “early critics and divines,” but he has specially mentioned Boyd of Trochrig, Fergusson of Kilwinning, and Calvin. Now it is frankly admitted that Boyd, in his ponderous

¹ The Causes of the Decay of Presbytery in Scotland, 1713, p. 22.

² Livingston's Psalter, Diss. i. p. 4.

³ Discussions on Church Principles, p. 267.

commentary on the Ephesians, eagerly argues for the introduction of human-hymns into God's public worship ; but Dr. Bonar has overlooked a very important fact. After trying to prove his point from the Psalmist's exhortations to sing a new song to the Lord, Boyd exclaims :—" But, yet we only sing ancient songs ; no new song is heard from our mouth in the church. Why therefore do we lend a deaf ear to the admonition of David so often repeated ?" As Boyd died in 1627, at the age of 48, these words show that even after Prelacy was triumphant, human compositions were not used in the services of the sanctuary. Dr. Bonar has therefore erred in calling attention to Boyd of Trochrig, but he has done still worse in citing Fergusson of Kilwinning. For after stating that " the Reformers and their successors " took for granted that the words " Psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs " " included human compositions ;" it was surely a terrible downcome, to quote Fergusson in the very next sentence as saying : " The Psalms of David, and other Scriptural songs in the Old Testament, may, and ought to be sung in this part of Gospel worship !" It would require a very vivid imagination to see any support to Dr. Bonar's cause in that quotation. It might be a fair question for discussion, whether by " the Psalms of David, and other Scriptural songs in the Old Testament," the Book of Psalms is not exclusively meant. But, passing that, does Dr. Bonar mean to insinuate that " the other Scriptural songs in the Old Testament " are human compositions ? Further, as he has cited Fergusson on Colossians, it may well be asked at him, if the same expositor, on Ephesians, does not expressly limit the terms to " David's Psalms and other Scriptural songs ?" And whether he does not say that in singing praises to God acceptably we must be filled with the Spirit "*though not to compose new songs ?*" No one will be uncharitable enough to hint that Dr. Bonar did not perceive the difference between Boyd's view and Fergusson's ; and yet he proceeds to say that Calvin with all the early critics and divines, " gives the same interpretation." But whether this means the same interpretation as Boyd, or the same as Fergusson it is impossible to tell. Calvin's opinion has been dealt with at the outset and need not be referred to again. Dr. Bonar has only shown the weakness of his cause by citing Boyd, Fergusson, and Calvin. After the Westminster Assembly, he has found " one or two writers confining the three words above to the Psalms exclusively," but he names none of them. Brown of Wamphray, published, in Rotterdam, an exhaustive Latin work against the Anti-Sabbatarians, in two volumes, which were respectively issued in 1674 and 1676. In the second volume, page 959, Paul's three words are restricted to the Book of Psalms, and several very cogent reasons are given for doing so. M'Ward's opinion has been already quoted. A Psalm Book was published in 1673, in the preface of which it is said : " To us David's Psalms seem plainly intended by these terms of Psalms and hymns, and ' spiritual songs, which the

* " Atqui nos cantica tantum vetusta cantamus ; Nullum novum carmen ex ore nostro in Ecclesia exauditur ; Numquid igitur ad hanc Davidis toties iteratam præmonitionem absurduimus ? " Bodii Prælectiones in Epistolam ad Ephesios, 1632, p. 727.

Apostle useth. Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16." And this preface is "signed by the celebrated Dr. Owen, and twenty-five others, among whom are to be found the most illustrious divines that have ever adorned the church." Principal Forrester, in reply to Bishop Honeyman's objection, that the Psalms were turned into metre by one who had no infallible inspiration, says, that "the framing of Psalms, commended for the use of singing (a commanded duty) into such a metrical composure, as is suitable hereunto, *I mean keeping still [i.e. always] close to the Sacred Text and not varying from the true and genuine sense of the words,*" falls "within the compass of the Divine commands enjoining the same."¹ Rhind, in his *Apology* for separating from the Presbyterian party, taunts them with objecting to a prayer book and yet praising God "by certain forms, when it is undeniable that the Spirit can as freely dictate praises as prayers, and metre as well as prose." To this Anderson, of Dumbarton, answers,

"Right, He can do so. And has He not dictated the matter of the Psalms? And does He not assist as to the manner, I mean with fervency and sincerity in singing 'em? And is not every minister in his congregation left at freedom to pitch upon such a portion of 'em, for the spiritual solace of his people, as the Spirit of God, in the use of rational consideration, suggests to him to be most suitable to their case? *Here is all the freedom was ever pleaded for by the Presbyterians.*"²

Probably Dr. Bonar will pay some respect to these opinions. But possibly Dr. Sprott will pay none; for he thinks that those English sects, who objected to prescribed prayer, were quite consistent in also objecting to prescribed praise, and allowing "only singing prophets to extemporise such rhapsodies as came into their disordered brains, while the congregation listened in silence to their effusions!"³ And so, after all, he is not like the "Tennowr" in Wood's manuscript Psalter—"ane man of mekill modestie."

In conclusion, it is worthy of remark that Baillie, Burnet, and Edward, in pleading for the doxology, maintain that it is founded on Scripture. And, further, that Baillie, in his conference with those yeomen who refused to sing it, says, "We have it but once almost in one *spirituall song*, for everie portion of the *Psalm*, which is right divided is a full *spirituall hymne* to us." And this may be taken as an indication of what that ardent champion of the doxology understood by the words Psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs.

Literature.

The Scottish Church and its surroundings in early times. By Robert Paton, Minister of Kirkinner. Edinburgh: James Gemmel, 1884.

IN the preface to this volume the author informs us that the various lectures of which it is composed were delivered to his congregation in the winters of 1881-2, 1882-3. The aim which he set before himself in their preparation was to trace and exhibit the progress of the Gospel in our land, at the very earliest stages of its known history. He felt that in our retrospect of church history in our own land

¹ The true Psalmody, 1867, p. 68.

² The Hierarchical Bishops Claim, 1699, part iii. p. 66.

³ Defence of the Presbyterians, 1714, p. 266.

⁴ Worship and Offices, p. 33.