

**LETTERS ON PSALMODY: A  
REVIEW OF THE LEADING  
ARGUMENTS  
FOR THE EXCLUSIVE USE OF  
THE BOOK OF PSALMS, PP. 1-213**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649631551

Letters on Psalmody: A Review of the Leading Arguments for the Exclusive Use of the Book of Psalms, pp. 1-213 by William Annan

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.  
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

[www.triestepublishing.com](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**WILLIAM ANNAN**

**LETTERS ON PSALMODY: A  
REVIEW OF THE LEADING  
ARGUMENTS  
FOR THE EXCLUSIVE USE OF  
THE BOOK OF PSALMS, PP. 1-213**



# LETTERS ON PSALMODY:

A REVIEW OF THE

LEADING ARGUMENTS FOR THE EXCLUSIVE USE

OF THE

## BOOK OF PSALMS.

BY

WILLIAM ANNAN,

AUTHOR OF "DIFFICULTIES OF ARMINIAN METHODISM," "GOTTSCHALK'S LETTERS  
TO PROF. YOUNG," ETC.

"And they (in heaven) sung a new song, saying with a loud voice, WORTHY  
IS THE LAMB THAT WAS SLAIN." Rev. 5: 9-12.

PHILADELPHIA:

WILLIAM S. & ALFRED MARTIEN,

No. 806 CHESTNUT STREET.

1859.

---

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1859, by

**WILLIAM ANNAN,**

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Western  
District of Pennsylvania.

STEREOTYPED BY W. E. MAYER, PITTSBURGH, PA.

---

## CONTENTS.

### LETTER I.

	PAGE
Introductory remarks—Origin of this work—Extract from a letter of an inquiring friend—Unhappy exaggerations of our views and usages—Drs. Watts and Latta misrepresented—Dr. Pressly formerly on the Presbyterian platform—His views at that time of the "traditions of the elders"—Plan of the discussion pursued in this treatise. . . . .	13

### LETTER II.

Question at issue: "Is a fair and full version of the whole book of Psalms of Divine appointment,"—Rouse's versification not "the pure word of God"—not a version at all, but in many parts "a paraphrase" or mixture of inspired truth with human composition—This proved by extended quotations. . . . .	22
--	----

### LETTER III.

Discussion of previous Letter continued—Rouse's versification a patchwork of human and Divine sentiments and phraseology—Not "the word of God" in the same sense in which the prose translation of our Bible is so—Further extracts and extended parallels to prove this. . . . .	31
---	----

### LETTER IV.

The book of Psalms never designed to be the only perpetual and unchangeable Psalmody of the Church—Not so regarded by the early church of Scotland, martyrs, reformers and other holy men—The exclusive doctrine a modern discovery—Not practically adopted even by the strictest of our opposing brethren—Omission of Psalm 72: 20—Most of the inspired titles excluded from Rouse—These proved to be a part of the inspired text, by Dr. Alexander, Horne and others—A glance at the Presbyterian doctrine of Psalmody. . . . .	33
---	----

## LETTER V.

PAGE

Rouse an explanatory "paraphrase," not a version or translation—Not "as literal as the laws of versification will allow"—A glance at the history of Scottish Psalmody prior to the publication of Rouse—"Sternhold and Hopkins" a loose paraphrase, and having many "gospel turns," after the manner of Dr. Watts—Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland authorizing Rouse call it a "paraphrase" twenty times, but never a version—The real question: "Shall we sing 'Rouse's paraphrase' or Watts' paraphrase?"—The idea of the Divine and exclusive authority of "a correct and faithful version" purely a modern invention. . . . . 53

## LETTER VI.

Sources whence the church must derive her songs of praise—"All Scripture of use to direct us" in praise as well as "in prayer"—Our brethren hold to the "Psalms exclusively;" all else they view as "corruption of Divine worship"—Scottish churches almost without exception, use "other songs"—Examples of "the Free and Established churches," "United Presbyterian church," &c.—The exclusive doctrine not countenanced by the examples of the inspired men of the Old and New Testaments, Isaiah, Hezekiah, &c. 68

## LETTER VII.

Question of "the Divine appointment" of the book of Psalms continued—Examination of 2 Chron. 29: 30—Contains no such Divine warrant—The common arguments from "the peculiar matter," "titles," and "original use" of the Psalms shown to be fallacious—The title and matter of "Solomon's Song" presumptive proof that it should be used for purposes of praise . . . . . 76

## LETTER VIII.

Discussion of previous Letter continued—"A Divine warrant" for the *exclusive use* of the Book of Psalms, not found in Paul's "psalms, hymns and spiritual songs," Coloss. 3: 16—Septuagint use of these titles—The fact that the Psalms were originally given to be sung by the Jews, does not prove them to be intended as an unchangeable, perpetual and exclusive system of praise—Various unsound arguments exposed, . . . . . 87



## LETTER IX.

Page

"A more excellent way"—"Whole word of God of use to direct us" in praise—Act of our General Assembly—Labors of Ralph Erskine—Sentiments of "the North British Review" in commendation of Dr. Watts—He viewed his versification as "a paraphrase;" not always a strict version or translation—Many of his Psalms are as correct versions as those of Rouse; in some parts more so—Specimens of Dr. Watts' manner in "Sternhold and Hopkins"—The Psalms need explanation—Testimony of Professor Patterson. - - - - -	101
--	-----

## LETTER X.

Attempts to create prejudice against our usages by references to certain expressions of Dr. Watts—Presbyterians not responsible for certain of his reasons in regard to the proper method of using the Psalms—Dr. Watts greatly misrepresented—His high valuation of the book of Psalms—Objections examined: "Watts wrote better than David," "Presbyterian Psalmody not the word of God," "tends to weaken the claims of inspiration," "those who use Rouse certainly sing the truth," "dare not sing 'human composition,'" &c. - - - - -	119
--	-----

## LETTER XI.

Hymns, or "the other songs of Scripture"—Example of the Scottish churches against the exclusive principle, in the proportion of two thousand eight hundred to thirty—Action of the early fathers of the Associate Reformed church—Dr. M'Master's sentiments in favor of hymns—Present views of Drs. Kerr and Pressly—Glance at the results—A large part of Dr. Watts' hymns are fair paraphrases of portions of the inspired word of God, and no more "human composition" than much of "Rouse's paraphrase"—Defense of the remainder. - - - - -	133
---	-----

## LETTER XII.

Use of hymns in the early church—Glance at Ephes. 5: 19, and Coloss. 3: 16—Authority of Ralph Erskine in favor of our views of these passages—Usage of the primitive church—Objections considered: "Book of Psalms perfect," "no command to make songs of praise," "setting aside parts of God's word," "hymns lead to alteration of the inspired records," "encourage error and heresy," "Lead to schisms and discord," &c. - - - - -	147
--	-----

CONTENTS.

LETTER XIII.

God has given us no *system* of Psalmody for exclusive use—  
Five further arguments to prove this point—Fruits of the  
exclusive system: Suspension of ministers, elders and  
church members—Argument from analogy: Prayer and  
praise, both of human composition, so mingled in the  
Psalms and in all direct worship of God as to be insepara-  
ble—Strange inconsistencies and jarring opinions about  
the real nature of “inspired Psalmody”—Views of Dr.  
Cooper, the “Preacher,” &c.—Gross errors in Rouse. - 166

LETTER XIV.

Misrepresentations of Dr. Watts exposed—Further proof of  
the use of “other than the Psalms” in the primitive  
church—Admitted by Dr. M’Master; proved by Merle  
D’Aubigne, and “the North British Review”—Letter of  
Pliny—Testimony of Eusebius—Hymns condemned by the  
Council of Laodicea, which also forbid any to sing but the  
choir—Case of the heretic Paul of Samosata—Truths es-  
tablished by that case. - - - - - 186

APPENDIX.

Review of “The True Psalmody.” - - - - - 206

## P R E F A C E .

SEVERAL years ago it was suggested to the author, by one of our most energetic and useful ministers, an honored pastor in the Presbyterian church, to undertake "the preparation of a small popular work on Psalmody." This request was enforced by the kindest considerations of a personal nature, and the brother was pleased to add: "we need a popular treatise \* \* \* to meet the public demand on this subject." Many circumstances conspired to forbid compliance with this suggestion until a recent period. The result is now with great diffidence submitted to the Christian public.

The providential circumstances which have seemed to demand some further *defense* of the cherished usages of the Presbyterian church in relation to the public and private singing of the praises of God, are fully stated in the progress of this discussion, and especially in the Introductory Letter. If our system of Psalmody be such as is described in the quotations made from the writings of the brethren whom we oppose, *then the sooner it is abandoned the better*; since it must be, as they are pleased to allege, "a *corruption of Divine worship*" of a very offensive and dangerous sort. But if, on the other hand, it is clearly demonstrable that these brethren have misapprehended, and therefore, greatly misrepresented the views and usages of our church; if, moreover, their confident and peculiar claims to the exclusive use of an "inspired Psalmody" can be shown to be altogether without foundation; a superstructure without a basis either in the Holy Scriptures, Church History or fact; then it becomes an obvious duty to present the evidence which clearly establishes these positions. This has been attempted in the following Letters.

We disclaim at the outset, the slightest intentional disrespect toward the Psalmody in use among these brethren, by the employment in this work of the phraseology, "Rouse's versifica-