

SCRIPTURE STUDIES

VOLUME IV

Three Defenses Of Music in Worship Answered

S.H. HALL

THE C. E. I. PUBLISHING CO.

Athens, Ala. 1960

Containing Some of S. H. Hall's Debates

Copyright 1960 THE C. E. I. PUBLISHING CO. Athens, Alabama

www.GravelHillchurchofChrist.com

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Contents | 2 |
| PART ONE: THE DEBATE WITH H.K. PENDLETON | 3 |
| The First Debate I Ever Had..... | 3 |
| Prove All Things | 4 |
| Chapter One..... | 9 |
| Chapter Two..... | 13 |
| Chapter Three..... | 18 |
| Chapter Four..... | 28 |
| THE WAYS OF CAIN AND ABEL | 37 |
| The Difference Between The Two | 38 |
| PART TWO: THE MUSIC QUESTION | 43 |
| Preface..... | 43 |
| Chapter One..... | 45 |
| Chapter Two..... | 49 |
| Chapter Three..... | 52 |
| Chapter Four..... | 59 |
| Chapter Five | 63 |
| Chapter Six | 73 |
| Chapter Seven..... | 80 |
| PART THREE: THE DEBATE WITH J. J. WALKER | 91 |
| The Hall-Walker Debate On The Music Question | 91 |
| Review of Walker's Tract..... | 94 |

PART ONE: THE DEBATE WITH H.K. PENDLETON

The First Debate I Ever Had

When I went to Atlanta in 1907, I found a small congregation of believers meeting in a small frame building that would seat about 150 people, and they owed a \$1, 000. 00 note, and could hardly keep up the payments. Brother F. W. Smith, my father in the gospel, raised \$75. 00 a month, to enable me to take the work. Brother Pendleton was then the pastor of the South Pryor Christian Church, with a membership of some fifteen hundred and had been with them about 10 years. Too, Brother Pendleton was a ripe Hebrew and Greek scholar, and was old enough to have been my father.

Brother Hugh E. Garrett and family lived at East Point, and they were all the members we had there. Brother Pendleton had conducted a meeting there, and he visited the Garrett home often, and had about got Brother Garrett convinced that he was right in his position. So Brother Garrett came to me and stated he wanted to hear Pendleton and me discuss the question. My reply to this was, “You will never get Pendleton into a discussion. Try him and see. He will tell you he has a large flock to look after and he does not have the time.” When Garrett approached Pendleton for the debate, he stated that he had a large congregation to see after, and had not the time, and Garrett immediately stated—“This is exactly what Brother Hall said you would claim.” It seemed to have pricked Pendleton a bit, and he stated he might give it some consideration. Brother Garrett then handed him my little tract on “Prove All Things” and stated, Brother Hall states that if you can prove God is pleased with instrumental music in worship, we will abandon our place of work and join your forces and have just the one congregation instead of two congregations. Pendleton evidently thought he could do that, and suggested to Garrett that he have me write him. And so I did, and the arrangements were perfected.

I secured the services of J. W. Shepherd as my moderator, who was as much a veteran as was Pendleton.

No statement have I ever received that I appreciate more than the following words from Brother Shepherd after he returned to Nashville

and made his report to Brother D. Lipscomb at whose feet I sat for some five or six years. Here are his words:

“Brother Hall, I made a full report to Brother Lipscomb of your debate with Pendleton, and told him that, of all the debates [had ever attended your debate with Pendleton was the most complete victory that I had ever heard.” Brother Lipscomb thought it a bit unwise for me to enter this debate because of Pendleton’s age and scholarship. God gave us the victory, and not S. H. Hall. I had asked every member of my little congregation to stay with me in their prayers to God, and when I began to speak to pray that at no time in the discussion would my fleshly feelings have anything to do with my part of the discussion. Pendleton lost his head, so to speak, and said things that it, seemed to me, no school boy would have said in a school debate. After the discussion closed and in the first elders meeting at his church, he was rebuked for his conduct, and he with a flash of temper, offered his resignation, and it was accepted, and in a few months he was out of Atlanta. How truly did Paul exclaim, “I can do all things through Christ who strengthenth me.”

Prove All Things

It is insisted, by some, that I give a write-up of my debate with H. K. Pendleton, who at the time was pastor of The First Christian Church in Atlanta, Ga. As a forerunner of the writeup, I wish to call the reader’s attention to the subject heading, this article.

1. Paul says in I Thes. 5:21, “Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.” In Eph. 5:10, he says: “Proving what is acceptable unto the Lord.” On the above, I would make the following comments:

(1) To please God should be our greatest desire. This was the spirit that ever animated his Son, Jesus the Christ; he said, “I do always those things that please him.” (Jno. 8:29). Paul says, “Now if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his.” (Rom. 8:11). The spirit that ever dwelt in the bosom of God’s Son, was to please him who sent him here to die for the world.

(2) Therefore, we should see to it, we should be careful, that our acts are well-pleasing in the sight of God. We are commanded to prove that they are. In Eph. 5:10, R.V., the command is

“Proving what is well-pleasing unto the Lord.” In I Thes. 5:21, as before stated, it is “Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.” Only that which we can prove, is good. If all should eliminate from their work and worship, those things they cannot prove are well-pleasing unto God, then the prayer Christ taught his disciples to pray would be answered, viz: “Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.”

2. But let us inquire. What will please God?

(1) Not that which we of ourselves think is right or will please him. “There is a way that seemeth right unto man, but the end thereof are the ways of death. (Prov. 14:12). “Yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service.” (Jno. 16:2). No, indeed, we cannot let our perverted minds and thoughts say what will please God. “O, Lord I know the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps.” (Jer. 10:23). May we, then, look to a higher clime for thoughts to direct us, for proof as to what will please God. “For,” saith Jehovah, “my thoughts are not your thoughts neither are your ways my ways—For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.” (Isa. 55:8, 9).

(2) Christ tells us what will please his Father. In John 8:29, he says, “I do always those things that please him.” But, now read the verse before this, 28th, and see what he really did. He says, “I do *nothing* of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things.” Ah! do you not see the secret? If he did nothing of himself, why should we claim the liberty to do so? He did nothing that he could not prove his Father wanted him to do. Are you doing, my brother, in your work and worship, things he has not taught you to do? If so, you are in rebellion to God, walking contrary to the Spirit of his Son.

3. When we get after some of our brethren for using instrumental music in church worship, they usually reply, “Where does the Bible say it is a sin to use it? Will you affirm that it is sin to use it?” Thus, they try to dodge the burden of proof that they are logically under obligations to shoulder. But rest easy, and we will meet them here.

(1) The command comes in thunderous tones, “Prove all things;

hold fast that which is good.” Again, “prove what is acceptable unto the Lord.” Now, the reason we do not use it is because we are unable to prove that God wants us to use it under the New Covenant. It was certainly permitted under the Old Covenant, but when Christ established the New Covenant and the apostles, guided by the Holy Spirit, set in order the first congregations, they left the instruments out. We do not know how we are to learn that God would accept it if we were to use it now. Here we confess our inability. Now is there a Goliath on the side of humanism that feels able to come to the rescue of this invention? If so, send him out before this great army of “will worshippers” (Col. 2:22, 23) who stand opposed to the church of God, and let us see how well he can do battle in behalf of the devotees of this human relic. We can prove that it pleases God for us to “offer the sacrifice of praise, the fruit of our lips” (Heb. 13:15), “uttering by the tongue words easy to be understood,” (1 Cor. 14:9), doing this with the spirit and understanding (15th verse), in which music we “speak to one another,” “teach and admonish one another” in “psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs” and make melody in our hearts to the Lord. (Eph. 5:13; Col. 3:16). I say we know he is pleased with this because we can prove it. But, as stated before, we cannot prove he accepts instrumental music in worship now—and *where is the man that can?* He does not exist. If you find him, let us know where he lives. The hardest thing we have ever undertaken to do, is to get a man to try to prove it. Only a very few (two are all that I have heard of) have ever undertaken the arduous task, and only one effort could we get them to make. You ask again, where is the proof that it is a sin? O, there is much proof.

But all that I ask of you, for the time being, to grapple with us, is your inability to prove God is pleased with it. We confess we are unable to prove it, hence, refuse to use it. May we yet hope for some one who practices instrumental music in church worship to come over and help us prove God will be pleased with it, if we use it?

(2) We practice immersion only in baptizing penitent believers into Christ. You ask, why? Because we can prove that God is pleased to see us do so. But often are we asked, Won't sprinkling and pouring do as well? If it will we don't know it. We are perfectly willing to practice it if some one will come

over and do that which we confess we are unable to do, viz: prove that it will please God. But some of our neighbors who believe in sprinkling raise the question, "Where does the Bible say it is a sin?" O, well, it says it in all those places where you fail to find any proof that God will accept it, and this covers the whole book—quite a big field of proof, is it not? Asking us to point out the scripture where it says it is a sin, is like asking us to point to the scripture which says, it is sin to use instrumental music under the New Covenant.

(3) We baptize penitent believers only. You ask why? Because we can prove God accepts it, is pleased with it. But you say, why not baptize the babies? My reason is that I cannot prove that God will accept it, that he will be pleased with it. If you can, I will gladly listen to you in your effort. But still we are asked, "Where in the Bible does God say it is a sin to baptize babies?" The thing that says it is a sin loudest and strongest, is the fact that no man on earth can prove God wants it done, that it will please him for us to do it. You had as well ask us to point you to the scripture that says it is a sin to use instrumental music in church worship today.

(4) We use bread and the fruit of the vine in commemorating the death of Christ and showing it forth till he comes again. We do this because we can prove God is pleased with it. Christ is spoken of as a Lamb, and we are taught to eat his flesh and drink his blood. You ask why we do not use a slice of mutton, well cooked, instead of the loaf or use it with the loaf? I answer because I cannot say God will be pleased with it, I am wholly unable to give any proof that he would. I cannot prove this, hence, do not use it.

(5) You ask, why we call the church, "the church of God," "the church of Christ," and its members "Christians," "saints, or disciples?" why not call them "Campbellites," "Baptists," "Methodists," and the church, "The Baptist Church," etc.? Well, we speak of the disciples and the church as the Holy Spirit speaks of them. We know this is right. "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." (I Pet. 4:11). Will some one tell me how I can ever know here that God would be pleased with anything else? "Prove all things; hold fast to that

which is good.” God’s thoughts are not ours; they are higher and better than our thoughts. It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps. This is what God says. Here is a man engaged in worship, and he is doing things God has not commanded him to do. By whose thoughts is he directed? Well did Christ say, “In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men.” (Matt. 15:9). In conclusion, let us hear Jeremiah, 6:16: “Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, walk therein, and ye shall find rest to your souls.” Take the book of proof, the Bible, and show that God wants you to use the instrument before you ask your neighbor to engage with you in such worship. Here we confess that we are unable to furnish the proof. We have long looked for a man who can furnish the proof, but thus far fail to find him. Can you find him for us?

S. H. HALL'S REPLY TO PENDLETON ON INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN CHURCH WORSHIP

Chapter One

I am a strong believer in public discussions, when properly conducted. Many mistakes are made in debates, but this does not prove that debates should not be conducted. Many mistakes are made by preachers in their efforts to teach when not in debates. Does this prove that all preaching should cease? Certainly not. I went into the above discussion, praying God that I might please him in all that I said and did: I also asked the brethren to do the same thing. Certainly our prayers were heard and answered: for there was not during the five nights discussion, one sensation of anger or unkind feeling experienced by me. I thank God for the discussion, and especially for the way he blessed me in its progress. I love to defend his blessed teaching, and pray that the day will never come in which I will be afraid or ashamed to meet any man in defense of the faith and practice of the church of the living God.

We kindly ask the reader to call to mind the truths presented in our preceding article under the heading: "Prove all Things." Listen, as much as you please or as long as you please, to any man, in his efforts to prove God is pleased with instrumental music in worship, and it is only to see him make a failure. I would gladly use it, if I had reasons to believe God would be pleased with it; but in vain have I looked for a reason. Paul says, "and he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Where is the man that can prove beyond a doubt that God, under this dispensation, will accept instrumental music in worship? We are still looking for the man; and, indeed, we will continue to look for him.

I shall follow my notes and give the points somewhat in the order in which they appeared:

1. Bro. Pendleton opened the discussion, objecting to debates, complaining that he was called upon for the discussion. Why do this? I had as much right to complain as did he: Bro. H. E. Garrett of this city was the man who asked for the discussion: why did not I complain because I was asked, by one who was seeking the truth, to discuss this question? The complaint against open discussion is, with but few

exceptions, a certain ear-mark of the advocate of false doctrine. Where did Christ and the apostles ever exhibit this complaining spirit when their doctrine was called in question? Without any doubt, this, nine times out of ten, is an unintentional confession that the party is conscious of the weakness of his side of the question. Suppose some of our Methodist neighbors should attack the position of our digressive brethren on the mode of baptism, telling them there is no authority for immersing people, and challenging them to defend their practice; what would they do? Begin to complain and say, we don't believe in public discussions? I trow not. Certainly they would come out boldly and say, We will *gladly* meet you in defense of our practice. Why? Because they are right on this question, they have the truth, and they know it. But call on them to defend their practice on the music question, and the air is rent with a pitiful cry, "We don't believe in discussions, you are disturbing our peace in making such a demand." Some of the best friends I have, use instrumental music in church worship. May God keep my heart, in the name of his Son, and allow not "the root of bitterness" to ever arise therein against them; may I ever be wholly unprejudiced as far as poor, weak man can be. But, brethren, those of you who use instrumental music, why is it that you so act? Many hard things have you said about us because we won't use it. Indeed, have the church doors been closed against me, and others, because we do not use it. Why do this unless you can furnish us with better proof that God will accept it? Shall we hope to see our brethren who have departed from the "old paths," cease this complaining, and come out boldly in defense of their practice?

2. Bro. Pendleton, in beginning the introduction of his proof, stated that, in Eph. 5:19, we are commanded to speak to one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs. He said we must learn the meaning of the word, "psalms." He then introduced Luke, 24:44, and argued that the Psalms of David were no part of the law of Moses or Old Covenant, as it is sometimes called; the law of Moses was done away but the Psalms of David were not, that they constituted a part of the New Testament. He also introduced I Cor. 14:26 and intimated—for it seems that he was afraid of the position he wanted to take—that the statement, "When ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm," refers to the Psalms of David, that this book supplied the early Christians with psalms.

In reply to this, I called his attention to the fact that "psalms" in 1 Cor.

15:26, undoubtedly has reference to psalms revealed directly by the Holy Spirit, and not the Psalms of David, and this was strong presumptive evidence that the Psalms of David were not suitable, all of them to say the least, for the use in the New Testament church, otherwise God would not have begun to supply them in this way with additional psalms.

Now we ask you to read with us the scripture in question: "How is it then, brethren? When you come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying." Now, how were the tongues, the interpretations, the revelations, etc., received? Were they not received miraculously? Just so were the psalms. You had as well argue they got their tongues and interpretations from the Old Testament as to say these psalms were taken from the Psalms of David. If not, why not?

Of course, Bro. Pendleton tried to make the impression that "hath a psalm" was equivalent to "hath an instrument"; since many of the Psalms of David were written to be sung to an instrumental accompaniment. But it was shown that the idea in I Cor. 14 is absolutely that of vocal music, not instrumental; that Paul, in regulating their use of these things said: "So likewise ye, except ye *utter by the tongue words* easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken?... What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also; I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also" (verses 9 and 15), showing the "psalm" was something to be sung "*by the tongue,*" not by the instrument. We also called his attention to the fact that the Greek is "psallo" (I will sing) in the 15th verse and "psalmos" (psalm) in the 26th verse, showing that these much disputed terms can be, as in this case, used with the vocal idea only inherent in them.

Next, I called his attention to the fact that his saying the Psalms of David were a part of the New Testament, put himself in direct opposition to Christ's use of them; that Christ in speaking of the Psalms of David, *to* the Jews called that book "your law"; and in speaking *of* the Psalms of David and *of* the Jews, he spoke of that book as "their law"; all of which shows, beyond a doubt, that the Psalms of David existed then as a book of law before Christ's law was established. See Jno. 10:34; 12:34; 15:25.

Further, I called the brother's attention to the fact that the position was ridiculous; that God, through Jeremiah said, several hundred years after David's day: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I *will* make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah"; and that, if Bro. Pendleton's position be true, it ought to read: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will *finish* the covenant, a part of which I have already written for the house of Israel and for the house of Judah." How strange that brethren who once stood with "The Grand Old Book," should wander so far away as to make this blunder.

It was then shown that the spirit of the Testament Christ established was different from the spirit of the Old Testament. The 5th chapter of Matthew was introduced, with this quotation: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, Resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also." We also quoted Christ's language to Peter: "Put up again thy sword." (Matt. 26:52). Bro. Pendleton was then asked if Psalms of David did not contain the above spirit which is declared not to be the spirit of the New Testament? And, to get well fixed in the minds of the audience that many of the psalms of that book contained the objectionable spirit, we read, Psa. 55:12-15; 58:5; 79:6; and 144:1; and then asked Bro. Pendleton how it would sound today to sing: "Blessed be the Lord my strength, who teacheth my hands to war, and my fingers to fight"; "O Lord God of hosts, the God of Israel, awake to visit all the heathen; be not merciful to any wicked transgressors"; "Let death seize upon them, and let them go down quick into hell."

But are you surprised when I tell you the brother would not answer me? This load from the artillery of God's eternal truth tore his breast works into splinters and left him standing defenseless in open field, exposed to other volleys from the same guns. In his embarrassment he exclaimed, "It says in Eph. 5:19 to use psalms, does not say what kind, and *any old psalm will do.*" Are you not astonished at such a statement from the mouth of one of their scholarly men, one who claims to preach Christ and him crucified? Brethren, sincerely, may I not ask you to think on these things? Why rend the church asunder by holding a position that forces one of your strongest men to such straits? He did his best, but he was burdened with a false position that he had taken.

Chapter Two

We come now with the second installment of the above discussion. Beginning where the first ended, we call your attention to No:

3. In defining worship, Bro. Pendleton said, there were two kinds of worship:

(1) under the Old Testament, the worship was formal, outward, and the condition of the heart had nothing to do with it;

(2) under the New Testament, it is just the reverse, it is spiritual, a condition of the heart, and the outward act has nothing to do with it.

This, of course, was denied. Bro. Pendleton's attention was called to the fact that, under the Old Testament, when offerings were called for the building of the tabernacle of Moses, God said, "Speak to the children of Israel, that they bring me an offering: *of every man that giveth it willingly with his heart ye shall take my offering.*" (Ex. 25:2). We asked him if the heart had anything to do with the acceptability of this act of giving; that, while it was true the two covenants differed in many respects, that the Old Covenant was not a heartless formality, that even under that Covenant God said, "Thou shalt be sincere (marginal reading) with the Lord thy God," (Deut. 18:13), that even then God did not accept money raised at a *baby show*, which is, indeed, a very outward formality used by some under the New Testament to raise money. (Bro. Pendleton's congregation had been using such methods).

Then, this question was asked: If your position be true, that worship now is simply a condition of the heart, a feeling of adoration in the heart toward God, pray tell us, what was the difference in Paul's worship before and after his conversion? We would also love to have the same question answered in reference to the Eunuch in the 8th chapter of Acts. This man had journeyed one thousand miles to Jerusalem "to worship." Did not he and Paul have the feeling of adoration in their hearts to God before their conversion? Was their worship acceptable? Show the difference in their worship feeling before conversion and after.

Here is another question Bro. Pendleton failed to notice. It was shown

that the proper condition of the heart is essential to acceptable worship, but that this condition must be expressed before God accepts it; and that the expression must be directed by the Truth; that “true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit (the worship coming from a sincere heart) and in truth” (that is directed by the truth). See Jno. 4:23. We also called his attention to the fact that faith is a condition of the heart, but that God does not accept it as such until expressed in his appointed way; that just as God has ordained baptism as an expression of saving faith, in which expression God accepts the faith and frees the sinner (Rom. 6:17-18), just so has God certain acts for the baptized believer to perform in expressing his adoration to and deference and respect for God; that Christ had this condition of heart in the highest degree, and that he, in describing it, said: “I *do nothing of myself*; but as the Father hath *taught* me, I speak *these* things.” (Jno. 8:28).

3. Then Bro. Pendleton introduced his Hebrew Bible and a few Greek Lexicons. The Hebrew word, *Zamar*, and the Greek word, *Psallo*, *psalmois*, *psallantes*, etc. were brought actively into play. He read from Donningan’s Greek Lexicon, Groves, Greenfield, Liddell and Scott, and a few others.

In reply to his use of the above works in his opening speech, I called the audience’s attention to the fact that, in Classical Greek, it is true that these words carry the idea of instrumental accompaniment, but that, in the New Testament use of these words, the idea is not there. I then read the following from Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament:

“Psallo: (a) to pluck off, pull out. (b) to cause to vibrate by touching, to twang; to touch or strike the chord, to twang the strings of a musical instrument so that they gently vibrate; to play on a stringed instrument, to play the harp: to sing to music of the harp; *in the New Testament to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praise of God in song.* James 5:13.”

Here I called Bro. Pendleton’s attention to the fact that this standard work in giving this word its New Testament meaning, excludes the instrument.

In addition to Thayer’s statement, it was shown that Sophocles, who made a special study of the meaning of the Greek words from B. C.

146 to A. D. 1100, which includes the time of the writing of the New Testament, gives “psallo” only one meaning, viz. “To chant, sing religious songs.”

It was also shown that not only Thayer leaves the instrument out of the New Testament meaning of the word, but that Robin’s Greek Lexicon, Green’s and Bagster’s do the same. We also called Bro. Pendleton’s attention to the fact that if the word has the instrumental idea in it, the apostles and early Christians themselves did not know it, and that this would be one command the apostles gave that they themselves did not obey, and it was left for the Roman Catholic Church to come along, in about the 6th Century, and for the first time obey it. In proof of this declaration, we quoted the following scholarly works:

(1) THE AMERICAN CYCLOPEDIA: —

“Pope Vitalian is related to have first introduced organs into some of the churches of Western Europe, about 670; but the earliest trustworthy account is that of the one sent as a present by the Greek Emperor, Constantine Copronymus to Pepin, king of the Franks, in 755.” Vol. 12, p. 688.

(2) CHAMBERS ENCYCLOPEDIA: —

“The organ is said to have been first introduced into church music by Pope Vitalian 1 in 666. In 757, a great organ was sent as a present to Pepin by the Byzantine Emperor, Constantine Copronymus, and placed in the church of St. Corneille at Compiègne. Soon after Charlemagne’s time organs became common.” Vol. 7, p. 112.

(3) SCHAFF - HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA: —

“In the Greek church the organ never came into use. But after the eighth century it became more and more common in the Latin church; not, however, without opposition from the side of the monks. * * * The Reform Church discarded it; and though the church of Basel very early introduced it, it was in other places admitted only sparingly and after long hesitation.” Vol. 2, p. 1702.

(4) FESSENDEN’S ENCYCLOPEDIA: —

1. "Vocal Music. This species, which is the most natural, may be considered to have existed before any other. It was continued by the Jews and it is the only kind that is permitted in the Greek and Scotch churches or with few exceptions, in dissenting congregations in England. The Christian rule requires its use both for personal and social edification. Eph. v, Col. iii. The vocal music of the imperial choristers in St. Petersburg incomparably surpasses in sweetness and effect the sounds produced by the combined power of the most exquisite musical instrument. 2. Instrumental music is also of very ancient date, its invention being ascribed to Tubal, the sixth descendant from Cain. That instrumental music was not practiced by the primitive Christians, but was an aid to devotion of later times, is evident from church history." P. 852, Art. Music.

(5) LONDON ENCYCLOPEDIA. —

"Pope Vitalianus in 658 introduced the organ into the Roman churches to accompany the singers. Leo II in 682 reformed the singing of the psalms and hymns, accommodating the intonation of them to the manner in which they are sung, or performed at the present day." Vol. 15, p. 280, Art. Music.

(6) ENCYCLOPEDIA BY J. NEWTON BROWN. (Baptist).

"That instrumental music was not practiced by the primitive Christians, but was an aid to devotion of later times, is evident from church history."

(7) NEANDER'S CHURCH HISTORY, Vol. 3, p. 1:

"From the French church proceeded the use of the organ, the first musical instrument used in the church."

Here is another argument to which Bro. Pendleton refused to reply, notwithstanding the fact, it was oft repeated. Kind reader, can you believe the authors of the seven works quoted above could have all been mistaken on this point? Certainly not. Do you not feel the weight of testimony that the advocates of the organ in worship have to face in discussion? No wonder that it is so hard to get them to debate this question. Even the dumb brutes can see the immovable rock before

them over which they realize their inability to pass.

But to my surprise, after all of the above matter, had been presented, and especially the quotation from Thayer, Bro. Pendleton came before us the third night of the debate, and abandoned every word he had introduced the first night except *psalmos*. He would not use psallo any more, threw it out of commission; just so with his Hebrew words. He said his case was resting on the one word *psalmos*. I say I was a little surprised at this. I was expecting, to say the least, to hear some more cannonading from his Greek and Hebrew artillery. But all of his guns are now out of commission save one. Wait and see what becomes of it.

Chapter Three

4. It was stated in our preceding article that Bro. Pendleton, the third night of the discussion, after introducing a number of Hebrew and Greek words both in the noun and verb forms, abandoned all of them except *psalmos*, the Greek word for psalms. From this time to the close of the debate, the battle was fought over this one word, principally. But before giving you what was said directly in reference to the meaning of *psalmos*, I want to give you other quotations that were used in reference to the meaning of *psallo*.

(1) We quote O. A. Carr, in a letter to J. S. Warlick, Jan. 31, 1898:

“As in the Old Testament the word circumcision was used to mean that which was outward in the flesh, but in the New Testament the very same word is used in contrast with its Old Testament use and refers to that which takes place in the heart, so the word *psallo* in the old covenant—literally, to twang, or pluck a string got to mean to play a musical instrument, designating the instrumental accompaniment; but in the New Testament the very same word is used in contrast with its Old Testament use and refers to that which takes place in the heart.”

(2) I. B. Grubbs, Prof. in the college of Bible, at Lexington, Ky., for a number of years, in a letter to J. W. Perkins, March 18, 1893:

“Dear Brother Perkins: — Your last was received a day or two since. Excuse my replying with pencil. I have no pen just at hand. You ask whether *psallo*, in Eph. 5:19, implies the use of instruments. I answer that if it does, the primitive church though guided by the apostles, disregarded their positive instructions, and that church continued to do so for eight hundred years; that only when it had pretty thoroughly apostatized did it obey the apostles’ instructions in this particular. Can we believe that the apostles would lay a duty upon the church and require it themselves and allow the churches which they founded to do the same, and yet never obey it or ask others to do so? If the word *psallo* in the passage referred to, implies the use of instruments, then it is clear from the passage that such a use becomes a duty, and not a mere expedient or allowable privilege. What proves too much proves nothing.

The fact is that the singing of David's psalms and like devotional compositions was psalming in the times of early Christians."

(3) M. C. Kurfees, Louisville, Ky., one of the greatest logicians of modern times, in a letter to J. S. Dunn in 1893 says:

"Sophocles and Thayer, in their lexicons, show clearly that in the New Testament *psallo* never had a meaning that will allow the use of a musical instrument. They define the word for this period by terms that not only leave the instrument out, but actually exclude the instrument."

(4) J. W. McGarvey, who was for years Professor of Sacred History and Evidences in College of the Bible, Kentucky University, and now Editor of Biblical criticisms on Christian Standard, published at Cincinnati, to G. W. Bonham in 1897:

"Dear Sir and Brother: At a recent public investigation of the song service in the church it was claimed that the Greek word *psallo*, when properly rendered, authorizes the use of instruments in the song service. Will you be kind enough to give me the authorities, the testimony of two or three standard lexicons, as well as your own opinion as a Greek scholar? I would be pleased to have your reply in your own hand, and I request you to please return this note along with your reply.

Your brother in Christ,

G. W. Bonham."

"Dear Brother: The Greek word *psallo* originally meant to touch, then to twang a bowstring, or play a bow stringed instrument with the fingers, as in the expression: 'Touch my light guitar.' It meant to play a harp, and finally to sing. You can find this gradual progress in the use of the word in the Greek lexicons generally, and especially in Liddell and Scott, though in the last the latest meaning given is: 'To sing to a harp.' Sophocles, who gives the meaning of the Greek words from B. C. 146 to A. D. 1100, which includes only the latter use of the language, gives *psallo* only one meaning: 'To chant, to sing religious songs.' No first-class scholar or translator in the

range of my knowledge takes the position of which you inquire.

Fraternally,

J. W. McGarvey.”

This able critic, some years before this, concludes his answer to a similar query in the following words: “This evidence derives additional force from the consideration that although in respect to both faith and practice the churches fell rapidly into corruption after the death of the apostles, their practice in this particular was so firmly fixed that they continued to worship without the use of instruments of music for about seven hundred years. Nearly every item of the old Jewish ritual and the old pagan ritual which now helps to make up the ceremonial of the Roman Church was introduced before the return to the discarded use of instrumental music. The first organ certainly known to have been used in a church was put into the cathedral at Aix-la-Chapel by the German emperor, Charlemagne, who came to the throne in the year 768. So deposes Prof. Hauck, of Germany, in the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, which you can find in some preacher’s library in your vicinity. The same learned author declares that its use met with great opposition among Romanists, especially from the monks, and that it made its way but slowly into common use. So great was this opposition even as late as the sixteenth century that he says it would probably have been abolished by the Council of Trent but for the influence of the emperor, Ferdinand. This council met in 1545. Thus we see that this innovation was one of the latest that crept into the Roman apostasy, and that it was so unwelcome even there that a struggle of about eight hundred years was necessary to enable it to force its way to universal acceptance. The Lutheran Church and the church of England brought it with them out of Romanism; all other Protestant churches started in their course of reform without it, and so continued until within the present century; while the Greek Church and Armenian Church, both more ancient than the Roman Church, still continue to reject it.

“To sum up these arguments, you can now see that this practice is one of recent origin among Protestant churches, adopted by them from the Roman apostasy; that it was one of the latest corruptions adopted by that corrupt body; that a large part of

the religious world has never accepted it; that, though employed in the Jewish ritual, it was deliberately laid aside by the inspired men who organized the church of Christ; and that several precepts of the New Testament implicitly condemn it.”

(5) Silas Jones, of Eureka (Ill.) College, to W. J. Roberts, Ripley, Ia., Jan. 8, 1908:

“My Dear Brother: President Hieronymus has asked me to answer your question in your letter of December 23, 1907. Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament defines *psallo* thus: (a) to pluck off, pull out; (b) to cause to vibrate by touching, to twang, to touch or strike the cord, to twang the strings of a musical instrument so that they will vibrate gently; and absolutely, to play on an instrument, to play the harp. *In the New Testament*—TO SING A HYMN, TO CELEBRATE THE PRAISES OF GOD IN SONG. There is no command in the New Testament to use instruments of music in worship, and there is no command not to use them.

Very truly yours,

Silas Jones.”

(6) Sherman Kirk, of Drake University, Des Moines, Ia., to W. G. Roberts, Dec. 25, 1907:

“My Dear Sir: Your letter to the president of the university was handed to me to answer. The word *psallo* means, primarily, to cause to vibrate by touching; to twang; to touch or strike the cord; and *in the New Testament it means to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praise of God in song.* (Jas. 5:13). This is taken from Thayer’s Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament. I think the New Testament does not authorize instrumental music by the word *psallo or psalmois*, or any other word.

Very sincerely,

Sherman Kirk.”

(Remember Silas Jones and Sherman Kirk represented schools run by our brethren who use the instruments. They certainly would have said something in its favor if they could).

(7) THOMAS AQUINAS, surnamed the Angelic Doctor, one of the most learned scholastic doctors produced by the church of Rome in the thirteenth century, and a voluminous writer, says:

“Our church does not use musical instruments, as harps and psalteries, to praise God withal, that she may not seem to Judaize.” Bingham’s Ant., Vol. 3, p. 137.

(8) ERASMUS (DESIDERIUS), a contemporary of Martin Luther and the most renowned classical scholar of his age, who is represented by high authority as “the most gifted and industrious pioneer of modern scholarship” says:

“We have brought into our churches certain operatic and theatrical music; such a confused, disorderly chattering of some words as I hardly think was ever in any of the Grecian or Roman theatres. The church rings with the noise of trumpets, pipes, and dulcimers; and human voices strive to bear their part with them. Men run to church as to a theatre, to have their ears tickled. And for this end organ makers are hired with great salaries, and a company of boys, who waste all their time in learning these whining tones.” Com. on I Cor. 14:19.

(9) JOHN CALVIN, the illustrious founder of the Presbyterian denomination, says:

“Musical instruments in celebrating the praises of God would be no more suitable than the burning of incense, the lighting of lamps, and the restoration of the other shadows of the law. The Papists therefore, have foolishly borrowed, this, as well as many other things, from the Jews. Men who are fond of outward pomp may delight in that noise; but the simplicity which God recommends to us by the apostles is far more pleasing to him. Paul allows us to bless God in the public assembly of the saints, only in a known tongue (I Cor. 14:16) * * * What shall we then say of chanting, which fills the ears with nothing but an empty sound?” Com. on Psa. xxxiii.

(10) THEODORE BEZA, the great Genevan scholar and translator, who was a friend and coadjutor of Calvin, says:

“If the apostle justly prohibits the use of unknown tongues in

the church, much less would he have tolerated these artificial musical performances which are addressed to the ear alone, and seldom strike the understanding even of the performers themselves.” Girardeau’s *Ins. Music*, p. 166.

(11) JOSEPH BINGHAM, the well known author of “*Antiquities of the Christian Church*” and said to be one of the most learned men the Church of England has ever produced, says:

“Music in churches is as ancient as the apostles, but instrumental music not so.” *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 137.

(12) LYMAN COLLMAN, an accurate scholar and Presbyterian author, says:

“The tendency of this (instrumental music) was to secularize the music of the church, and to encourage singing by a choir. Such musical accompaniments were gradually introduced; but they can hardly be assigned to a period earlier than the fifth and sixth centuries. Organs were unknown in church until the eighth or ninth century. Previous to this, they had their place in the theater, rather than in the church. They were never regarded with favor in the Eastern church, and were vehemently opposed in many places in the West.” *Primitive Church*, pp. 376, 377.

(13) PROF. JOHN GIRARDEAU, a Presbyterian and Professor in Columbia Theological Seminary, says:

“The church, although lapsing more and more into defection from the truth and into a corruption of apostolic practice, had no instrumental music for 1, 200 years (that is it was not in general use before this time); * * * the Calvinistic Reformed Church ejected it from its services as an element of popery, even the Church of England having come very nigh to its extrusion from her worship * * * It is heresy in the sphere of worship.” *Instrumental Music*, p. 179.

(14) JOHN WESLEY:

“I have no objection to the instruments being in our chapels, provided they are neither seen nor heard.”

(15) ADAM CLARK (Methodist) An author of one of our best

commentaries:

“I am an old man, and I here declare that I never knew them to be productive of any good in the worship of God, and have reason to believe that they are productive of much evil. Music is a science I esteem and admire, but instrumental music in the house of God I abominate and abhor. This is the abuse of music, and I here register my protest against all such corruption of the worship of the author of Christianity.”

(16) CHARLES H. SPURGEON, one of the greatest men the Baptists have ever produced:

“Praise the Lord with the harp. Israel was at school, and used childish things to help her to learn; but in these days, when Jesus gives us spiritual food, one can make melody without strings and pipes * * * We do not need them. They would hinder rather than help our praise. Sing unto him. This is the sweetest and best music. No instrument like the human voice.”
Comments on Psa. 42:4.

Spurgeon says:

“David appears to have had a peculiarly tender remembrance of the singing of the pilgrims, and assuredly it is the most delightful part of worship and that which comes nearest to the adoration of heaven. What a degradation to supplant the intelligent song of the whole congregation by the theatrical prettiness of a quartet, bellows, and pipes! We might as well pray by machinery as praise by it.”

(17) ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, one of the most powerful scholars in the Restoration of Primitive Christianity:

“The argument drawn from the Psalms in favor of instrumental music is exceedingly apposite to the Roman Catholic, English Protestant, and Scotch Presbyterian Churches, and even to the Methodist communities. Their churches have all the world in them—that is, all the fleshly progeny of all the communicants; and being founded on the Jewish pattern of things—baptism being given to all born into the world of these politico-ecclesiastic communities—I wonder not, then, that an

organ, a fiddle, or a Jew's harp, should be requisite to stir up their carnal hearts, and work into ecstasy their animal souls, else hosannas languish on their tongues, and their devotions die. * * * And that all persons who have no spiritual discernment, taste, or relish for their spiritual meditations, consolations, and sympathies of renewed hearts, should call for such aids is but natural * * * So to those who have no real devotion or spirituality in them, and whose animal nature flags under the oppression of church service, I think that instrumental music would be not only a desideratum, but an essential prerequisite to fire up their souls to even animal devotion. But I presume, to all spiritually-minded Christians such aids would be as a cow bell in a concert.” (Millennial Harbinger, 1851, page 581).

(18) ISAAC ERRETT, in Harbinger of 1861:

“That melody in the heart is the great end to be sought, and that artistic excellence is only valuable as may conduct to that end. That the highest artistic skill in sacred music has somehow been generally associated with the lowest spiritual culture, and has been far more promotive of sensuous than of spiritual attractions. That the genius of this reformatory movement, like that of previous reformations, is not favorable to choir singing and instrumental music. Its sympathies are with bewildered and sin-oppressed masses, and it wants ‘music for the million.’ Its original power will be largely lost when the stirring melodies of its early days shall have been supplanted by stately artistic performances. As the church of Christ is the common home of all his people — ‘Barbarian, Scythian, bond and free,’ who are all one in Christ Jesus—and as singing is the only part of worship in which the great mass of Christians can personally participate, no choir singing or instrumental music should ever be allowed to interfere for a moment with this privilege and right of the saints.”

Now, how does the above testimony sound to you, kind reader? Does it look now like we are a set of “old fogies,” as we are sometimes called, with no company except the illiterate of the earth? May I tell you that we feel quite comfortable sitting with the scholars quoted above and also in our preceding articles. Too, I may say, we are

delighted; for we have Christ and all of his apostles sitting with us.

Bro. Pendleton's proposition says, "The New Testament teaches that the disciples of Christ have a right to use instrumental music in worship when assembled together for worship." But may I say his "New Testament" was used but little by him. I don't suppose he stayed in the New Testament "ten minutes" during the five nights' discussion. Do you wonder why? There is no wonder about it. The man does not live that can talk ten minutes on instrumental music in church worship and stay in the New Testament; for the New Testament says nothing about such worship. In the correspondence, preparatory to the discussion, Bro. Pendleton stated that he had been in the "ministry— nearly thirty years in which" he had "not mentioned the 'music question' half a dozen times." He also said: "I never spoke half an hour on the subject all put together." Now is this not pretty strong evidence that the New Testament says nothing about it? How could he manage to dodge it so successfully in thirty years preaching as to strike it only seven times, if it is taught in the New Testament? There being no proof in the New Testament for him, he rushed to the Psalms of David and other books; and, of course, I went into the same fields with him and met him on his own grounds with such testimony as given above and in the articles gone before.

Bro. Pendleton got exceedingly nervous about this stage of the discussion, made another strong objection to debates, said he wished he was not there, etc. But the most interesting predicament that his excitement led him into about this time was this: he had said that his father was the education behind Alexander Campbell, and that he thought he remembered to have signed Sherman Kirk's diploma: "Why," said he, "Isaac Errett did not know the Greek alphabet, and in his editorial work on the Christian Standard, when any question arose which could not be handled without reference to the Greek, it was always referred to my father, who was the only accomplished Greek scholar among the Disciples."

Remember these were three of my witnesses that I had introduced: Sherman Kirk, representing Drake University, and Alexander Campbell and Isaac Errett who need no introduction. Bro. Pendleton, in his strait, seems to have forgotten what he said and in commenting on the scholarship that I had introduced, said they were not scholars, that they were ignoramuses on this question. I then asked him if he

knew he was striking himself, and his learned father also, in the face when he made the statement; in as much as he had represented himself as signing one of my men's diploma and his father as the education behind two of them. So he, Saul-like (I Sam. 31:4, 5), fell upon his own sword. But what better could he have done?

Chapter Four

5. Bro. Pendleton having abandoned *psallo*, his case, as stated before, is now hanging on one word, viz.: *psalmos*. He has, so to speak, been driven from every fortification behind which he sought protection and has fled to the furthest end of *psalmos-point*, that extends out over the sea of defeat, from which he must inevitably fall.

I must confess that I was not expecting him to divorce *psallo* and *psalmos*, the latter being the noun form of the former. He dropped all of his authorities that he had introduced and that he intended to introduce on *psallo*, and rested his case on *psalmos*. He was asked what he would think of a Methodist's trying to rule the verb "believe" out of court in debating the proposition that salvation is by *faith* only. The proposition has the noun *faith*, but Christ said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved:" *faith* is a noun form of the verb "believeth."

On the same grounds that Bro. Pendleton tried to rule *psallo* out of the debate, after introducing it, the Methodist could rule "believeth" out in Christ's statement above. But the use that has been made of *psallo* in dealing out death to his own proposition, made it so warm that he could not well hold to it longer.

6. Since Bro. Pendleton rested his case on the word *psalmos*, in Eph. 5:19 and Col. 3:16, this question was asked him: "*Is the instrument essential to obedience to the command in Eph. 5:19?*" This question was repeated a number of times before he would notice it. It was insisted that the question was vital and *must be* answered. Finally, he appealed to the moderators, claiming the question was not pertinent and that I was out of order in insisting that he answer it. His moderator concurred with him in the contention. Here Bro. Shepherd did some of his splendid work as a moderator, stating that I had a right to ask the question, and that Bro. Pendleton could answer it if he wanted to, or he could let it alone, and that it would be left for the audience to judge as to why he would not answer.

Indeed, this question was a thorn in Bro. Pendleton's flesh, and he seemed to be fully aware of the fact that the audience could see it. And well can you see it too, kind reader; for (1) if he said the instrument was essential to obedience in this command, then he would be forced

to admit that we were sinning in not using it. But he had stated in the correspondence that our practice is right, that we do not have to use the instrument.

(2) If he said the instrument was not essential to obedience to the command in Eph. 5:19, then down went his contention that *psalms* translated psalms, contains the idea of instrumental accompaniment. Here he was confronted with a dilemma, and answer it, he would not.

But to made his confusion worse confounded, he claimed, that a noun has nothing to do with a command, that in the verb we find commands, that he was not resting his case on the verb *psallo* but on the noun *psalmos* as found in Eph. 5:19. Hence, he contended that the question: “Is the instrument essential to obedience to the command in Eph. 5:19 and Col. 3:16?” was not pertinent. In reply, it was shown that, if his position be correct, there is no command for water baptism. He was asked if we have “water” in the verb form in the command for water baptism; that if it were not a fact that baptidzo is the verb in that command, which means to dip, plunge, or immerse without regard to the element in which to do the immersing; that if the element were not expressed in the noun “water” would we have any command for water baptism. This disconcerted Bro. Pendleton no little; it seemed to have shocked him like a clap of thunder from a clear sky.

His next effort to dodge this question—for it seemed to be worrying him no little—was on the *mode* of the verbs in Eph. 5:18, 19 and Col. 3:16. He said he felt very much like opening a school for me to attend, that the *mode* here was not that used in mandatory commands, that it was not a command that had to be obeyed like baptism, etc. — and here I might say a school was opened for a few minutes.

“Let” and “be” are the verbs in these two scriptures: (1) “*Let* the words of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs” (Col. 3:16); (2) “*Be* not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but *be* filled with the spirit; speaking to yourselves in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord.” (Eph. 5:18, 19). In reply it was shown that, if his position be true, it is not necessary to “Let the word of Christ dwell in us richly,” for this is what it says. Neither is it necessary for us to have the mind of Christ when Paul says, “Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ

Jesus.” (Phil. 2:5). And worse still, when Paul says, “Let him that stole, steal no more” (Eph. 4:28), it is not mandatory, that we do not steal. The same was shown in regard in the verb “be.” If it is not mandatory, then we can get drunk and allow not the Spirit to dwell in us; for Paul says, “Be not drunk with wine * * *, but be filled with the Spirit.”

Kind reader, what do you think of such dodging? It seems that his proposition is not finding much more *rest* on *psalmos* than it found on *psallo*. Here to make absurdity ridiculously absurd, he replied that it was true we *must* “let the words of Christ dwell in us” and “be not drunk with wine,” but that the binding force of these things was not in the verbs “let” and “be” but in the mind of Christ. He was then asked to tell how that binding force got from the mind of Christ to the hearts of those Christians, if it were not conveyed through the two verbs in question.

How weak indeed, is a proposition that will force a man of Bro. Pendleton’s learning and ability into such straits. Here the audience’s attention was called to the fact that the trouble was not in Bro. Pendleton’s strength, but in the weakness of his proposition; that his proposition makes *babies* of *giants*; that Brethren Stark and Briney suffered just as Bro. Pendleton was suffering in trying to establish a similar proposition.

Bro. Pendleton spoke of instrumental music in worship being such a little thing, as though it were too little to debate. It was replied that granting it to be a *little* thing, he would have to admit that *Christian Union* is a *big* thing (See Psa. 133:1; Jno. 17:20-22; I Cor. 1:10; Prov. 6:16-19), and that if he really thought it was so *little*, why not drop it for something *big*, viz.: *a united brotherhood*. How strange that people will make such things their god, and hold to them at the expense of the prayers and wishes of God’s Son.

Bro. Pendleton was told that Paul said, “He that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith; for whatsoever is not of faith, is sin.” (Rom. 14:23). It was insisted that he must establish his proposition beyond a doubt before Christians could afford to embrace it. At this, he complained no little, stating that no proposition could be established beyond a doubt, that even the proposition that Christ is the Son of God could not be established beyond a doubt. Here it was

replied that we were not debating the question from the standpoint of an infidel, but from the standpoint of New Testament teaching. He was asked *if the New Testament does not teach beyond a doubt that Christ is the Son of God?* and that the thing we wanted him to do was to show that the *New Testament teaches* that we have a right to use instrumental music in connection with our worship when assembled together for worship.

But in vain does his proposition wait for a friend to come to its rescue and do the *impossible task* of showing that the *New Testament sustains it*.

7. That David and others sang with instrumental accompaniment under the Old Testament, was admitted. But it was shown that even then the *psalm* did not include the idea of instrumental accompaniment. To settle this, we read Psalms 81:2 “Take a psalm (words to be sung), and bring hither the timbrel, the pleasant harp with the psaltery.” If the word psalm includes the instrument, why did David go ahead and name the instruments after using the word *psalm*? Echo answers WHY? We have the word *psalms* standing alone in Eph. 5:19. Lovers of man’s way want that word to bring in the instrument, when that is calling upon it to do more than it did even in David’s day; the word *then* did not mean a song to be sung to the instrument, hence the instrument had to be stated. See also Psa. 149:3.

The following clipping was then read and Bro. Pendleton was asked if he endorsed the procedure described:

“The presence of thirty-five canary birds as a part of the choir and participating in the Sabbath-morning musical program constituted a unique innovation in the regular religious services at Lincoln Park Institutional Baptist Church.

“The idea of calling the birds into commission as a part of the choir was original with the pastor, Dr. George R. Robbins, and the use of the canaries along with the choir voices and the great church organ, it was declared by members of the congregation, added greatly to the choir service.

“The sermon was based upon the text: ‘Who are these that come flying through the air like doves?’

“The regular song service preceded the discourse by Dr. Robbins. Members of the congregation had been charged in advance to bring with them as many canaries as were available. The birds began their chirping with the first strains from the choir and ceased when the music did. The keeping of musical time was noticeable, especially in the observance of the slight intermission between voices of the song. Dr. Robbins and many members of the congregation did not hesitate to assert that the feature of the canaries added much to the service.”—G. A. Aug. 5, 1909.

After reading the above, it was asked how he could object to it after trying to make the arguments he had from the Psalms of David; since the last words of David’s last Psalm, are, “Let every thing that hath breath praise the Lord.” Shall we bring the canaries into our worship because David said this? How weak the position! And how strange that those who say they love the truth will run off after such things!

8. The following additional testimony was brought into use as to the meaning of *psalmos*:

(1) Robinson’s Greek Lexicon: (Psalms) “In the New Testament, a psalm, a song in praise of God.”

(2) Green’s Lexicon: (Psalms) “A sacred song, psalm.”

(3) Bagster’s Lexicon: (Psalms) “In the New Testament, a sacred song, psalm.”

(4) Webster’s International Dictionary: (Psalm) “A sacred song, a poetical composition for use in the praise of worship to God; to extol in psalms; to sing—as psalming his praise.”

(5) Funk and Wagnalls’ Standard Dictionary: (Psalm) “To celebrate, extol, or praise with psalms, songs, or hymns; to sing psalms.” (Psalmody) “The use of psalms or hymns of praise in divine worship; psalm singing.”

(6) Standard Dictionary: Psalmody; to hymn, “The art, act, or practice of singing psalms, hymns, as a part of worship; to hymn, celebrate in psalms.”

(7) J. W. McGarvey in Christian Standard of 1895: “If any man

who is a preacher says that the apostle teaches the use of instrumental music in the church by enjoining the singing of psalms, he is one of those smatterers in Greek who can believe anything he wishes to believe.”

(8) Conybeare and Howson, two scholars of high repute in the Church of England, commenting on Eph. 5:19, say: “Let your songs be, not the drinking songs of heathen feasts, but psalms and hymns; and their accompaniment, not the music of the lyre, but the melody of the heart.” *Life and Epis. of Paul*, Vol. 2, p. 408.

(9) We then stepped back almost close enough to John, the apostle, as to clasp his hand, and read: (1) Justin Martyr (A.D. 139): “The use of singing with instrumental music was not received in the Christian churches, as it was among the Jews in their infant state, but only the use of plain song;” (2) Chrysostom (A.D. 347): “It was only permitted to the Jews, as sacrifice was, for the heaviness and grossness of their souls. God condescended to their weakness because they were lately drawn off from idols; but now, instead of organs, we may use our own bodies to praise him with.”

(10) Moses E. Lard, who has given us the matchless commentary on Romans: “The day on which a church sets up an organ in its house, is the day on which it reaches the first station on the road to apostasy. From this it will soon proceed to other innovations; and the work of innovations once fairly commenced, no stop can be put to it till ruin ensues.”

(11) Strong quotations were also given from Benjamin Franklin and others, but space forbids more quotations.

Bro. Pendleton’s attention was also called to the fact, that in ten different translations of the New Testament—which translations were quoted—in which we have the best efforts of about one hundred and fifty of the best scholars we have ever had, that *not* in *one* is there to be found a translation with the instrumental music idea in it. Then, in addition to this, the Greek Church composed of thousands of people who spoke the very language in which the New Testament was written, has never used the instrumental music in their worship. *Is this not enough to convince any man that is governed by testimony?*

9. We come now to the closing scene. Arguments were made in rebuttal on “The Ways of Cain and Abel,” “The Two Covenants,” and “The Law of Faith.” But we think it best to give these arguments in full development under their respective headings instead of condensing them into this write-up.

Bro. Pendleton introduced nothing new in the way of evidence the last night. In fact, he did not make much use of the material he had introduced, by way of recapitulation. He simply rested his case on *psalmos* with the contention that it meant, in the Old Testament, a song to be sung to the accompaniment of the instrument, and that I must show that its meaning was changed. He also made a sally at bluffing in his efforts to hold on to *psalmos-point*. It was this: he proposed that the evidence that had been introduced in the oral discussion be placed before some judge of court, and let him examine it and decide whether his proposition had been established, on the condition that I was to pay him \$2,000 if the judge decided in his favor, and he pay me \$2,000 if the decision was against him.

Indeed, this was amusing to me. In my reply, I began with his proposition by saying that I would accept it with some modification, viz.: (1) that the question was one that each individual must decide for himself, that the judge could decide it for himself, but not for others, that the auditors before us were the judges of the oral discussion; (2) but that the only thing about the debate with which I was not pleased, was that not enough people had heard it; (3) hence, in lieu of Bro. Pendleton’s proposition, I proposed that we write our speeches and publish them in bound volume and place one copy as free literature in every home in Atlanta, he paying half the expense and I would pay the other half, that a copy could be placed in the hands of some judge and let him render his decision, but that he would decide it for himself and not others. I insisted that Bro. Pendleton let us know in his rejoinder, which was his last speech in the debate. A “Togo-blow” was also made on the word *psalmos* on which he had rested his case, most of the matter being given in Nos. 8, 9, and 10 above. It was shown conclusively that many words used in the Old Testament had an entirely different meaning in the New Testament: Circumcision was given as an example. Bro. Pendleton was asked if he did not open the debate with the contention that the word *worship* in the Old Testament had exactly the *opposite meaning* in the New Testament. He seems to have forgotten this and rested his case on the idea that *psalmos* in the

Old Testament allowed the use of the instrument and that it *must* have this meaning in the New Testament.

But it was shown that *Psalmos* (psalm) did not even include the idea of the instrument in the Old Testament—Here, kind reader, turn to Psalms 81:2 and read it carefully. Notice there that “Take a *psalm*” *did not* necessarily mean to take the instrument, hence it must be stated that the instrument is to be taken, if taken at all. It was shown that the idea of the instrument was not in the word and only got connected with the word, even in Classical Greek, by the law of association. Then the phraseology of the Psalms of David were compared with that of the New Testament. It was shown that *then* the psalm was commanded to be brought and also the instruments, but *in the New Testament* the psalms are commanded to be used, but the additional command to use the instruments also, was not given.

Well, I must confess that Bro. Pendleton’s closing speech showed that he was perfectly lost. He even stated that his contention was not that *psalmos* contained the idea of the instrument, but that *psalmos* and *psallo*—*even* grabbed again at *psallo*—*were musical* terms and that his contention was that they contained the *musical* idea. Here he sang the two words or rather called them over trying to make them sound *musical*.

In my closing speech, I called the audience’s attention to the fact that when he stated that *psalmos* did not carry with it the idea of the *instrument*, but rather the *musical* idea, he gave up the question, that the debate was not over the *musical* idea; for the New Testament taught us to make vocal music by psalming or singing, that the debate was over the idea of instrumental accompaniment—here I might say, it was hard for Bro. Pendleton to sit still while I was on this point. It was also shown that Liddell and Scott give “plucking the hair or beard” as one meaning of *psallo*, and Bro. Pendleton was asked what kind of music all this would make. Thus our able opponent tumbled from *psalmos-point* into the sea of utter defeat.

But, doubtless, you want to know what was done with the proposition that was suggested in lieu of the one Bro. Pendleton suggested. Be it remembered that his proposition was not repeated; and, with some degree of embarrassment, he replied to mine by saying the people of Atlanta were not capable of deciding such a question as the one we

were discussing. Did you ever! If his statement were true, I had followed the brother for five nights in water too deep for the brains of Atlanta to fathom.

Now may I conclude, kind reader, by telling, you, that the position we hold is not the choice of the flesh. In fact, our whole fleshly nature rebels against the position we hold; for it is very unpopular. But *it is a matter of conscience, it is a matter of loyalty to Christ*. We are taught to walk by faith, though it leads us, as it did the early Christians, at times, to stand all alone and to be looked upon as “fools” for Christ’s sake (See I Cor. 4:11-13). We commend what we have written to your careful consideration, and especially the articles that follow this one on the subjects named above. Praying God to bless you I am yours for the “old path.”

THE WAYS OF CAIN AND ABEL

Jehovah says, “But to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and that *trembleth* at my word.” (Isa. 66:2). We should ever remember *that when we* approach God, we should remove *our* sandals from our feet and be shod with those *He has prepared* (Eph. 6:15); for, in his presence, we are walking on holy ground—

Father, help us, we beseech thee,

To worship thee “acceptably with reverence and godly fear;”

And to remember that the “fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.”

Let us imagine that we are sitting together almost at the very beginning of time, with the first family that ever existed, and we are beholding them as they worship the same God whom we all, I hope, desire to worship aright today. Let us study carefully what we see. Remember, however, that we are just cut of the garden of Eden and why we are outside; that Satan has entered that beautiful abode and enticed Eve and, through her, Adam to violate God’s law. But while sitting there, we see away in the distance the “Star of Bethlehem” dimly shining in the words, “the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent’s head” and in the lamb that Abel brings to the altar.

But let us *beware*, as we sit here; for, doubtless, the same enemy who caused the happy two to violate Jehovah’s law in the garden, is still pursuing them and will make an effort to keep them down after causing them to fall.

Behold! here come Cain and Abel with offerings unto the Lord, whose law their father and mother had broken. *This looks so impressive*: Two brothers in the flesh, bringing their offerings before the God who planted the beautiful Eden home in which their father and mother once lived. Doubtless they have learned all about their father and mother’s sin and why they are out of the garden and have been made to feel the necessity of bringing offerings to the Lord. So as far as we are able to see Satan is not in this work; in fact, how could he have anything to do with such a beautiful service?

But, on the wings of time, we soar over the centuries to nearly our own

day and settle down in the days of the apostles, and we listen to them as they speak of the offerings that we have just seen. (1) Paul: “By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God *testifying* of his gifts; and by it he being dead yet speaketh.” (Heb. 11:4). (2) Jude: “*Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain.*” (Jude 11). We hear these words about sixty years after Christ was born into the world, and about four thousand years after Cain and Abel’s day. What can be the trouble? Did Satan have anything to do with those offerings? Indeed, and it is our purpose to learn what the trouble was, and take warning. Cain and Abel walked in two entirely different ways, notwithstanding the fact, they were brothers in the flesh and, I presume, worshipped at the same altar. The *ways of Cain and Abel are ways of worship*, and should be carefully studied by every one who desires to please God.

Here is the first religious difference that ever arose between men on earth, and it occurred in the first family, between brothers in the flesh, and these two brothers have been placed on record in both Old and New Testaments as representatives of the *two ways*, one *broad* and the *other narrow*, *one leading to death* and the other unto *eternal life*. It becomes highly important, then, that we learn:

The Difference Between The Two

It is not easy to see, at a glance, just how two worshippers of the same God at the same altar, can represent two ways so divergent from each other. Yet this is true of these two brothers. Let us inquire:

(1) Does the difference consist in Abel’s believing there is a God and Cain’s not believing it? Indeed, it does not; for Cain believed God existed as much as did Abel.

(2) Does the difference consist in Abel’s believing that God ought to be worshipped and Cain’s not believing it? Certainly not, for Cain brought his offerings unto God as zealously as did Abel.

(3) Does the difference consist in Abel’s being prompt and diligent in this worship and Cain’s being careless in bringing his offering? Certainly not, for the record shows that Cain was as prompt as Abel. Here is the record: “And in process of time, it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering to the Lord. And Abel, he

also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof.” (Gen. 4:3, 4). Hence, it is easy to be seen that they both believed in the true God, that they both believed God ought to be worshipped, and that they both brought their offerings unto the same God. Yet one of these boys represents the way to heaven, and the other the way to death. Hence, we can readily see that two beings can be, one in the broad way, and the other in the narrow way, while believing in the existence of and worshipping the same God. Cain was not an Atheist; he does not represent that class. Cain represents one class of worshippers and Abel another class. They together represent the two ways of worship, viz.: The right way and the wrong way, the narrow way and the broad way. May I again ask, *What is the difference between Cain and Abel?*

John says, Cain’s “works were evil, and his brother’s righteous” (1 John 3:12). But it certainly says, “And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord.” How could this be evil? Remember, it says Abel’s works, the act of bringing the lamb, was righteous. How could one of these acts be righteous and the other evil? Remember, too, it teaches that Abel *did well* in bringing his offering, but that Cain *did not well* in what he did. How could one of these acts be righteous, *doing well*, and the other act be unrighteous, or *doing not well*? It also says, “The Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering: but to Cain and his offering he had not respect.” See Gen. 4:4, 5. *Why this difference?*

But suppose, we call up a few more scriptures and see if they can help us any. David says, “The entrance of thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding to the simple.” Let us call, then, to our help a few more statements from God’s truth:

(1) Jeremiah 10:23: “O Lord, I know the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps.”

(2) Isaiah 55:8, 9: “For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.”

Undoubtedly Cain walked in his own thoughts and ways in bringing the offering he did, instead of letting Jehovah guide him. David says, “Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory.” Certainly Cain had some directions that he ignored in this

matter. Remember it says God respected Abel and his offering, but did not respect Cain and his offering. It would be well to ask, then: What and whom does God respect and why? Let Isaiah answer: “Thou meetest him that rejoiceth and worketh righteousness, *those that remember thee* in thy ways.” (Isa. 64:5).

It is easy to be seen, then, that Abel walked in God’s way, was directed by God’s commandments or righteousness—(Psa. 119:172), while Cain walked in his own way, was guided by his own ideas of what he should offer. Truly did Christ say, “In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men” (Matt. 15:9), and Paul says, “My heart’s desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God’s righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.” (Rom. 10:1-3).

But let us call Paul again to our assistance just here. He says, “By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God *testifying* of *his gifts*.” (Heb. 11:4). Here we learn that their gifts differed in that God *testified* of one and did not testify of the other; one brought what God had *testified* of, or said bring, while the other brought an offering that God had not *testified* of or said bring. Hence, God had respect unto Abel and to his offering because he had brought only that which he had taught him to bring; while he had no respect for Cain and his offering because he brought that which God had not testified of or told him to bring.

But let us look at it from another angle. Paul says, “By faith Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain.” This makes the difference, one of faith. But may I ask, *Wherein did their faith differ?* In the fact that one believed God existed and the other did not? Certainly not; they had common faith on this point. Did their faith differ in the fact that one believed God should be worshipped and the other did not? Certainly not, for Cain believed that God should be worshipped as much so as did Abel. Where, then, is the difference? It was certainly a difference of faith. Well, one believed that you should bring an offering unto the true and living God, and that you must bring only what he *testifies of or says bring*. The other believed that you

should bring offerings unto the true and living God, but that something God had not testified of, would do as well as what he had said bring. Hence, one believed in worshipping the right object only in the way he said for men to worship. The other believed he should worship the right object, but *any old way would do*. One is the *broad, liberal minded way*; the other is the *narrow way*, just as narrow and just as broad as the testimony goes.

Doubtless Cain's way seemed right to him; for Solomon says, "There is a *way* which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the *ways* of death." (Prov. 14:12). So certain was Cain that he was right that he got exceedingly angry when it was called in question.

Ah! my friend, can you not see the way of Cain? It is a way in which worshippers of the true and living God travel. The idea is: *just so you worship the right object, any way will do*. Indeed this does seem right—God says it seems right to us—but the *end thereof are ways*: it gives birth to as many ways as there are likes and dislikes among us.

But let us apply this lesson to the music question. What is the difference in instrumental music in worship today and vocal music? Exactly the same difference that existed between Cain's and Abel's offerings.

Now let us see:

(1) Do we have any testimony in behalf of vocal music? is it called a sacrifice? and are we commanded to offer it? Indeed we are. Listen: "By him (Christ) therefore let us *offer the sacrifice of praise* to God continually, that is, the *fruit of our lips* giving thanks to his name." (Heb. 13:15). In this offering, we are told to "*utter by the tongue words easy to be understood*," to "sing with the spirit" and "with the understanding also." (I Cor. 14:9, 15). Remember, too, that in this sacrifice, we speak to one another, teach and admonish one another, "in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in our hearts unto the Lord." (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16).

But where, in the New Testament, is there any testimony for instrumental music in worship? Echo answers *where*? It is not to be found. Abel's offering was an offering of faith, it was this that made it more excellent than Cain's offering. But Paul says, "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." (Rom. 10:17). Abel had the

word of God for what he did, Cain did not. Just so we have the word of God for the music we offer in our worship, but those who use instrumental music have not. Then, kind reader, do you think it strange that we do not use it?

These facts were presented to Bro. Pendleton in our debate: somewhat more condensed, however. Are you surprised when I tell you he made no attempt at answering?

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To M. C. Kurfees' great work on "Walking by Faith," and "Otey-Briney Debate," "Stark-Warlick Debate" and "D. Lipscomb's Dispositions," we are indebted for a number of quotations used in the above debate. —S. H. H.

PART TWO: THE MUSIC QUESTION

Discussed by

S. H. HALL, Atlanta, Ga. and

R. C. HARRELL, Longlane, Mo.

Preface

It is strange that people, in religion, will be so careless and presumptuous. Man's every desire should be to please God. This is certainly the spirit that governed our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ while he was here in the flesh. "For I do always those things that please him," said he. (John 8:28, 29). Again he said, "I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." What better can we do than to *wholly* surrender to our Father's teaching as did he? It is sad to see so many claiming to be preachers of the gospel instead of teaching the people what God says, teaching them the "*doctrines and commandments of men,*" leading the people to worship God "*in vain*" hence making themselves "*blind guides*" instead of true teachers of "the Word." (See Matt. 15:9, 14.) For my part, I shall ever teach and practice only that that I can *prove*, for I am commanded "To prove all things" that I teach in the name of Christ.

The discussion on the following pages grew out of an article from the writer on "Prove All Things" that was published in the Firm Foundation Jan. 31, 1911. We ask you, kind reader, to give it a careful reading, desiring to "Stand perfect and complete in all the will of God." (Col. 4:12).

Those who use instrumental music in worship certainly have a hard time trying to defend it. But they are to be blamed for taking positions that they cannot defend. There are hardly any two of them that will take the same position. J. Carrol Stark took the position that, in the New Testament, we are told to worship God in song but are not told how and that we have to go to the Psalms of David to learn how, that the Psalms of David belong to the New Testament. In my debate with H. K. Pendleton, one of their strongest men, he took the position that the instrument comes in through the Greek words *psallo* and *psalms*.

Bro. Harrell comes along and says it can come in *only* as an expedient. E. S. Smith, another one of their strongest men, took this position in a discussion that the writer had with him. These brethren claim that they believe in “organized effort,” but when it comes to defending instrumental music in worship, we find them sadly “disorganized.”

My challenge still stands, viz: *“There is not a man on earth who can prove God is pleased with instrumental music in worship under the New Covenant.”*

Chapter One

S.H. Hall

1. Paul says in I. Thes. 5:21, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." In Eph. 5:10, he says: "Proving what is acceptable unto the Lord." On the above, I would make the following comments: (1) To please God should be our greatest desire. This was the spirit that ever animated his Son, Jesus the Christ; he said, "I do always those things that please him." (Jno. 8:29). Paul says, "Now if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." (Rom. 8:11). The spirit that ever dwelt in the bosom of *God's* Son, was *to* please him who sent him here to die for the world. (2) Therefore, we shall see to it, we should be careful, that our acts are well-pleasing in the sight of God. We are commanded to prove that they are. In Eph. 5:10, R.V., the command is "Proving what is well-pleasing unto the Lord." In I Thes. 5:21, as before stated, it is, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." Only that which we can prove, is good. If all should eliminate from their work and worship, those things they cannot prove is well-pleasing unto God, then the prayer Christ taught his disciples to pray would be answered, viz: "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

2. But let us inquire, What will please God?

(1) Not that which we of ourselves think is right or will please him. "There is a way that seemeth right unto man, but the end thereof are the ways of death." (Prov. 14:12). "Yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service." (Jno. 16:2). No, indeed, we cannot let our perverted minds and thoughts say what will please God. "O, Lord I know the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." (Jer. 10:23). May we then, look to a higher clime for thoughts to direct us, for proof as to what will please God. "For," saith Jehovah, "my thoughts are not your thoughts neither are your ways my ways--For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." (Isa. 55:8-9).

(2) Christ tells us what will please his Father. In John 8:29, he says, "I do always those things that please him." But, now read the verse before this, 28th, and see what he really did. He says, "I do *nothing* of

myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things.” Ah! do you not see the secret? If he did nothing of himself, why should we claim the liberty to do so? He did nothing that he could not prove his Father wanted him to do. Are you doing, my brother, in your work and worship, things he has not taught you to do? If so, you are in rebellion to God, walking contrary to the Spirit of his Son.

3. When we get after some of our brethren for using instrumental music in church worship, they usually reply, “Where does the Bible say it is a sin to use it? Will you affirm that it is sin to use it?” Thus, they try to dodge the burden of proof that they are logically under obligations to shoulder. But rest easy, and we will meet them here.

(1) The command comes in thunderous tones, “Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.” Again, “prove what is acceptable unto the Lord.” Now, the reason we do not use it is because we are unable to prove that God wants us to use it under the New Covenant. It was certainly permitted under the Old Covenant, but when Christ established the New Covenant and the apostles, guided by the Holy Spirit, set in order the first congregations, they left the instruments out. We do not know how we are to learn that God would accept it if we were to use it now. Here we confess our inability. Now is there a Goliath on the side of humanism that feels able to come to the rescue of this invention? If so, send him out to the front of this great army of “will worshippers” (Col. 2:22-23) who stand opposed to the church of God, and let us see how well he can do battle in behalf of the devotees of this human relic. We can prove that it pleases God for us to “offer the sacrifice of praise, the fruit of our lips.” (Heb. 13:15), “uttering by the tongue words easy to be understood” (I Cor. 14:9), doing this with the spirit and understanding (15th verse), in which music we “speak to one another,” “teach and admonish one another” in “psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs” and make melody in our hearts to the Lord. (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16). I say we know he is pleased with this because we can prove it. But, as stated before, we cannot prove he accepts instrumental music in worship now—and *where is the man that can?* He does not exist. If you find him, let us know where he lives. The hardest thing we have ever undertaken to do, is to get a man to try to prove it. Only a very few (two are all that I have heard of) have ever undertaken the arduous task, and only one effort could we get them to make. You ask again, where is the proof that it is a sin? O, there is much proof. But all that I ask of you, for the time being, to grapple with, is your inability

to prove God is pleased with it. We confess we are unable to prove it, hence, refuse to use it. While we have many arguments to show it is a sin, the one we ask you now to consider is man's inability to prove God is pleased to see us thus worship him. May we yet hope for some one who practices instrumental music in church worship to come over and help us prove God will be pleased with it, if we use it? Meet this argument and we will not have to debate about who should be in the affirmative.

(2) We practice immersion only in baptizing penitent believers into Christ. You ask, why? Because we can prove that God is pleased to see us do so. But often are we asked, Won't sprinkling and pouring do as well? If it will we don't know it. We are perfectly willing to practice it if some one will come over and do that which we confess we are unable to do, viz.: prove that *it* will please God. But some of our neighbors who believe in sprinkling raise the question, "Where does the Bible say it is a sin?" O, well, it says it in all those places where you fail to find any proof that God will accept it, and this covers the whole book—quite a big field of proof, is it not? Asking us to point out the scripture where it says it is a sin, is like asking us to point to the scripture which says, it is a sin to use instrumental music under the New Covenant.

(3) We baptize penitent believers only. You ask why? Because we can prove God accepts it, is pleased with it. But you say, why not baptize the babies? My reason is that I cannot prove that God will accept it, that he will be pleased with it. If you can, I will gladly listen to you in your effort. But still we are asked, "Where in the Bible does God say it is a sin to baptize babies?" The thing that says it is a sin *loudest* and strongest, is the fact that no man on earth can prove God wants it done, that it will please him for us to do it. You had as well ask us to point you to the scripture that says it is a sin to use instrumental music in church worship today.

(4) We use bread and the fruit of the vine in commemorating the death of Christ and showing it forth till he comes again. We do this because we can prove God is pleased with it. Christ is spoken of as a Lamb, and we are taught to eat his flesh and drink his blood. You ask why we do not use a slice of mutton, well cooked, instead of the loaf or use it with the loaf? I answer because I cannot say God will be pleased with it, I am wholly unable to give any proof that he would. I cannot prove

this, hence, do not use it.

(5) You ask, why we call the church, “the church of God,” “the church of Christ,” and its members “Christians,” “saints,” or “disciples?” why not call them “Campbellites,” “Baptists,” “Methodists,” and the church, “The Baptist Church,” etc.? Well, we speak of the disciples and the church as the Holy Spirit speaks of them. We know this is right. “If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God.” (I Pet. 4:11). Will some one tell me how I can ever know here that God would be pleased with anything else? “Prove all things; hold fast to that which is good.” God’s thoughts are not ours; they are higher and better than our thoughts. It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps. This is what God says. Here is a man engaged in worship, and he is doing things God has not commanded him to do. By whose thoughts is he directed? Man’s, of course. Well did Christ say, “In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men.” (Matt. 15:9). In conclusion, let us hear Jeremiah, 6:16: “Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, walk therein and ye shall find rest to your souls.” Take the book of proof, the Bible, and show that God wants you to use the instrument before you ask your neighbor to engage with you in such worship. Here we confess that we are unable to furnish the proof. We have long looked for a man who can furnish the proof, but thus far fail to find him. Can you find him for us? (F. F. Jan. 31, 1911).

Chapter Two

R.C. Harrell

In looking over my papers, a few days ago, I was somewhat amused at an article written by S. H. Hall, of Atlanta, Ga., in the Firm Foundation of January 31, 1911. He seems to be anxious for a debate on the organ question. He says: "We cannot prove he accepts instrumental music in the worship now—and where is the man that can? He does not exist. If you find him, let us know where he lives." Again, he says: "Now is there a Goliath on the side of humanism that feels able to come to rescue of this invention? If so, send him out to the front of this great army of will-worshippers (Col. 2:22-23) who stand opposed to the church of God, and let us see how well he can do battle in behalf of this human relic."

Now, Bro. Hall, you boldly assert that the man does not exist who can prove that God will accept instrumental music in the worship. I do not claim to be a Goliath, neither do I believe a Goliath is needed to defend instrumental music in the worship. I only claim that the organ can be used as an expedient. To illustrate: We are commanded to meet for worship; and, when

we meet, we sing; but we use song books. These books are strictly human. We use notes as a help to obey the command, "sing." We use tunes made by uninspired men. Some of these tunes are made by unbelievers. We sing bass, tenor, treble; and, yet, these are not taught in the word of God. But, as they help us, we use them. We call these helps, expedients. So the argument will turn on whether the organ can be used as an expedient or not. We claim it can; Bro. Hall, of course, will deny it. So the burden of proof will rest upon us. While Bro. Hall has nothing to prove, we will try to give him something to disprove. He must show that the organ cannot be used as an expedient.

To govern us in this investigation, we will lay down two rules, which are self-evident: 1. An expedient must always help to obey a command; 2. An expedient must never violate a command. We know that song books help to obey the command, "sing," and that their use never violates the command. If Bro. Hall rules out expedients, then he must go back and find the same songs used by the apostles and sing them to tunes used by Peter and Paul. I am afraid he will fail in his

undertaking. We will wait and see.

You say: "We practice immersion only in baptizing penitent believers into Christ. You ask why? Because we can prove that God is pleased to see us do so." You further say: "But some one of our neighbors who believes in sprinkling for baptism, will raise the question, Where does the Bible say it is a sin to sprinkle for baptism?" Then you say: "Asking us to point out the

Scripture that says it is a sin to sprinkle for baptism, is like asking us to point to the Scripture that says it is a sin to use instrumental music in worship under the New Covenant." We admit that you can prove immersion pleases God. You do this by proving that baptism is immersion; and, this being proved, to sprinkle would violate the command to immerse. This would come under rule second: An expedient must never violate a command. So you see, Bro. Hall's argument falls short of what he intended to prove by it. We must do nothing in violation of the commands of God.

His argument on baptizing babies only shows that he has not studied his subject closely. He asks: "Where does the Bible say it is a sin to baptize babies?... You had as well ask us to point to the Scripture that says it is a sin to use instrumental music in church worship today." Here you fail to meet the real issue, God demands belief of the heart as a prerequisite to baptism. (Acts 8:37), and to baptize babies would violate the command to baptize believers. Hence to baptize babies could not be an expedient, as it violates rule second.

Again you say you ask why we do not use a slice of mutton, well-cooked, instead of the loaf or use it with the loaf? In using mutton, we would violate the command to use bread and the fruit of the vine. Hence mutton cannot be used as an expedient. But to use an organ violates no command of God. Hence Bro. Hall's argument falls short of what he intended to prove. So with his argument on the name. We dare not change the name. But, in using an organ, we do not change any command. If you rule out all that is human, then you should quit using your present songs. You should do away with notes. You should go back and hunt among the old historical rubbish till you find tunes made by the apostles. You should destroy all publishing houses where religious papers are printed to extend the gospel. No apostle ever taught that way. No one is commanded to send the gospel

by having it printed and sent abroad while he stays at home. And if Bro. Hall chooses to rule out the organ because not taught by command of the Bible, how will he still teach through a religious paper and claim that he uses nothing that is human in his obedience to God? All these are strictly human. How will Bro. Hall show that God is pleased with all these human relics? He says: "Take the book of proof, the Bible, and show that God wants you to use the instrument before you ask your neighbor to engage with you in such worship." Will Bro. Hall please try this on some of these human relics? If he will, I think he will be led to see the fallacy of his argument. I believe it is right to print religious papers, I believe it is right to send the gospel abroad that way. It violates no command of God and helps to obey the command found in Matt. 28:19. God is pleased with the spread of the gospel. The organ helps to obey the command, "sing." It gives the proper pitch, and holds the proper pitch. It makes the music more inspiring. The reason that singing has an advantage over the same truths told in preaching, is the tune. And we know that the organ makes the same words more impressive. Would God be displeased with that which helps to implant in us greater zeal, higher hopes, nobler impulses for the right? Certainly not."

Eld. R. C. Harrell.

Chapter Three

S.H. Hall

1. No, Bro. Harrell, I am not “anxious” for a debate; but I am *very anxious* for you to give us the proof that God is pleased with the use of instrumental music in church worship today. We are still looking for the man. You will not call the above the *proof*. Tell us what chapter and verse to which you have cited us in the above is *proof*. Is it not a fact that there is not a single Scripture referred to in your article except the one that is contained in a quotation that you make from my article? Is this the best that you can do, Bro. Harrell? Certainly it is. The man does not live that can show from the New Testament that God wants instrumental music used in worship under the New Covenant. Christ says: “And he that sent me, is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I *do always those things that please him.*” But what proof does Christ give that this is so? Read the sentence that comes just before the above quotation. “*I do nothing of myself; but as the Father hath taught me; I speak these things.*” (Jno. 8:28-29). Here Christ clearly teaches that the reason he knew he always pleased his Father was because he did nothing except that which his Father taught him to do. Bro. Harrell, Where has Christ or his apostles taught you to use instrumental music in worship under this covenant? Your article is a confession on your part—unwittingly, of course—that you know of no such proof.

2. But you say: “I claim that the organ can be used *only* as an expedient.” You admit, then, that there is no Scripture for it? that it does not come in by command or necessary inference, but as an *expedient*?

Very well. But, my dear sir, here I inform you that its use violates the New Testament law of expediency. Here is the law of expediency, as taught in the New Testament:

- (1) It applies to things that are *lawful*.
- (2) It must *edify or build up the soul*.
- (3) It must give *no offense*.

Here is what Paul says about expediency: “All things are lawful for

me, but all things are *not expedient*; all things are lawful for me, but all things edify not—Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no question for conscience sake—But if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not for his sake that showed it, and for conscience sake— Conscience, I say, not thine own, but of the other—Whether therefore, ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God. Give none offense, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God.” (See I Cor. 10:23-32).

Now, if the use of instrumental music violates either one of the three rules above, it cannot be used as an expedient. But, without a doubt, it violates two, and the man does not live who is able to show it does not violate the other. It is not *lawful*. If Bro. Harrell thinks it is, let him give us the *law* on the subject. It gives *offense*, it has divided what was once a united brotherhood; *Will Bro. Harrell deny this?* Have you never learned this law of expediency? Do you not know that if the organ were permissible—a thing I deny—that you could not use it if it causes offense? Hence to prove that it is an expedient, you must prove (a) that it is *lawful*, (b) that it *edifies*, (c) that it gives *no offense*. Bro. Harrell is as helpless as a baby in such an undertaking. It may not take a “Goliath,” Bro. Harrell, but you will think that it takes more than a “Goliath” before you succeed in any such undertaking.

Again, Paul says: “If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no meat while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend.” (I Cor. 8:13). He also says, “But when you so sin against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ.” (See Verse 12). Is it not strange that the very law that Bro. Harrell lays down to justify the use of instrumental music, proves, beyond a doubt, that it is a sin to use it. Bro. Harrell, let me insist that you no longer transgress.

3. Enough has been said, already, to set aside Bro. Harrell’s article. But lest other bits of his sophistry deceive the unwary, I want to say a few more things, to show how exceedingly futile his efforts are.

(1) He places song books, tune, notes, etc., on a level with the use of the organ. This only shows what theological somersaults a man will turn when he undertakes to defend an unscriptural practice. Don’t take this as unkind, Bro. Harrell; for I have turned a few of them myself; but I found it such an unpleasant task that I quit, and am now teaching and practicing only that which I can prove. Remember Paul’s

injunction: “Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.” (I Thes. 5:21).

But now for a few questions for Bro. Harrell’s consideration: (a) If God had commanded us to play, would this not demand that we provide ourselves with the instrument to play? Certainly it would. But he has not commanded us to play, hence there is no demand for the instrument, (b) Has not God commanded us to “speak to one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs,” (Eph. 5:19), to “teach and admonish one another” in such songs (Col. 3:16)? Does this not demand that we have such songs to sing? If not, why not? Could we any more obey this command without the suitable songs than we could obey the command to be baptized without the water? There is no command to write songs, neither is there any command to provide water or hunt for suitable places for baptism, but the command demands that such be done. Does not the fact that bread and the fruit of the vine’s being the essential elements in the Lord’s supper, demand that we provide ourselves with these things? We are no where commanded to bake bread and press the juice out of the grape. But the command to eat the Lord’s supper, demands that we do so. Can we any more obey the command to sing without the songs than we could obey the command to eat the Lord’s supper without the bread and the fruit of the vine? or the command to baptize without the water? Bro. Harrell, can you not see how absurd your position is? Song, tunes, hence notes or their equivalent; are demanded in the command. Where is the demand for the organ? Will you tell me, WHERE? If we were commanded to play, the demand would be in the command. But we are not so commanded. Hence, you have taken the ridiculously absurd position that a thing not demanded is parallel with things that are demanded. The brother talks about our having to “go back and hunt among the old historical rubbish” till we find tunes made by the apostles. He had as well speak of our having to go back through the old buildings in Jerusalem to find a piece of bread that the apostles baked or the fruit of the vine that they pressed out for the Lord’s supper, or that we must go back to the same rivers and pools in which *they did the* baptizing. We must have the same in kind, and this we can have without this exploration you speak of. We have the Bible to guide us in writing and selecting the songs; this is all we need. But don’t forget the questions above: the issue is clear; now meet it like a man—it may not take a “Goliath,” but if one less than a “Goliath” will

answer them, we will be satisfied.

(2) But our good brother says that the songs that we use are human. Now where did he learn this? I deny that they are human any more than the bread and fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper and the water we use in baptizing are human. Will you say a thing demanded in the command is human. Yes, your organ is human, this you well know; and on the ground that misery loves company, you would be pleased to make what we are using human in the sense that your *humanism* is human. But this you cannot do. You may undertake it, but you will feel, again, that you need more than the strength of a "Goliath" to do so. Bro. Harrell, it is strange that men can go so far wrong. Bro. Harrell,

I am commanded to "preach the word," and in my preaching, "to speak as the oracles of God." (See II Tim. 4:1-2; I Pet. 4:11). Well, I take the subject of salvation by faith and teach the hearers exactly what God says about it. Will you say that is human in the sense that you use the word in your article? Certainly you can not take any such position. Well, I am commanded to teach and exhort in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs. If I sing a song that is just as sound in its teaching as the sermon I preached was sound in its teaching, have I any less obeyed the command in one instance than in the other? Is one any more human than the other? May I again ask, When we hunt for a suitable place to baptize and bury the candidate in the water and resurrect him from the water, is that human? I do not approve of the way our brethren have allowed themselves to be governed in the songs they have used in church worship. They have been slow to learn the importance of teaching and exhorting in song as well as sermon. I am as particular about the songs used in my work as I am about what I teach in my sermons. Hence, Bro. Flavil Hall and I, assisted by Bro. F. L. Rowe, have brought out two books, viz.: "The Gospel Message in Song," a book of 205 songs; and "Redemption's Way in Song," a book of 115 songs, that we may have the kind the Bible requires. When we prepare suitable songs, it is as much divine as when I prepare my sermons. If not, why not?

(3) But from one tumble to another you go. This is the best that a man can do when he is trying to defend an unscriptural practice. You say. "No one is commanded to send the gospel by having it printed and sent abroad while he stays at home." "No apostle ever taught that

way.” My brother, I am astonished at you. Now hear Paul: “Those things which you have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me, *do.*” And what will follow? “The God of peace shall be with you.” (See Phil. 4:9). But what do we see Paul *doing*? We see him teaching orally and in writing. Now shall we do so, Bro. Harrell?

Yes, God gave man eyes as well as ears, and I am commanded to send the message to the soul through the eyes in my written sermons, and to the soul through the ear in my oral preaching. I say it is my duty to do this. The man that can teach in writing as well as speaking and does not do so, buries his talent. This is a sin. *Teach the nations*, is the command. The Bible gives us two ways to do this teaching, viz: By *writing* and *speaking*. No man can deny this. Yet you call it a “human relic;” not, forsooth, because it is, but because your organ is a human relic, and you want to make things that are Scriptural human relics in order to justify the one you have. This is a terrible sin. However, I believe you are doing this unwittingly. This only shows the baneful fruit of trying to defend an unscriptural practice. Let the *unscriptural* thing go, Bro. Harrell.

(4) But a few words more explicit as to whether the command demands tune, hence notes, etc.

Is it not true that whatever is essential to the doing of a command is contained in the command? Certainly you understand this. Well, I contend that we have nothing in the song book that is not essential to the doing of the command to “speak” to one another, “teach” and “admonish” one another in “psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs,” hence that the apostolic church used all that we have or its equivalent. Now let us test this and see: (a) This “speaking” and “teaching” in “psalms, etc,” demand suitable words in which to do the speaking and teaching; we have the words in the song book, and in having the words, we have nothing that the early church did not have, (b) We are to teach and admonish one another in these songs, which demands that each “psalm,” “hymn,” and “spiritual song” that we use contain a scriptural lesson or admonition. We have prayerfully endeavored to make the songs in the books we send out contain a scriptural lesson or admonition. The songs used in obeying the command in Eph. 5:19 and Col. 3:16 can not contain just any kind of words, (c) These psalms were to be sung, which demand musical notes or their equivalent. Certainly you can see this. We are commanded to sing; but may I ask,

Can we sing without a tune? Certainly tune is included in the command to sing and certainly the apostles had tunes in their singing. Further I ask, Can a tune be sung unless pitch and length of tones are indicated? But notes or their equivalent are essential in indicating the length and pitch of tones. Hence notes or their equivalent are included in the command to sing, and the apostolic church used them. When we sing a tune from the song book we do nothing more nor less than we do when we sing a tune without the song book.

(5) But, in conclusion, we notice your two “self-evident” rules. I accept them as you give them, viz: (a) That an expedient must help to obey the command; (b) That an expedient must not violate the command. We have shown you that the use of instrumental music violates the law of expediency. You can never show that instruments, and that of all sorts, help to obey the command to speak to one another, teach and admonish one another. In this, the Book says use “words easy to be understood,” to sing with the spirit and the understanding. (See I Cor. 14:9-15). How a lot of inarticulate music could help in this, I do not see. In fact, it hinders instead of helping. But take the command and show that it helps.

But the use you make of rule two, ruins your own position. You say when we prove that baptism is immersion, it would be a sin to sprinkle; for this would violate the command to immerse. Good. Just so we are commanded to sing, to teach and admonish one another in the words of the song. When we play we make as much another kind of music as the act of sprinkling would be from immersing. If not, Why not? You say that what I say about infant baptism shows that I have not studied the question. Well, you are not the judge. But the use you make of what I said, shows that you have not gotten in sight of an argument to prove your position. Yes, the command is to baptize believers, and when we baptize people who do not believe or cannot believe, we violate this command. Just so we are commanded to *speak* to one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, and when we *play*, we just as certainly do something else as when we baptize babies instead of believers. Just so with what you say about the Lord’s supper. We are to use bread, not a slice of mutton. But when you use instrumental music in worship, you use as much *another kind* from that contained in the command as a slice of mutton is *another kind* of food from bread. If not, Why not? Brother, give us one argument for your position. Is this the best you can do? To be sure it is. Who could

do better than you have done. It is not so much the weakness of the man: It is the weakness of your cause.

Perhaps, my reply is too long. But I wanted to show that there was not one shadow of proof in all that you say. I would beg you to let the unscriptural thing *go*. I know God wants you to do this. May I not expect you to do so.

S. H. Hall.

Yours for "the old paths."

Atlanta, Ga.

Chapter Four

R.C. Harrell

I have before me Bro. Hall's reply to my article in the Firm Foundation of September 26th. He quotes Jno. 8:28-29, which reads: "I do nothing of myself but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things. The Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please him." Bro. Hall concludes that the reason Christ pleased the Father was that he always did the things the Father taught him. He then asks the question: "Where has Christ or his apostles taught you to use instrumental music in the worship under the new covenant?" Bro. Hall knows or should know, that an expedient is not a command, and that I claim the organ can be used *only* as an expedient. To illustrate, Christ says, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." In obeying this command, I take a buggy as the means of travel, another rides a horse. Bro. Hall might ask, Where has Christ or his apostles taught you to use buggies or horses in obeying the commission? These are only means to aid in carrying out the command found in the commission. Just like an organ is only a means in obeying the command to sing. It aids and assists in the singing. Bro. Hall tells us that singing carries with it the demand for books, tunes, notes, etc. If an instrument helps in the singing; then, to the extent it helps, to that extent it is a demand. We know it makes the tune more inspiring. It creates in us greater zeal, greater love. It helps also to edify, or build up the soul, which is Bro. Hall's second article in the law of expediency. The tune whether made by the human voice, or an instrument, contains no ideas. But it helps to bring out the meaning of the words and impress them more fully upon our hearts. It helps to implant a love of the pure and good. Many have been led to turn from sin, and confess their Saviour, by having the words of the song carried home to the heart, by the tune. If the organ helps to make the words more inspiring, then it edifies. Bro. Hall's next rule is, "An expedient applies to things that are lawful." I would like for Bro. Hall to tell me what law of God is violated, when the human voice is aided by the tune played on an organ. Paul says: "All things are lawful for me but all things are not expedient. All things are lawful for me but all things edify not." I Cor. 10:23. Paul's argument is, if the all things he refers to violate no law, then they are lawful.

The use of meats violates no law, and if they edify, then they are

expedient. We know the song assisted by the organ edifies and violates no law of God. It can therefore, be used as an expedient. Now Bro. Hall, try your logic on this. It may be you can correct the apostle Paul. Again in matters of expediency, or where there is no law, you make law. Then are you not guilty of adding to God's word? God has not said, Thou shalt not use any instrument in the worship. But you and your people do say it, and are therefore guilty of making laws for God. If we were to make it a law to use an organ, we would be guilty of adding to the word of God. If you make it a law forbidding its use, you likewise add to the word of God. I often hear you people quote the motto of Thomas Campbell: "Where the Bible speaks we speak, and where the Bible is silent we are silent." But where the Bible is silent is where you make the most noise; or where the Bible is silent, you cry the loudest. I am surprised at what you say about the use of meats as an expedient. For if they cannot be used as an expedient then your argument is not to the point. God's kingdom has nothing to do with their use. Paul says: "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." (Rom. 14:17). Again he says: "But meat commendeth us not to God. For neither if we eat are we the better; neither if we eat not are we the worse." (I Cor. 8:8). So meats have nothing to do with the worship. We can obey every command of God and either eat meat or let it alone. Meat can not be used as an expedient, as its use helps to obey no command. So Bro. Hall's third article in the law of expediency, is without foundation. The use of meats do not edify, and therefore their use is not an expedient. So reasons the apostle Paul. (I Cor. 10:23). Bro. Hall tells us he used to turn theological somersaults. It seems that he is a little out of practice, as he lit wrong side up. Try again, Bro. Hall, but be a little careful where you light.

Bro. Hall called for a Goliath, but a few sling shots from God's truth in the hands of a David is enough. In speaking of the songs used in worship, Bro. Hall says, "I deny that they are human any more than the bread and fruit of the vine in the Lord's supper, and the water we use in baptizing are human. Will you say a thing demanded in the command is human?" Bro. Hall, do you intend to teach that bread, and the fruit of the vine are no part of the command, and that water is not specified in the command? You are too well informed to make such a statement. The arrangements of the words in our songs, are strictly human. Many of our tunes are made by unbelievers. The apostles

knew nothing of the science of music, like we have it today. If the command always carried with it the demand, then the apostles had notes, and compositions made by uninspired men. If they did not have them, they are not demanded in the command. If you must have a thus sayeth the Lord for all you do, tell me if the early church sung tenor, treble, bass, etc. If you cannot tell; then, is not this left to us as a matter of expediency? I would like to have a thus sayeth the Lord here, so we could worship just like the apostles did.

Bro. Hall is astonished because I claim no apostle ever printed the gospel, and sent it abroad, while he stayed at home. And you are surprised that I call the printing press a human relic. Please give chapter and verse to show it is divine. Tell me which apostle run the press, which one had the oversight of the engine? What firm did they buy their coal from? Bro. Hall you say that whatever is essential to the doing of a command, is contained in the command. If printing presses and steam engines are essential, then they are contained in the command, and the apostles had them. If you claim that such human relics are necessary to meet the demands of an advanced age, and they greatly help to send the gospel to all the world; then why not use the organ as it helps to sing, and meets the demands of an advanced age? Again you say, "This speaking and teaching in psalms, etc., demand suitable words in which to do the speaking, and teaching, we have the words in the song book and in having the words, we have nothing that the early church did not have." Well! That is something I never thought of before. Paul printed his letter to the Romans, while Peter kept up the fire in the engine, and John was engineer on some fast train, to carry his letter over to Rome, that they might read it in the morning papers. This is enough to show that whatever is essential to the doing of a command is not always contained in the command. And it is just as much in place for me to call for the scripture that makes mention of these human relics, as for Bro. Hall to call for chapter and verse, that mentions the organ in worship. The organ aids in obeying the command to sing, just like steam and printing presses, aid in helping to obey the great commission.

Again you say, "Further I ask can a tune be sung unless pitch and length of tones are indicated, but notes or their equivalent are essential in indicating the length and pitch of tones. Hence, notes or their equivalent are included in the command to sing, and the apostolic church used them." If notes or their equivalent are essential in

indicating the length and pitch of tones, why not use an organ which will help to bring to the ear the proper length and pitch of tones? The organ brings to the ear, what the notes presents to the eye. But Bro. Hall may say we can give the proper length and pitch of tones without an organ. We perhaps could do so. So could we send the gospel abroad without printing presses, but each is a great help in carrying on the work in Christ's Kingdom. We use them and the argument for one, will hold good for the other. Bro. Hall's argument on sprinkling is very poor logic. He says,

“When we play we make as much another kind of music, as the act of sprinkling would be different from immersing.” When we sprinkle it takes the place of a positive command, and obedience to the command is left off. The rule I offered to govern us in the use of expedients was: An expedient must always help

to obey a command. Does sprinkling help to obey the command to immerse? You know it does not. While the organ does help to obey the command sing, and also edifies. So the organ agrees with my rule, and as it edifies it agrees with Bro. Hall's rule. And as it violates no law and edifies it agrees with Paul's rule. So try again, Bro. Hall. Maybe you can turn your theological somersault better next time. You seem to be a little out of practice. In speaking of baptizing infants, Bro. Hall says, “When we baptize people who do not believe we violate this command.” True hence not an expedient. But when we play an organ it helps to obey a command: We continue to sing. Baptizing infants does not help to obey the command to baptize believers. The argument about using a slice of mutton in the Lord's supper is like all the others; illogical and far from the truth. Would a slice of mutton aid and assist in obeying the command? You know it would not. Would it edify? Of course not. Bro. Hall, you have undertaken to do what no man can do. You had better get a good spring-board before you turn again.

R. C. Harrell.

Chapter Five

S.H. Hall

I am glad the brother has discovered that it would be quite awkward for me to turn a theological somersault, and that if I ever succeed, I will have to get a “spring-board” to assist me. I wish I could say as much for him; for certainly he can turn them without the assistance of a “spring-board:” *he is an expert*. Why advise me to get a “spring-board;” if, indeed he thinks I am trying to turn theological somersaults? Why not advise me to quit? (a thing I would be delighted to see him do).

1. Remember that the article from me that called forth Brother Harrell’s efforts gave only one reason for our not using instrumental music in worship, namely: the fact that we are commanded to “walk as children of light—*proving* what is *well- pleasing* unto the Lord,” to “*prove all things*; hold fast that which is good” (See Eph. 5:10; I Thess. 5:21, R.V.) I confessed my inability to *prove* that instrumental music pleases God in worship, and asked those who use such music to furnish us with a man that could *prove* it. Brother Harrell came forth, claiming that he could. I was amused at his undertaking it, but was pleased to see him try.

2. But *where* is the brothers’ *proof*? Brother Harrell, we are still looking for the man. Your efforts are as good as could be made in behalf of your contention, but it falls short of proving your claims. Your article is filled with assertions. But *assertions* are not *proof*. An *affirmation* is the *thing* to be *proven*. Yet you pile up one *affirmation* upon another as *proof*. He even admits that he has no *proof*. Here are his words in answer to my call for chapter and verse: “Brother Hall knows, or should know, that an expedient is not a command, and that I claim that the organ can be used only as an expedient.” “I would love to have a ‘thus saith the Lord’ here, so that we could worship just like the apostles did.”

Who is it that is so blind that he can not see that the brother, in the above statements, confesses, in as strong terms as could be used, that he has *no proof*? Yet he speaks of his efforts being “a few sling shots of God’s eternal truth in the hands of a David.” How about this, Brother Harrell?

3. But he says, "If you must have a 'thus saith the Lord' for all you do, tell me if the early church sang tenor, treble, bass, etc.? If you can not tell, then, is not this left to us as a matter of expediency?"

When we sing tenor, soprano or bass—it matters not which —when we do either, we are doing *exactly* what the Spirit says do, namely: *speaking one to another in psalms, hymns and spiritual songs; we are singing*. This *no* man can deny. But not so with your organ. When you use the organ, in the act of using the organ, you are not speaking, you are not singing; but you are making *another kind* of music that was *intentionally* left out of the new covenant.

Our brother actually puts instrumental music and singing tenor, soprano and bass as parallels; when, in fact, such singing is the command per se. For either is "speaking," is "singing," and you can not sing without using a quality of voice that musicians would name by one of such terms, while the organ, he himself admits, can be only an aid to the voice in singing either part. Hence, he makes the thing aided and the aid parallels, says both are expedients. Now, where is the command? The command ceases to be, if his logic is correct, and all is a matter of expediences. The brother lacks discrimination.

4. As an illustration of the organ's being, as he claims, an aid, he refers us to the commission. Here he again confuses things that are not parallel. The commission says "go," but we are not told how to go. Whenever we are told to do a thing and the how is not specified, the command includes all means of doing said thing. Hence, the apostles used every means of going that existed in their day; they rode donkeys, walked, sailed in ships, etc. Just so we today *go*, using the means at our command. If I go on the train, I am doing exactly what I am commanded to do, namely, "*go*." If not, why not? Just so if I go on horse-back, in a buggy or walk. In either case, I am doing what God says do, and no man has the right to restrict me to any one way of going. If God had commanded us to make music, without specifying the kind, every kind would be included. But he has specified the kind, namely: *vocal music*. In specifying the kind, he excludes all other kinds, and it is rebellion to use another kind. In telling us to go, if he had said, "Go walk into all the world, ' etc., then the going would have been restricted to walking, and it would be a sin to go any other way. He speaks of the organ's being *only* a means of singing! He had as well talk of *walking* being a means of *riding*. Walking is certainly a

means of going, but can not be a means of riding. Just so the organ is a means of making music, but never a means of singing or singing a means of playing. Singing is certainly a means of making music, and this is the kind God has specified to be used in our worship.

5. The brother actually makes the organ and the tune parallels. Here are his words: “The tune, whether made by the human voice or on an instrument, contains no ideas. But it helps to bring out the meaning of the words, and to impress them more fully upon the heart. It helps to implant a love for the pure and the good—if the organ helps to make the words more inspiring then it edifies.”

Here I remind our brother of the fact that *tune* sustains the same relationship to instrumental music that it does to vocal music; for you can have neither without the *tune*. Instrumental music is as much dependent, for its existence, upon *tune* as vocal music is. Yet he uses the organ for the *tune*, when we can have, and do have the *tune*, without the organ. Certainly we must have the *tune*, and the *tune* helps to carry the words to the heart. But the *tune*, in its use, has been restricted to making vocal music when we come to worship. All that he has to say about the wonderful effects of the *tune*, we have without using the instrument, a thing Christ *intentionally* left out of the New Testament. If the brother does not think so, let him come to Atlanta and we will let him hear such music without the instrumental accompaniment.

6. Again, let me remind Brother Harrell that *affirming* a thing is not *proving* it. His whole article is a bundle of affirmations wholly barren of proof. He has much to say about instrumental music *edifying*, when, to save his life, he could not prove that such music edifies at all. Where is your proof, Brother Harrell? Doubtless his assumption is based upon the feelings produced in him when he hears instrumental music; when the facts are, he can not tell the difference in the feelings produced by the “enchanted” strains of a violin in a ball room and the feelings produced by the rendition of the same piece in a church house. Can you Brother Harrell? If so, tell us. Yet on this assumption, he sets aside the Holy Spirit’s law of expediency, namely: (1) Expedients must be lawful; (2) must edify; (3) must give no offense, and substitutes for this God-given law the following: (1) Just so they violate no law; (2) and we feel that they edify; (3) then use them anyhow, if they do give offense. The brother can not say that I am

mistaken in the law that I attribute to him; for what he says about eating meat, means nothing, if it does not mean this. Edify means “to build up or strengthen, especially in faith or morals; to impart instruction.” Nothing that has not in it the element of teaching can impart instruction, and unless Christ has commanded us to do a thing, the doing of said thing will not build up the soul. Brother Harrell says that eating meat will not edify, or build up the soul. Granted. But may I ask, Why? Will the eating of a small piece of bread and a small sip from a cup that contains the fruit of the vine in memory of Christ’s death and suffering, edify? Certainly it will. Well, why is it that the eating of a small piece of bread and drinking the fruit of the vine will edify, and eating meat will not? Because one is commanded, and the other is not. This is one reason why vocal music will edify—it is commanded—and instrumental music will not edify, because it is not commanded, but was intentionally left out of the new covenant. But vocal music also has the other element of edification, namely: it imparts instruction to the hearers. Can instrumental music impart instruction, Brother Harrell? No, it can not even aid in instructing the people, but hinders the instruction, as you well know.

I am perfectly aware of the fact that the kingdom of God is not “meat and drink;” that is, it is not to satisfy the fleshly demands. But, pray tell me, why all this “advanced music” today, if it is not to meet the demands of the “advanced flesh” of this age? No, Brother Harrell, you can not bring instrumental music in through the door of expediency—and you say this is the only way it can come in—for it violates God’s law of expediency; hence is not lawful, you can not prove that it edifies, and it offends. It may not take a Goliath, Brother Harrell, to prove your proposition, but you will wish for greater strength before you succeed. We are still calling for *proof*, Brother Harrell. You are doing as well as any man could do for your proposition, but you are without proof, hence can not prove.

7. But using instrumental music in worship violates more than the law of expediency.

(1) It violates the law of worship. Christ says: “The hour cometh, and now is, which the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for such doth the Father seek to be his worshippers.” (Jno. 4:23). To worship in the spirit, is to do what you do from the heart, do it sincerely, do it to please God and not yourself. To worship in truth,

is to worship as God's word directs you. Christ says: God's "word is truth." (Jno. 17:17). Both of these elements must exist, or the worship is vain. When we use instrumental music in the worship, we do it by God's direction or man's. Brother Harrell has admitted that God has not so directed us. This forces him to admit that it is done by man's directions. But Christ says: "But in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrine the commandments of men." (Matt. 15:9). (2) Its use violates the "law of faith." (a) In Romans 3:27 Paul declares that we are under the law of faith, (b) In 2 Corinthians 5:7 he says we walk by this law. (c) In Romans 14:23 and Hebrews 11:6 he says if we walk any other way we sin. (d) In Ephesians 4:5 he says there is but *one* faith to walk by. (See also Phil. 3:16). (e) In Romans 10:17 he declares that this faith comes by hearing God's word. When we make vocal music in praising Jehovah, we are walking by faith, and no man can deny it. Brother Harrell has admitted that, in using instrumental music, he is not walking by faith; for he says it is not commanded. The law of faith cannot exist where God has not spoken. But Brother Harrell may say instrumental music is no part of the worship, but is an exterior prop that man uses to hold up and aid the God-ordained music. In fact, this is his position. But here I would remind him of the fact that when it was used under the Old Testament it was a part of the worship; for "the trumpeters and singers were as one, to make one sound to be heard in praising Jehovah." (See 2 Chron. 5:13). How could a thing that was then a part of the worship, when used, cease to be a part and become a mere expedient? Will Brother Harrell tell us?

8. But the brother charges us in matters of expediency, of adding to God's law—because we refuse to add instrumental music. No, Brother Harrell, you and yours are doing the *adding*. As stated before, God has given us a law to govern expedients, one article of which says, not to use it if it gives offense. You dare not say we made this law. Your organ, you say, can come in *only* as an expedient; and the law says not to use such things, while the world stands, if they give offense. We are not using them. We let others do as they please; but as for us, we refuse to use them. Is this adding to God's law? But you have certainly subtracted a part of the law of expediency by saying, "Use it, if it does give offense; for it meets the demands of an advanced age." You even call Paul's article on things that offend, "Brother Hall's third article" in the law of expediency. I beg to differ with you; for this law was written several centuries before I was bom. (See I Cor. 8:12, 13;

10:23). Brother Harrell, we are still looking for the man who has the *proof*.

9. But the brother says: “God has not said ‘Thou shalt not use any instrument in the worship.’ But you and your people say it, and are, therefore, making laws for God.”

Well! Well! This caps the climax! Brother Harrell, I did not know that you hold the position that the “instrument is *in* the worship;” I thought you claimed that it is only an aid, only an expedient. What is your position on this question, anyhow?

Yes, God has said, “Thou shalt not use the instrument,” just exactly like he said, “Thou shalt not baptize babies.” But how has he said this? From the simple fact that his commandments on these questions are both exclusive as well as inclusive. When he says, “Teach all nations,” “Preach the gospel to every creature,” “Baptizing them,” he specifies the kind of creatures to baptize, namely: *penitent believers*. This, you admit, excludes the infants, as much so as if he had said, “Thou shalt not baptize infants.” Just so with the music question. In telling us to make music, he specifies the kind, namely: *vocal music*. This excludes any other kind. If not, why not?

10. Here I am going to put your own words in the mouth of an advocate of infant baptism, substituting “infant baptism” where you have “instrumental music,” and ask you to read it carefully:

“God has not said, ‘Thou shalt not baptize babies.’ But you and your people say it, and are, therefore, guilty of making laws for God. If we were to make it a law to baptize babies, we would be guilty of adding to the word of God. But we do not make it a law. We simply teach the mothers that it is a good thing, but is a matter left with them, which, if done, means much to the baby and will edify the mother. But we have many good sisters in our church who have not baptized their babies. But if you make it a law, forbidding infant baptism, you have added to God’s word. I often hear you people quote the motto of Thomas Campbell: ‘Where the Bible speaks, we speak; and where the Bible is silent, we are silent. But where the Bible is silent, you make the most noise. The Bible says nothing about infant baptism. But here is where you cry the loudest.’”

Now, how do you like that, Brother Harrell? Pretty good argument,

isn't it? You brethren have never made one argument in defense of your unscriptural practice that others have not already used before you in defending their unscriptural practices.

But let me here remind you that what you have said about our use of Thomas Campbell's motto, makes you say again that the Scriptures are silent on the use of instrumental music in worship. Now, where are those sling-shots from God's eternal truth in the hand of the modern David? According to your own words, my Dear Brother, they are wind-bags of modern make.

11. Yes, Brother Harrell, I am still saying that when Christians use psalms, hymns and spiritual songs in their worship, each composition containing a scriptural lesson or admonition, that this is no more human than the same lessons taught in sermon; no more human than the bread and fruit of the vine that we prepare for the Lord's supper; no more human than finding or arranging suitable water for baptism; for certain it is, the command demands the kind of psalms, hymns and songs mentioned, as much so as the other two commands referred to demand bread and the fruit of the vine and water. If not, why not?

Here, again, I ask the question: If God had commanded us to play, would this not demand that we provide ourselves with an instrument to play? You know it would. But he has not so commanded, hence no demand for the organ. But has he not commanded us to sing psalms, hymns and spiritual songs? Does this not demand that we have them to sing? If not, why not? Will you not, then, cease to contend that a thing not demanded is parallel with a thing that is demanded?

12. Yes, the apostles had notes and compositions, or their equivalents, *without a doubt*. Else they could speak to one another in songs without the songs, in which to do the speaking — which would be like baptizing a man in water without water — and sang without a tune, which would not be singing at all. Certainly you see this. Why fight against God, when he has spoken so plainly on this subject?

13. Yes, Brother Hall was astonished at your saying that no apostle ever printed the gospel and sent it abroad while he stayed at home, and I am astonished all the more that you still so contend.

But you want me to tell you which apostle ran the press, which one had the oversight of the engine, and what firm they bought their coal

from. Well, you do not have to know this, any more than you need to know what firm manufactured the books and parchments that contained the writing of Paul and others (See 2 Tim. 4:13), whether his amanuensis used a goose quill or something else in writing, or who piloted the ships that carried the letters written in Palestine to Europe and Asia Minor. We know they taught, both orally and in writing; that others often did the writing for them, and that the letters were sent from place to place by the then known means of travel. We do the same; or rather, we take the same doctrine they then taught by both the *oral* and *written* method and teach it today by both methods—because we are commanded to follow their example (See Phil. 4:9) —which gospel was sent abroad by all means of travel existing. We continue to send it abroad by all means of travel existing. But there is a great difference in this and using instrumental music in worship today; a thing that existed then, but which they refused to use.

14. No, we do not use anything today simply to meet the demands of an advanced age, but because the apostles and early Christians taught the gospel orally and in writing and scattered it abroad as fast as they could, using all that that age furnished them in the way of material on which to write and means for traveling from country to country, which licenses us to use all the material that this age furnishes us on which to write, and the best method of writing and sending the good news abroad. That we have better ways of travel, I admit. But I do not use these things to meet the demands of an advanced age; for they themselves constitute the advanced age.

But not so with the music question. If we should incorporate instrumental music in the worship, we would have to do it to meet the demands of people who think they are an *advanced people*, hence need an *advanced worship*; for certain it is, that instrumental music existed in the days of the apostles, but was not used. If instrumental music aids us in making the kind of vocal music God commands us to make, pray tell me why the Spirit did not guide the apostles into it. Have you discovered something in this *advanced age* that the Spirit was ignorant of, namely, that instrumental music *edifies* and makes vocal music *more inspiring*? Are you not afraid to take such a position? Did not the Holy Spirit guide the early Christians into ‘*all truth*,’ into ‘*every good work*,’ ‘*into all things that pertain to life and godliness?*’ (See 2 Pet. 1:3; 2 Tim. 3:16; Jno. 16:13). Where did it guide them into the use of instrumental music, as an aid to make vocal music more inspiring?

Again, I ask, *Where?* Tell me, my brother, or lay down your pen and confess that you know not *where*. One “sling-shot from God’s eternal truth” will satisfy your humble brother, and he will cease asking for *proof*. A thing that existed in the days of the apostles, that was at their command, that they could have used; and, furthermore, had been used under the Testament just ended, yet they refused to use, are we to come to any other conclusion than that they intentionally refused to use it? We do nothing in worship to meet the demands of an *advanced age*, for this would be worshipping the *age*, and not God, who is the only true object of worship. To contend that there is such a thing as *advanced worship* that we now must render to God, is to say, by implication, that God has *advanced*; since God is the one and the only one who is to say the kind of worship we must render unto him. (See Jno. 4:24). Will you say God has a more highly cultured ear now—I say this reverently—and to meet its demands, we must use *advanced music*? What awful conclusion does every false position force man to take! Here, I beg you, my brother, to see the danger of your position, and change your course. The instruments existed then, but where did God direct the early Christians to use them? On what grounds may we now use them, since God gave no directions then? It could not be because we think it will please him, for we have no reason to so believe. The only reason I know of is the one you mention, namely: to meet the demand of an *advanced age*. This would be done to please the *age*. But I am not an “*age*” server, hence have to refuse to follow where you would lead.

15. The brother even denies that whatever is essential to the doing of a command is contained in the command, because the Bible does not say: “Paul printed his letter to the Romans, while Peter kept up the fire in the engine, and John was engineer on some fast train to carry his letter over to Rome, that they might read it in the morning paper.”

Wonderful logic this. And he says it is just as much in place for him to ask me for chapter and verse where the Bible says these things were used, as it is for me to call on him for chapter and verse where it says they used instruments of music as an aid to singing.

No, no, my brother; here you are sadly mistaken. The steam engine and fast trains did not exist then; the instruments of music did. Since the instrumental music existed then, I have a right to demand that you show that they were used as an aid to singing. They used every means

of writing and travel then existing, which gives me the right to use every means before me today. If we have better means of travel now than they had, well and good; they used the best they had, and so do we.

16. But our brother raises this inquiry: "If notes or their equivalent are essential in indicating length and pitch of tone, why not use the organ, which would help to bring to the ear the correct length and pitch of tones?" Simply because, in doing so, we make music not commanded. He has not commanded us to use but one kind of music in worship. We know this will please him. But how am I to know that more than this will? Instrumental music existed when he gave the New Covenant. He failed to incorporate it as an aid or otherwise. Why should I dare do so? Because I think it is a good thing? What if I did? My thoughts are not God's (Isa. 55:8-9). Neither am I capable of directing my steps when it comes to worshipping God. (See Jer. 10:23). If others think they are capable, they will have to go without me. For my part, Jehovah shall guide me. When God called and sanctified Nadab and Abihu to burn incense (See Exo. 28:1), if he had not told them the kind of fire, they could have used any kind they wished. But he told them where to get the fire, the kind to use (see Lev. 16:12); hence when they used another kind, God slew them. (Lev. 10:1-2). What reason have I to believe that instrumental music in the worship is any less *strange music* than the fire they used was *strange fire*?

In conclusion, let me say, there is no proof under the heavens that will establish the claim that God is pleased with instrumental music in worship. But there are many reasons for doubting his being pleased with it, and so long as a doubt exists in my mind, you will have to excuse me. "*For he that doubteth is condemned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith; and whatsoever is not of faith is sin.*" (Rom. 14:23).

Atlanta, Ga. S. H. Hall

Chapter Six

R.C. Harrell

Bro. Hall commences his article by claiming his inability to prove that instrumental music pleases God in worship. Perhaps he has never tried, but has spent all his time and talents in trying to disprove it. We are referred to Eph. 5:10; I Thess. 5:21. We are here commanded to walk as children of light, but how this has anything to do with instrumental music in worship, I am unable to see. Perhaps our good brother has gotten hold of the Urim and Thummim of Joe Smith, and by this means can discover hidden truths, that the ordinary reader cannot see. He can have printing presses and steam engines to help in sending the gospel abroad. Each one is only an aid. We could sing without the organ and we could send the gospel abroad without printing presses. Bro. Hall says: "When we do either, we are doing exactly what the Spirit says do, viz.: Speaking one to another in psalms, hymns and spiritual songs. We are singing. This no man can deny. But not so with the organ. You are not speaking, you are not singing, but you are making another kind of music, that was intentionally left out of the new covenant." I do not know where Bro. Hall learned that when he sings soprano or bass, he does just what the apostles did. My Bible is silent on the manner of apostolic singing. The world has certainly advanced in singing since the days of the apostles. He is certainly mistaken when he says, When we use an organ we are not speaking or singing. When we play an organ, we are speaking one to another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs. We only wake the words more inspiring by the tune. The worship is in the thoughts impressed upon the heart by the tune.

Bro. Hall claims if the voice is aided by the organ, it would do away with the command. "Hence he makes the thing aided and the aid parallels, says both are expedient. Now where is the command? the command ceases to be." I am surprised at such false logic. For instance, the congregation is singing, "There is a land of pure delight, where saints immortal reign," and our hearts and minds are centered upon the beauties and glories of that heavenly world, as these words are carried home to the heart by the human voice aided by an organ. Bro. Hall appears and says, This is not singing. To be sure our brother is a theological athlete. Again he says, "But he has specified the kind, viz: vocal music. In specifying the kind, he excludes all other kinds

and it is rebellion to use another kind. In telling us to go, if he had said, go walk into all the world, etc., then the going would have been restricted to walking.” True, but would such a command forbid the man from using helps, such as light shoes, and a cane to help him on in obeying the command to walk? Would our brother say if the man uses a cane he is not walking? I suppose so, as he claims that when we use an organ the command ceases to be. The command is to sing. The organ helps to obey the command. If man had been commanded to go walk into all the world, he would disobey the command to ride. He would be doing a different thing from what he was commanded to do. But if he walked and used a cane, the cane would be a help to obey the command to walk. Just so when we sing and use an organ to aid the voice, we are obeying the command to sing. Our brother claims we should not use an organ because we can have the tune without its use. True, but the organ helps, and we are no more disobeying the command “sing,” when we use it than the man is disobeying the command to walk when he uses a cane to aid him in walking.

Bro. Hall admits that instrumental music does affect the emotions of man. He says, “Doubtless his assumption is based upon the feelings produced in him when he hears instrumental music. When the facts are he cannot tell the difference in the feelings produced by the enchanting strains of a violin in a ball room, and the feelings produced by the rendition of the same piece in a church house.” If instrumental music suited to a ball room excites to revelry, why cannot instrumental music when played with devotional songs direct the mind to spiritual things? If the devil can use instrumental music to inspire his followers to serve him, why can not God use it to direct our minds toward heavenly things? I suppose Bro. Hall means man has two hearts. One can be influenced by instrumental music, but the other cannot. Fine argument indeed.

Again he says, “And substitute for this God-given law the following: (1) Just so they violate no law, (2) and we feel that they edify, (3) then use them any how if they do give offenses.” Now read what he says in the paper of October 3. “But in conclusion, we notice *your* two self-evident rules. I accept them as you give them; (a) That an expedient must help to obey the command; (b) that an expedient must not violate the command.” In one paper he claims I substitute these two rules instead of the God-given law. In another paper he says he accepts them as I gave them. Please excuse the brother in his anxiety

to fight instrumental music in the worship; he forgot that the reason why the eating of meats will not edify, is because they direct the mind to no religious truth, but the bread and wine will, because in their use our minds are directed to the suffering of the Saviour, and shedding of his blood for a lost world. It is the purpose or motive in our hearts when we take them. The same bread and wine at an ordinary meal would not edify.

Bro. Hall puts great stress upon what he calls the law of worship. He says, "It violates the law of worship, Christ says, The hour cometh and now is when the true worshipper, shall worship the Father in spirit and truth." He further says, "To worship in truth is to worship as God's word directs you." From this he argues that the use of instrumental music in worship is done by man's direction. He has again forgotten that he admits my two rules governing the use of expedients: (a) That an expedient must always help to obey a command; (b) An expedient must never violate a command. If what he admits be correct, then when we help obey a command, and violate no command, we are inside the great principles, and laws as set forth in the word of God. Paul says, "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, against such there is no law." (Gal. 5:22-23). Instrumental music helps to implant in our hearts love, gentleness; inspires us to live better lives. In connection with suitable words, it implants in our hearts one of the fruits of the Spirit, viz: goodness, and God himself, cannot make a law against it. "Against such there is no law." Great moral principles are right within themselves, and never change. Faith and repentance, goodness, purity, and love were right before the New Testament commenced, and will always be right. Devotional music, whether played on an organ or sung with the human voice, reaches the heart of man and helps to inspire him with zeal to live a life of purity, a life of goodness, a life of love; and for God to make a law against it, would be to contradict himself. For God is good, and makes no laws against that which is good. Hence, when we use an organ, we are inside the limits of truth. Bro. Hall reminds me of the new Justice of the peace that would not try a man, accused of stealing a water barrel, because he could not find any law in the Statute against stealing water barrels. The Bible lays down great principles, and from these we can learn many truths that are not itemized.

He next argues that the use of instrumental music violates the law of

faith. He quotes Paul in Rom. 10:17, which reads, "So then faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God." Right once more. God's word tells me there is no law against goodness, purity, etc. We can then play the organ in faith, because, when played in connection with devotional songs, it helps to lead the unconverted to Christ. I have had the pleasure of taking many by the hand, and hear them confess their Saviour that came forward while the organ in connection with song, was leading their minds to a Saviour's love. God would certainly not make a law forbidding anything that would help to build up his kingdom. "Against such there is no law." God is too good to make laws against anything that helps to make mankind better. Bro. Hall admits my two rules governing expedients. Now he claims nothing can be used only by direct command. He forgot again. Now, Bro. Hall, if I were to make a law compelling the church to use instrumental music, I would be making laws for God. And if you make a law compelling the church to not use instrumental music, you would be making laws for God. For God has certainly not made such a law, and you would be guilty of adding to the word of God. I am surprised that you still use the old argument on meats. Paul says, "All things are lawful for me but all things are not expedient. All things are lawful for me but all things edify not." (1 Cor. 10:23). While it is lawful to use meats, it was not expedient; because their use did not edify. You have forgotten your own rule for an expedient. Meats have nothing to do with worship in any form. (1 Cor. 8:8). They do not help to obey any command, and are not an expedient by my rule which Bro. Hall accepts. In baptizing babies, we violate God's law which teaches us to baptize believers. Bro. Hall you have forgotten again that you admitted my rule to be right: That an expedient must help to obey a command. What command does baptizing babies help to obey? None whatever. Hence, cannot be an expedient, as it violates both rules which Bro. Hall admits to be right. So all his paraphrasing falls to the ground. I hope I will not have to notice this argument again. Bro. Hall tells us that God specifies the kind of music, viz: vocal music. True, and the organ helps to carry out this command. We continue to sing and in most instances, much better. No law of God is violated, but baptizing babies violates the law which specifies believers.

I am asked, as I admit the scriptures are silent as to the use of an organ; where are those sling shots from God's eternal truth in the hands of the modern David? I have shown, and from the scriptures,

that the organ can be used as an expedient. It is surprising that our friend argues that the music of the present day is not human. No doubt but that much of the music of this day and age is composed by unbelievers. But when we set such tunes to suitable words, we sing them.

Again we are asked the question: "If God had commanded us to play, would this not demand that we provide ourselves with an instrument to play?" Once more I will ask our friend to confine himself to the argument. I have never met the man that claims instrumental music is commanded under the New Covenant. We only claim that it can be used as an expedient. I will illustrate so that our friend can, perhaps, understand what is meant by an expedient. "Here again, I ask the question: If God commanded the man to use a cane, would this not demand that he provide himself with a cane." But, in Bro. Hall's argument the man was commanded to walk. The cane was only an expedient. The command is to sing. The organ is an expedient. The command to walk said nothing about a cane. But the man used one to help him obey the command to walk. The command is to sing: we use an organ to help obey the command. The very fact that Bro. Hall builds up a false theory, then overthrows it, is because he cannot meet the real issue.

Our brother still claims that the apostles had notes or their equivalents. He says, "Else they could speak to one another in song without the songs in which to do the speaking. Which would be like baptizing a man in water without water." There were men in the church that received their songs by inspiration and if Bro. Hall intends to be apostolic he will have to go back and hunt up those songs. Paul says, "How is it then brethren? When ye come together every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying." (I Cor. 14:26). With the abundance of revelations given to the church they were causing confusion by each one's attempting to give his revelation, and in the twenty-seventh verse Paul lays down a rule to govern them in speaking. Part of this speaking was done in psalms. Here was music that was divine. But since the days of miracles, our brother is confined to the human.

I shall say but little about Bro. Hall's weak attempt to justify his position in the use of printing presses. If the command carried with it

the demand for printing presses, then the apostles had them. If, as the age advances, no new demands can spring up, then it is wrong to print the gospel and send it abroad by steam. If we cannot advance in matters of expediency, then our brother should throw away his printing press; do away with his new song books he advertises, and start back to Jerusalem, with pick and shovel, and give to the world the inspired songs used by the apostolic church. Again he asks: "Where the Holy Spirit guided the apostles into the use of instrumental music?" It seems that he cannot distinguish the difference in a direct command, and an expedient; but, if he is determined to know, I will tell him. He will find the scripture he is looking for the next verse below where the Holy Spirit guided the apostles to use printing presses to do away with inspired songs and to supply themselves with imperfect songs made by poor, weak, uninspired man. He argues that the Holy Spirit guided the apostles into every good work. True again, but it did not itemize the work. To illustrate, Paul says, "As we have therefore opportunity let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith." There are many ways in which we can do good to our fellow man, and to make a Bible that would go over every act, would make it too large for use. But I see our friend is yet looking for the water barrel.

We are again asked the question: "Where did it guide them into the use of instrumental music, as an aid to make vocal music more inspiring?" If the apostles had been guided into the use of instrumental music as an aid to vocal music, then instrumental music would be a command, and not an expedient. I might ask where does the Holy Spirit guide the church into building church houses, erecting pulpits, putting in stoves, printing Bibles, etc? Our brother seems to have a perfect knowledge as to the kind of music the apostles used. He says, "A thing that existed in the days of the apostles, that was at their command, that they could have used, and furthermore had been used under the Testament just ended, yet they refused to use." I wonder how he knows. Is it not strange that the apostles fought circumcision and the keeping of the law, yet they said nothing against instrumental music? Would not the believing Jew be as prejudiced in the use of instrumental music, as he would be in keeping of the law? If not, why not? Why did he give up the use of instrumental music without a line or precept against it, and yet he was continually contending for the observance of the law? It took great effort on the part of the apostles to prevent the Jew from

going back to the law, but not one word is said against instrumental music. The only reasonable conclusion is the apostles did not forbid its use. Bro. Hall claims my argument is made up of affirmations. Of course, he proves every argument, he only forgot to give chapter and verse where the apostles forbid the use of instrumental music in worship.

Bro. Hall's argument on the kind of fire God commanded Nadab and Abihu to use in burning incense, is like all his arguments: Illogical and not to the point. God told them the kind of fire to use. They disobeyed the command. But in playing the organ we continue to sing, and obey the command much better. It is not strange music, but vocal music; the kind God commands aided and assisted by an organ. To illustrate, God commanded Nadab and Abihu to burn incense, using certain fire. They used good dry wood to aid in making the fire burn, just like we use an organ to aid the singing. Our Brother appears and says you were to use a certain kind of fire. Therefore, you disobey in using wood. He has to learn the difference in a command and an aid to a command.

R. C. Harrell.

Chapter Seven

S.H. Hall

1. We come now to close the discussion between Bro. Harrell and the writer. It has been a most pleasant affair, with me, and I stand, more than ever before, settled in the conviction that the man does not live who is able to prove God is pleased with instrumental music in worship. Bro. Harrell has done the best that could be done for that side of the question: but he undertook to *prove* a proposition without *one word of proof* to be found in the Bible, hence has had a hard time.

He says that Eph. 5:10 and I Thess. 5:21, have nothing to do with the question. In these scriptures, we are commanded to “Prove what is well pleasing unto God,” to “Prove all things” and “hold fast to that which is good.” These scriptures demand that he prove that God is pleased with his instrumental music in worship. But he sees he cannot obey these scriptures and at the same time hold to his music; hence, he would be glad to reject these scriptures, say they have nothing to do with the question, than to drop his unscriptural practice. It is sad to see one pursue such a course.

2. But in this, his last effort, our erring Brother comes hobbling up with a walking cane. He is certainly beginning to feel his weakness. The next time you hear from him, it will be a pair of crutches. He makes the use of the walking cane, in helping the decrepit to walk, parallel with the use of the organ in worship, when they are as far apart as the heavens are from the earth.

Note this, Bro. Harrell; as stated before, there are two kinds of music, viz: vocal and instrumental. But a walking cane is not a kind of going, if you please. The man, in using the cane, does not resort to another way of going; he is using the one way, namely, walking. But not so with your organ; you are making another kind of music in addition to that prescribed in the New Testament. The walking cane would better illustrate the hymn- book in which we have the words and music written; for, in using them, we are not making another kind of music, as you well know, but the very kind commanded, viz: vocal music. Just so the man walking with a cane is not using another way of going while doing so, but the one way used in my illustration, viz: walking.

But here I wish to help Bro. Harrell get an illustration that will suit his case. We will say the command is, "Go walk into all the world and preach the gospel." Bro. Harrell admits this would restrict the going to the one way. But in spite of this admission, he comes along and says, "Let us take another way of going, namely, horse back riding, as an aid to walking." So he buys for himself a small donkey and puts one leg across the donkey and keeps the other foot on the ground and says, "*This riding is an aid to the walking.*" But his attention is again called to the fact that the way prescribed is *walking* and that he is using *another* way. But he answers, "True, but am I not *walking* all the while I am *riding*?"

This illustration fits your case, Bro. Harrell, and it seems that you should see it without the aid of Joseph Smith's Urim and Thummim. Walking is one way of going; riding is another way of going. If the going were restricted to walking, you admit it would forbid riding. Just so singing is one way of making music; playing is another way. Since God has restricted the making of music in worship to singing, it forbids playing, and it is not enough for you to come along and say, "We are speaking to one another in song while the organ is playing, hence are doing what the command says do." Yet Bro. Harrell comes along with his organ, one way of making music, to aid God's children in singing, the way God says make music in worship, as though God's commandments cannot take care of themselves, cannot be obeyed without man's inventions. And when he does so, he looks just as ridiculous, logically and scripturally, as he would in trying to walk and ride a mule at the same time. Bro. Harrell, I insist that you take that leg off of that donkey (human theory) of yours, and let both feet rest on the rock of God's eternal Truth. You will look more graceful, to say the least.

3. He seems to be so badly stunned by my last article that he cannot even read well. I would ask you to re-read my reply to his contention that soprano, alto, bass, and tenor singing are parallel to the use of the organ, and then read his attempt at reply. He does not touch my argument. As stated before, when we sing, using that quality of voice known to the musical world, as soprano, alto, tenor, or bass, we are doing exactly what the command says do, namely *speaking to one another in song*; and Bro. Harrell cannot obey the command without using some such quality of voice. One is as much obedience to the command as the other. Yet Bro. Harrell calls them expedients, aids,

hence parallel to the organ. Hence, as I stated before, makes the *thing aided* and the *aid* parallel, both expedients. May I ask again, then, “What becomes of the command to sing?”

4. He still confuses the organ and the tune, when the organ music is as much dependent on tune for its existence as vocal music is. But hear him further on this. He says, “The worship is in the thoughts impressed upon the heart by the tune.” From the above, it is easy to be seen that Bro. Harrell does not even know what worship means. Worship means “The act of religious homage toward a deity, especially the Supreme God — such as adoration, thanksgiving, prayer, praise, offering.” (Standard Dictionary). We certainly cannot worship our God acceptably when we reject the—*how* he has said for us to worship him. “But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men.” (Matt. 15:9).

5. But our brother is still trying to prove his proposition. He says, “If the devil can use instrumental music to inspire his followers to serve him, why cannot God use it to direct our minds to heavenly things?” Wonderful? thought this. I will ask him the same question, with a little substitution. “If the devil can use the ball room or whiskey to inspire his followers to serve him, why cannot God use them to direct our minds to heavenly things?”

Bro. Harrell favored me with a little tract he published to expose some of his religious neighbors for depending too much on their feelings. Here is what he says: “Here he sets aside Holy writ and makes his feelings his Bible.” (Harrell’s tract, Page 6). Yet, Bro. Harrell’s whole contention is based on his *feelings*. Again he says, “God never intended man should grope his way in darkness. He intended that he should have the best of evidence.” (Ibid pages 1 and 2). Good, Bro. Harrell. Where is this “*best* of evidence” on the music question? We are still looking for the man who has “the *best* of evidence” that it pleases God. I say with you, Bro. Harrell, “May God help us to come to the Bible and find a ‘thus sayeth the Lord’ for all we do and practice.” (Ibid page 6). Why don’t you practice what you preach?

6. He claims that I contradict myself because I accepted his two rules, governing expedients, and later stated for Bro. Harrell a law that better represents his position. This makes him say that the law I attributed to him correctly represents him, and that he thinks it means the same as

his two self-evident rules. This is getting him into a bad predicament, but I cannot help it. I accepted his two rules, one of which says, "It must not violate a command," and showed that instrumental music violates God's law of expediency, which says not to use it, if it gives offense. And I also showed it violates the law of worship and the law of faith and is parallel to the strange fire used by Nadab and Abihu. I also challenged him to show that it helps us to speak to one another in song, as we are commanded, and showed it hindered the speaking and teaching by drowning out the voice.

But remember his charge here that I contradicted myself makes him go on record as endorsing the following absurd and pernicious rule: (1) Just so it violates no law; (2) and we feel that it edifies; (3) *then use it, anyhow, if it does give offense*. And, in committing himself to this rule, he correctly represents the history of our digressive brethren; for they certainly love their organ much better than they love the teaching of the Bible on Christian Union. Paul says to not use such things while the world stands, if they give offense. (See 1 Cor. 8:13). Bro. Harrell says, "Use them, anyhow; for they meet the demands of an advanced age." Which will you follow? Certainly the organ meets the demands of an *advanced* people! But who are they? They are the people who have *advanced beyond* the teaching of the Bible. Paul tells us "not to *go beyond* the things which are written." (See 1 Cor. 4:6 R.V.)

7. The brother says the reason eating meat will not edify is because it directs the mind to no religious truth. Good; for the same reason the organ cannot edify. Certainly the purpose or motive has much to do in making the eating of the Lord's supper acceptable. But this is not all that is necessary: you must have the God-ordained elements, viz: *bread* and the *fruit of the vine*. To worship God in Spirit or with a pure motive is not enough; it must be done in *truth* also, that is directed by the truth. (See Jno. 4:23). We can worship God in vocal music in both *spirit* and *truth*. But not so with instrumental music, for the *truth* gives us no directions here.

8. But the brother calls Gal. 5:22-23 into commission, and makes instrumental music one of the fruits of the Spirit, a "great moral principle," and says, "God himself cannot make a law against it." Did you ever hear the like? What next? I thought our brother said that instrumental music could come in *only* through the *door of expediency*. Now he has two more doors through which to bring it. Of course, his

statement proves nothing except the fact that he tried to bring it in as an expedient and failed, so he thought he would try another door. But we meet him here and put him to flight just as we did at the door of expediency.

All moral principles existed from the beginning. Who will deny this? But I find the Bible saying, “Woe unto them that are at ease in Zion, and trust in the mountain of Samaria—that chant to the sound of the viol, and *invent* to themselves instruments of music like David.” (Amos 6:1-5). If the brother’s position be true, here is David inventing a “great moral principle,” or one of the fruits of the Spirit. The idea of instrumental music in worship originated with man, not with God. God permitted it under the Old Testament just as he did divorce and the kingly government, on account of the hardness of the people’s heart. Space forbids my quoting here, but be *certain* to turn to and read the following scriptures: Matt. 19:3-8; 1 Sam. 8:4-22; 10:17-19; 12:16-19; Hosea 13:9-11. Bro. Harrell had just as well argue that divorce and the kingly government are connected with “a great moral principle” or the fruits of the Spirit, as to argue as he does about the organ in worship.

Bro. Harrell, the only way you can get your organ in is just like the children of Israel got their king, viz: *In order to be like other folks*. You talk just as the children of Israel did. After Samuel told them that God did not want them to have a king and that such a course would lead them to ruin, they said: “Nay; but we will have a king over us.” (See 1 Sam. 8:13). Just so you say, “Nay; but we will have instrumental music, if it does give offense; for it meets the demands of an advanced age.”

But he might say that he does not claim that instrumental music in worship is a great moral principle or a fruit of the Spirit per se, but only an aid to them. He has said the organ is only an aid, perhaps he means this. Here I would ask him how he can *aid* “a great moral principle” or one of the fruits of the Spirit with an invention of man! This forces him to say God’s ways are not self-supporting but need Bro. Harrell’s “walking cane” to help them along. What awful positions a man will take in trying to defend error.

But hear him again. He says, “No, Bro. Hall, if I were to make a law compelling the church to use instrumental music, I would be making laws for God.” This makes him say that there is nothing that demands

its use. Now what becomes with all he has said about “the fruits of the Spirit” and “a great moral principle?” Paul says for us to be “fruitful in every good work.” (Col. 1:10). Bro. Harrell says we do not have to be fruitful in the use of the organ in worship. This forces him to admit that *it is not a good work*. Don’t you see, Bro. Harrell?

9. But our brother says that they received psalms in the days of the apostles by inspiration, and that if “Bro. Hall intends to be apostolic, he will have to go back there and hunt up those songs.” Well, “Bro. Hall” certainly “intends” to be apostolic. It seems that Bro. Harrell thinks we cannot be apostolic today.

One of the purposes of psalm singing in the New Testament, is to *teach and admonish*. (See again Col. 3:16). This made it absolutely necessary that God give them psalms that contained the doctrine of the New Covenant. This was just as necessary as it was to give unto the apostles in the beginning, sermons that contained the doctrine of the New Covenant. But Bro. Harrell says all of our songs today are human. This I deny, Bro. Harrell. Will you say that a sermon today is human, in which some fact or command of the New Testament is strongly set forth, simply because the man who delivers it is not inspired? Certainly you know better than this. Timothy was commanded by Paul to commit the things he had heard unto faithful men, who should be able to teach others also. (2 Tim. 2:1-2). Now when Timothy took the doctrine that Paul taught him and taught it to others, was that human? No more human than it is human to baptize a penitent believer into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Just so a song that teaches sound doctrine, is not human for the command demands that we have such songs to sing and gives us the gospel that enables us to write such songs. There are some sermons and songs in existence that are very *human*, but they are those sermons and songs that contain or teach this *human doctrine* you are trying to get us to believe. No, Bro. Harrell, I do not have to go back to Jerusalem with my pick and shovel. I do my digging in the New Testament, a thing I would be delighted to see you do on the music question.

10. He does not like for me to ask him for the scripture that shows the Spirit guided the apostles into the use of instrumental music in worship. He says I will find it in the next verse below where the Holy Spirit guided the apostles into the use of printing presses, etc. This is a

confession that he has no scripture, and because “misery loves company,” he wants to make it appear that we are in the same predicament. We have the scripture, Bro. Harrell, as I have already shown you, that gives us the right to publish the gospel to the nations of the earth, both orally and in writing, using all the means of copying and transportation at our command. (See again Phil. 4:9).

11. But he quotes the scripture, “As ye have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men,” to show that there are “lots” of things we are to do that the scriptures say nothing about. But here he is in trouble again. This scripture, demands that I do good where the opportunity permits. If we have an opportunity to do good that the apostles did not have, it is certainly right to avail ourselves of the same. But the apostles had the opportunity of using instrumental music in worship, of teaching others so, and of installing it in the churches they established, *but they did not do so*. Hence it follows, *as certain as night follows day*, that, since the apostles commands us to use *all opportunities* to do good, and they *had the opportunity* of installing the organ and did not, *its use is not good*; otherwise they did not practice what they preached. How about it, Bro. Harrell? You certainly have worked hard for your proposition, but in vain do you hunt for one scripture to help you. They are all against you. I told you, at the beginning, you would need more than the strength of a Goliath. Truly “the way of the transgressor is hard.” Why not stop the arduous task and preach the Gospel without these *human* additions? No, Bro. Harrell, your “friend” is not looking for a “water barrel,” but for the man who is able to prove that instrumental music in worship pleases God. But if you keep *rolling and tumbling*, he will begin to think that he has found his water barrel, and an empty one at that.

12. But he tries again to answer my call for the scripture where the Spirit guided the apostles into the use of instrumental music as an aid to make vocal music more inspiring. This time he says, “If the apostles had been guided into the use of instrumental music as an aid to vocal music, then instrumental music would be a command and not an expedient.” Again you say, then, that the Holy Spirit did not guide them into its use. This makes you wiser than the Spirit, if all you say is true; for instrumental music existed then and you have the Holy Spirit guiding the apostles *all around it* into other things, but *ignoring* its use. What becomes now of all the many things you have said about its beneficent use? the fruits of the Spirit? and a great moral principle?

Was the Holy Spirit ignorant of all this? Does not the Bible say that the Holy Spirit guided them into *all* truth, into *all* things that pertain to life and godliness, *every* good work, the *whole* will of God? But you admit it did not guide them into the use of instrumental music. Hence it is no part of the Truth, does not pertain to life and godliness, is not a good work, is no part of the will of God. Bro. Harrell, can't you see this? Certainly you do. Yet you have been laboring hard to guide me into using a thing you admit the Spirit did not guide the apostles into. Are you going to tell that congregation, of two hundred and fifty members that you wrote me about, these facts? Will you let them read this discussion after it is in tract form? If you do, I venture the assertion that you are going to have to do some preaching over there or you will lose some of your members, for I am sure they are honest and want the truth.

10. But you want to know where the Holy Spirit guided the apostles into using pulpits, meeting houses, lights, and providing fire to warm their cold bodies. Did you ever read of a pulpit of wood in Neh. 8:4? and of Christ's getting into a ship and having Peter push it a little way off from the shore and there teaching the people where he could be better seen and heard? (Luke 5:3), and where Paul abode two whole years in his own hired house and received the people and taught them? (Acts 28:30-31), and of Paul's preaching in the school of one Tyrannus for two years? (Acts 19:9), and in the upper room where they had *many lights*? (Acts 20:8), and of Paul's helping to make fires to warm his body and those that were with him because of the rain and cold? (Acts 28:2-3). "Art thou a stranger in Jerusalem and knowest not these things?"

11. Bro. Harrell says I seem to have a perfect knowledge of *the kind* of music the apostles used. This makes him say that he does not have a perfect knowledge of the kind they used. If you do not, Bro. Harrell, how are you going to prove that God is pleased with the music you are using? The "perfect law of liberty" (James 1:25) which is able to make the man of God "perfect," furnishing him *completely* unto *every* good work (2 Tim. 3:16-17), tells me that they used vocal music, Bro. Harrell, in which they taught and admonished one another in psalms, hymns and spiritual songs What say you?

12. But he says the "apostles said nothing *against* instrumental music." Wonderful argument this. Just here, I will take Bro. Harrell's exact

words and substitute “incense” where he uses instrumental music and let you see how it sounds:

“Is it not strange that the apostles fought circumcision and the keeping of the law, yet, they said nothing against the *burning of incense*? Would not the believing Jew be as prejudiced in the use of *burning incense* as he would in keeping the law? If not, why not? Why did he give up the use of the *burning of incense* without a line or precept against it, and yet he was continually contending for the observance of the law? It took a great effort on the part of the apostles to prevent the Jew from going back to the law, but not one word is said against *burning incense*. The only reasonable conclusion is the apostles did not forbid its use.”

Now, how does that sound, Bro. Harrell? You condemn the Catholics for burning incense. They claim that the graceful curls of the smoke from the altar of incense aids them in ascending to God on the wings of prayer. I put your argument in their mouth. Answer it.

13. Now to Nadab and Abihu. The brother says that here I am “illogical and not to the point.” Well, we will see about this. He says, “God told them the kind of fire to use. They disobeyed the command.” To be sure they did. But he says, “in playing the organ, we continue to sing, and obey the command much better. It is not strange music but vocal music, the kind God commands, aided and assisted by the organ. To illustrate,” says he, “God commanded Nadab and Abihu to burn incense using a certain kind of fire. They use good dry wood to aid in making the fire bum, just like we use the organ to aid the singing.”

Here the brother makes the mistake in making good dry wood parallel to instrumental music in worship. Again, I call his attention to the fact that there are two kinds of music, viz: vocal and instrumental. But is good dry wood a kind of fire, Bro. Harrell? Furthermore, I would call his attention to the fact that good dry wood or its equivalent was contained in the command; for, certain it is, you cannot have fire without wood or its equivalent to bum. Bro. Harrell is the last man who ever attempted an argument who should accuse his opponent of being illogical and not to the point.

He has had much to say about their continuing to sing while the organ is being played, hence they have the scriptural music aided by instrumental (unscriptural, eh?) music. Suppose Nadab and Abihu had

used the kind of fire God said use, and had brought the other kind, too, as an aid? Would this have been accepted, Bro. Harrell? This fits your case exactly. You take this *scriptural* music and undertake to aid it with *unscriptural* music. Nadab and Abihu could have argued just as you do. For instance, they could have said, "In using this strange fire, we continue also to use the fire God commanded, and it bums much better. It is not the strange fire simply that we have, but also the kind God said use, aided by our fire." How about that, Bro. Harrell?

17. In conclusion, let me again say, "We are still looking for the man who can prove God is pleased with instrumental music in worship." Bro. Harrell has tried his very best, so have a few others, but they fail to give us one word of proof. Their arguments are based, absolutely, on *their own feelings* and *thoughts*. But we must have something better than this. I can prove that God is pleased to have us "teach and admonish one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs," in which we offer unto God the "sacrifice of praise, the fruit of our lips, using words easy to be understood" (Col. 3:16; 1 Cor. 14:9-15; Heb. 13:15), but Bro. Harrell, and no other man, can prove God will accept instrumental music in worship. Christ said that he did nothing of himself, and for this reason knew that he pleased his Father. (John 8:28-29). Just as certain as God exists, just that certain does Bro. Harrell use instrumental music of himself. He admits God has not commanded it, but that it meets the demands of an advanced age, as though we must please the age in which we live in order to please God. Bro. Harrell's contention that it helps, is distortion without proof. But we would call his attention to the fact that *unscriptural* music can never help *scriptural* music. This is like the children of Israel's going into Egypt to get *unscriptural* soldiers to help the *God-ordained soldiers*. Jehovah says: "Both he that *helpeth* shall stumble, and he that is *helped* shall fall." (Isa. 31:3). Baptizing infants certainly does not help to baptize believers. Neither does sprinkling a man help to immerse him. Infants are *unscriptural* subjects, just as sprinkling is an *unscriptural* act. But no more so than instrumental music is *unscriptural* music. God has specified the kind of people he wants us to baptize, viz: *Penitent believers*. Bro. Harrell admits this forbids our baptizing those who cannot believe. Just so he has as clearly specified the music he wants us to use in worship, viz: *Vocal music*. This forbids, without a doubt, our using another kind. If not, why not? Yet we are asked, "Where does God say, Thou shalt not baptize babies?"

and sprinkle for baptism?” Again I say this is like asking us, Where has God said Thou shalt not use instrumental music in worship? Both parties are making the same mistake the “Justice of Peace” made who would not condemn the man for stealing a “water barrel” because the “Statutes” did not say, “Thou shalt not steal a water barrel.” The Statutes condemned stealing. This was enough. Just so the New Testament forbids our making additions to God’s word and using man’s inventions to aid God’s ways.

But enough has been said. Kind reader, we leave the question with you. Bro. Harrell has done his best, but his proposition stands in a worse condition than at the beginning. For him, I entertain the kindest feeling. It grieves me to see men who put themselves up as leaders of the people, tear the church of God asunder with the doctrines and commandments of men.

In concluding, Bro. Harrell, let me insist that you put your time and talent on the side of truth and stop trying to defend false doctrine. We must face each other in the judgment with what we teach. Will your doctrine that has divided what was once a united and happy people, stand the test? Praying God to bless us all, and sanctify this discussion to the good of souls. I am yours for the old path.

S. H. Hall

PART THREE: THE DEBATE WITH J. J. WALKER

The Hall-Walker Debate On The Music Question

It is well to give the background to this discussion. When I began work at Russell Street, Nashville, Tennessee, on the first day of the week, month and year, January 1st, 1922, I found the church had been without a regular minister for some months and that J. J. Walker, pastor of what is known as The Woodland Street Christian Church, had so ingratiated himself into the hearts of some of our members that he had some of our best singers in his choir and one of our best pianists to function at the piano in their services. I dared not say anything by way of criticism of Walker to some of the members for they thought him the best Bible teacher to be found. I set my head on getting him into a debate on the music question. He announced in the regular church announcements that he would discuss the music question on one Sunday night, and that those who thought it wrong to have instrumental music in church worship were cordially invited to hear it. I got permission from my elders that I be excused from the Russell Street pulpit that night and hear it. And so I did.

I had never met Walker, so when the service closed, I went to the front and introduced myself to him, and stated that I would like to discuss the question with him. He stated that some of his elders objected to debates, and it was true that some of mine did. But I stated, "Brother Walker, what could be wrong in your coming to Russell Street and give your very best reasons for the use of the instrument, and I follow you and show that the reasons are not based on the Scriptures, but purely human preference? And it will be understood that nothing shall be said by either of us unbecoming to a Bible study, further, let us both sign a pledge that we will go before the audience each evening in the same spirit that we come to the Lord's table on the first day of the week." Without further statements about the preliminaries, this agreement was perfected and the elders of each congregation endorsed it.

That discussion continued five nights and resulted in thirty- five

bonafide conversions from the use of instrumental music in worship. Among the number was Dr. Tarpoly, whose wife stood with us. He had agreed to be baptized into the Christian Church if she would go with him. He had offices in the same building with Dr. Cowden, an elder in the Vine Street Christian Church. Brother Walker, during the debate, visited Dr. Cowden's office a number of times, trying to get Tarpoly converted to the idea of instrumental music in church worship. But Tarpoly was baptized at Russell Street, at the close of the debate, and so was Charlie Jackson and wife, his wife being a Baptist and he not a member of any church. His wife had agreed to go into the Christian Church if he would be baptized into the same. Something similar to this could be said about every convert we got in that discussion, and we lost not one of our members. This saved Russell Street, without a doubt, and got the minds of the membership cemented together, when the church was almost split on some personalities.

This discussion, by the request of both sides was repeated at Montgomery, Alabama, and then repeated at Shelbyville, Tennessee.

Now it is the Shelbyville debate that serves as a background for the tract that followed that discussion. I learned incidentally that Walker had prepared a neat little tract, entitled "My Very Best Reasons For Using Instrumental Music In Church Worship." It struck me that Walker meant to hand out this tract at the close of the discussion, and thus have the advantage by letting the audience have his arguments in printed form when they would be dependent on memory for my arguments. So I went to J. C. McQuiddy and showed him Walker's tract and stated that it was my judgment that this is what Walker meant to do. And I wanted to review it and have my review to hand out in the event Walker handed his out. So McQuiddy told me to get my review ready in manuscript and he would have it set for the regular appearance in Gospel Advocate, take the type thus set for the Advocate and run off a couple of thousand, stitch them and have them ready for the last night of the debate. He ran his press till after midnight on Monday night, the night the debate began, and Dr. Reagor, a former elder at Shelbyville but who then was worshipping with us at Russell Street had the review there by Wednesday night. I instructed Brother H. Leo Boles, my moderator, to let me be the last one called on for a statement the night the debate closed, that I wanted Walker to have a chance to say something about his tract, if he handed it out. And so it turned out. I wish you could have seen Walker, how

he strutted, thanking the people for being so nice to him, and that as they went out they would find ushers with his arguments in tract form and to take one as a memento of how much he appreciated the treatment they had shown him. Well, I need not tell you how I felt, but I arose as soon as he was through and said, "Brother Walker, I happen to have gotten hold of your tract and have reviewed it, and so friends as you leave the building, be certain to take one of Brother Walker's tracts, and read it, then carefully read my reply to every argument he makes." Never, in all my days, have I seen a sicker looking group than Walker and his men looked at the close of that debate. They tried to have the discussion repeated at Livingston, Tennessee, after this and Walker said, "There is nothing doing—S. H. Hall is too mean for me to debate with." So ended my experience with J. J. Walker. And tell me not that he did not know how to debate. He was highly educated and was one of the best specimens of a six foot well built man that I have ever seen.

Now carefully read my review of his tract, and this will be enough of my debates for this time.

Review of Walker's Tract

J. J. WALKER'S TRACT, "INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN CHURCH WORSHIP IS SCRIPTURAL," REVIEWED.

S. H. HALL

I was very much surprised recently when a tract entitled "Instrumental Music in Church Worship is Scriptural," put out by J. J. Walker, fell into my hands, because Brother Walker is the last man who should affirm a proposition like this. As he did in both of his debates with me, he fails to define the terms in his proposition; hence, before beginning the review, let us examine the meaning of the terms. This logic and reason impel us to do.

THE TERMS DEFINED

"*Music*," the dictionaries declare, is "the science and art of the rhythmic combination of tones, vocal or instrumental, embracing melody and anything emotional." ("The Standard Dictionary of English Language.") Under definition 3, this work gives the following: "Any succession or combination of sounds pleasing to the ear; melody; harmony; hence, any entrancing sensation or emotion, such as might be caused by melody or harmony." Do not forget this definition of music, as we will need it later. You will observe that this dictionary makes it clear that we have two kinds of music—viz., *instrumental and vocal*. Brother Walker affirms that "instrumental music in church worship is scriptural."

"*In*" means "within," or "inside."

"*Church*," in this proposition, means a body of Christians assembled together for worship. We have before us, then, local congregational worship.

"*Worship*" means "the feeling or the act of religious homage toward a deity, especially the Supreme God; an act or the acts collectively of such homage, as at a given time and place, such as adoration, thanksgiving, prayer, praise, and offerings." In other words, we have before us the acts of worship that the church may engage in when, as Paul says, "the whole church is assembled together" in one place.

“*Scriptural*” means “pertaining to, contained in, or warranted by the Holy Scriptures; as, scriptural authority.”

Brother Walker is trying to prove that when God’s people assemble together in one place to engage in acts of religious homage to God, the use of music made on mechanical instruments in these acts is *contained in the New Testament Scriptures*, and that such acts *are warranted by the same*. I say he means this, else he has a meaningless proposition. Neither J. J. Walker nor any other living man can define the terms of this proposition according to the definitions found in our best dictionaries without surrendering his proposition. He realizes this fact. Hence, in two oral discussions, when repeatedly urged to do so, he dared not to make a single attempt to define his terms, and also in this tract he makes no attempt, thus demonstrating the point I have made. He is booked for the third oral debate to begin at Shelbyville, Tenn., on July 28, 1924, and we will watch him dodge defining terms again.

NOTHING IS GOOD UNLESS PROVEN

In 1 Thess. 5:21 we are commanded to “*prove all things; hold fast that which is good.*” I take it that nothing is good unless we can prove it. In Eph. 5:10 we are commanded to prove “what is well pleasing unto the Lord.” Nothing is correctly proven unless done so by the word of God. (See Isa. 8:20). Now, just watch Brother Walker’s arguments and see if they prove that instrumental music in church worship is “*contained in*” the

New Testament Scriptures and “*warranted*” by the same. While his arguments do not prove this, I do not want you to think that I claim they prove nothing; for, if ever a thing has been proven, his arguments show beyond a doubt, *prove to a demonstration*, that J. J. Walker has failed the width of the heavens proving “instrumental music in church worship” is “*contained in*” the *New Testament Scriptures* and “*warranted*” by the same. His introductory remarks I am saving for the last. Let us now examine the proof.

HIS PROOF EXAMINED

First—*The Tuning Fork Argument*. Brother Walker, where did you learn that a tuning fork is an instrument of music? When you can make

music on a tuning fork, then will be time enough to give this consideration. “Music,” you ought to know, is not *one* sound, but a “*combination of tones*” or “*succession of sounds.*” The painful difference in the tuning fork and the instrument he is trying to defend is this: The tuning fork *does not* and *cannot* make any music *whatever*, but Brother Walker’s instrument makes a music in worship that our Lord *knowingly* and *intentionally* left out of New Testament worship in spite of the fact that it had been formerly used under the old covenant.

Second—*The Note Book or Songbook Argument*. He places songbooks, tunes, notes, etc., parallel with the use of the mechanical instrument. This only shows what theological somersaults a *man* will turn when he undertakes to defend an unscriptural practice.

But now for a few questions for Brother Walker’s consideration: (a) If God had commanded us to play a mechanical instrument in worship, would this not demand that we provide ourselves with the instrument to play? But Walker has not shown, neither can he show, where God has commanded us to play mechanical instruments in the worship; hence there is no demand for the instrument, (b) Has not God commanded us to speak “one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs” (Eph. 5:19), to teach and admonish one another in such songs (see Col. 3:16)? Does this not demand that we have such songs to sing? Could we any more obey this command without the suitable songs than we could obey the command to be baptized without the water? There is no command to write songs; neither is there any command to provide water or hunt for suitable places for baptism, but the command demands that such be done. Does not the fact that the bread and the fruit of the vine’s being the essential elements in the Lord’s supper demand that we provide ourselves with these things? We are nowhere commanded to bake bread and press juice out of the grape. But the command to eat the Lord’s supper demands that we do so. Can we any more obey the command to sing without the songs than we could the command to eat the Lord’s supper without the bread and the fruit of the vine, or the command to baptize without the water? Songs, tunes, hence notes or their equivalents, are demanded in the command. Where is the demand for the mechanical instrument? If we were commanded to play mechanical instruments in worship, the demand would be in the command; but we are not so commanded. Hence, he has taken the ridiculously absurd position that

a thing *not* demanded is parallel with things that *are* demanded. Who is it that cannot see this? May I ask Brother Walker if instrumental music is not just as dependent on notes as vocal music? I want to ask him if he can have instrumental music without notes or their equivalents.

The facts are, we have two kinds of music—*vocal* and *instrumental* and each is equally dependent on tune, hence the length, pitch, and quality of tones; each sustains identically the same relationship to these things. Yet he takes his tune, notes, etc., and tries to make them parallel with instrumental music. Why not make such parallel with vocal music? There is just as much reason for the one as there is for the other. But our Lord placed vocal music in the church worship, not instrumental music; hence, the church of Christ uses it because it is commanded. Brother Walker uses the other just because he like it and not to please God. Brother Walker knows that whatever is essential in obeying a command is contained in the command whether expressed or not. The command to sing demands a tune, unless Brother Walker can sing without one. Tunes demand notes or their equivalents. This is true of vocal music, and it is just as true of instrumental music. Our Lord calls for vocal music, and this we use in our worship. The people call for instrumental music, and Brother Walker listens to them as much as he does God. To speak to one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs is a command. This demands psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs in which to do this speaking or teaching. Yet he would try to have you believe there is as much scripture for mechanical instruments in church worship as there is for songs, hymns, and tunes. Songs, hymns, and tunes are in the command, and this any one should be able to see. As to having them in book form, I will state that in using the books we do not a thing under the heavens except what the command says do —viz., *speaking to one another, teaching and admonishing one another, in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in our hearts to the Lord*. But, Brother Walker, when you use what you call a “musical staff boxed up in a cabinet,” you make a music that our Lord intentionally left out of the New Testament worship. Can’t you see the difference? If not, others can.

WALKER HAS CHANGED

Third—*Brother Walker now comes to the lexicons and different translations*. Before noticing directly what he says in his tract, may I

present a few interesting facts to my readers?

Before I ever debated with him, he invited me to preach in his stead some Lord's-day morning at Woodland Street. This I agreed to do, provided he would have only vocal music in the worship, as I could not conscientiously take a part in this part of the worship unless the instrumental music was left out. This he refused to do, and here are his own words in a letter dated June 5, 1922, as to why he could not: "Of course, Brother Hall, when you think about it, you could not expect me to compromise my conviction, which is just as strong for the instrument as is yours against it." At that time Brother Walker could not conscientiously leave instrumental music out of the worship; and he told a sister that if he could not prove that we should use it, he would be perfectly willing for his arms to drop from his shoulders. Also, in a meeting with his board before our first debate, he stated to them that this was the course he was going to take. He was kindly advised by one of the older members of his board that whenever he assumed that the mechanical instrument is in the word *psallo* or the command to sing, he would be in trouble; and, in spite of this warning, into this trouble he went, for he took the position in our first debate that "*absolutely to play on a stringed instrument*" in Thayer's definition of *psallo* runs through what Thayer says is in the New Testament meaning. I then replied that if this be true, we had to have the instrument when we *psallo*, and that Eph. 5:19 should read as follows: "Speaking to yourselves in *absolutely playing on a stringed instrument* and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and *absolutely playing on a stringed instrument in your heart to the Lord.*" And in 1 Cor. 14:15 it should read: "I will *absolutely play on a stringed instrument* with my spirit, and I will *absolutely play on a stringed instrument* with my understanding." This was pressed on him good and strong. But in my next debate with him in Montgomery, to my surprise, he had tamed down no little, and said he would *now* let the instrument stay silent for my sake; that he *now* believes that the instrumental music question is a matter to be left entirely with the wishes of each local church; that if the majority vote for it, he thinks they should have it; but if the majority be opposed to it, then he is opposed to its being used in that local church. And just here I think it well to say that we had quite a bit of trouble getting him to agree to meet me in the third debate, and a lengthy correspondence took place between him and me about the same, and I closed the correspondence

thinking I had failed. But I want to give, in this connection, a quotation from my last letter to him, dated February 29, 1924:

“Is it not true that you stand right where some of our sprinkling friends stand on *baptizo*? —viz., it means immerse, and it does not mean immerse; immerse it means if you want to be immersed; but if you do not want to be immersed, then it means you may leave off immersion and do something else. Your much-loved *psalmo* with you means to play on a stringed instrument, and it does not mean this. It means to play on a mechanical instrument if you want instrumental music, or if the majority vote for it; but it most certainly loses this meaning if the majority vote against it. Hence, *psalmo*, according to your position, certainly, at Woodland Street, where you preach, means to play the mechanical instrument. But it just as certainly means not to use it in the mission near Edenvold, where your Brother Sheldon, a former deacon, started a mission, put it in, but some Sundays ago voted it out, and now is depending on us to help him with his thirty-odd members.”

It will be noted from the above that Brother Walker has abandoned the lexicographers on their meaning of *psalmo* and transferred it to the field of politics, and you have to get out and electioneer to get it to mean anything, and its meaning is determined by the number of votes it gets; and if there should be a *tie*, it would then mean nothing, I presume.

How does what he has put out in his little tract sound standing side by side with these facts? In his tract the sum and substance of all that he says is that his scholars say it means to “*sing with or without instrumental accompaniment.*” In the “Boswell-Hardeman Discussion” you will find on Boswell’s chart these words: “*The affirmative position, to sing with or without instrumental music.*” I give the following from Brother Kurfees: “A lexicon, then, is to ‘fix the bounds’ or ‘to mark limits of’ words. Of course, this means it must fix such ‘bounds’ or such ‘limits’ as include *all that belongs to the meaning of the word*, and everything not so included is excluded. Hence the correct definition of words is both inclusive and exclusive. It includes all that the word means, and whatever it does not include is excluded from the meaning of the word; otherwise it is no correct definition at all.” Who ever heard of a word’s meaning that a thing *is in* it if you want it *in*, and it is *out of it* if you want it *out*? But this is

the ridiculously absurd position that the advocates of instrumental music in church worship take on the meaning of *psallo*.

THE DEFINITION OF “PSALLO”

But some one says: “*Tell us what it means.*” I give you Thayer’s definition of the word, and he is the best that we have. Here are his exact words: “*Psallo*—(a) To pluck off, pull out. (b) To cause to vibrate by touching, to twang; to touch or strike the chord, to strike the strings of a musical instrument so that they gently vibrate; and absolutely to play on a stringed instrument. to play the harp; to sing to the music of the harp. *In the New Testament*, to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praises of God in song, James 5:13 (R.V., *sing praise*).” He then gives the New Testament references.

Now, what are we to do with the above definition? Are we to take everything he says is in the word and put it in the New Testament meaning? If so, when we assemble, we must put some over in one corner and let them pluck off their beard, for some of the lexicons say it means this; and we would have some in another corner of the house pulling out their hair, for some of the lexicons say it means this; and we would have others in another part of the building plucking the carpenter’s line, for Liddell and Scott say it means this; then there would be others just plucking the strings of an instrument without any thought of making music, for this word certainly means this; and there would be others *absolutely playing* on an instrument, for this word means this; then there would be some singing to the music of the harp, for does it not say this is one of the meanings? But you say: “Stop, Brother Hall; I am disgusted.” Well, so am I. But every one of these statements is to be found in Thayer and other lexicons. But you say this word may have meant these different things at different times and places, but cannot mean all of this in its New Testament use. Exactly so. And I ask you to look above and see if Mr. Thayer does not positively say that “*in the New Testament*” this word means “*to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praises of God in song*”

WALKER PERVERTS THAYER

But you notice Brother Walker steps back up into the classical meaning and puts “*absolutely to play on a stringed instrument, to play the harp,*” as a part of the New Testament meaning. Why does he not

bring the other things said by Thayer into the New Testament meaning? No, he just takes what suits him. And notice, he fails to give all Thayer says and actually changes the punctuation in his rash effort to make the New Testament meaning carry with it the idea that the *mechanical instrument* inheres in the word. Here is what Brother Walker says is Thayer's definition: "'*Psallo*, ' absolutely to play on a stringed instrument, to play the harp, in the New Testament to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praise of God in song.'" Compare what Brother Walker gives with what Thayer says as quoted above. Thayer makes a distinction between the classical and New Testament meaning. Brother Walker intentionally so arranged some of Thayer's words as to make the impression that the classical and New Testament meaning blend or run together. A man is in desperate straits to prove a proposition when he resorts to such tactics. What is to be thought of a cause when a man of Brother Walker's standing among those who advocate the use of instrumental music in church worship puts himself in the unenviable predicament that he has in his efforts to make Thayer say what he wants him to say? Brother Walker either knows Thayer's position on the New Testament meaning of this word, or he does not. If he does not, he is to be pitied, and is an unsafe teacher; if he does, then there is absolutely no confidence to be placed in him when it comes to handling lexicons on a question of this kind, and still is an unsafe teacher. If Brother Walker does not know that Thayer gives, *specifically*, the New Testament meaning to be that of "*singing, to celebrate the praises of God in song*," then I ask him to take from Thayer's definition of this word, "*in the New Testament*," then tell us if he has changed Thayer's definition. What do the words, "*in the New Testament*," mean, if Thayer by them did not mean to let us know that he was then and there giving us the *specific* New Testament definition of *psallo*?

His perversion of Thayer on *humnos* is worse than what he has done with *psallo*. Here is what Thayer says about *humnos*: "A song in praise of gods, heroes, conquerors; but in the Scriptures of God, a sacred song, hymn: plur., Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16." Then in brackets he gives the synonyms: "(Syn. *humnos psalmos, ode*; ode is the generic term; psalm and hymn are specific, the former designating a song which took its general character from the Old Testament 'Psalms' (although not restricted to them, see 1 Cor. 14:15, 26), the latter a song of praise)." Does this not make it clear that Thayer does not believe that

psallo in 1 Cor. 14:15 calls for the idea of the Old Testament Psalms, and that the psalms spoken of in verse 26 do not refer to such Psalms? Does this not show even more conclusively that he believes these words have a *peculiar New Testament meaning* without any regard to the Old Testament signification where the instrumental idea is associated with these words? But Brother Walker then gives Thayer's quotation from Lightfoot and tries to pervert this into making Thayer take a position absolutely contradictory to what he has just said. Here is what Lightfoot says: "While the leading idea of 'psalm' is a musical accompaniment and that of 'hymn' is 'praise to God,' 'ode' is the general word for a song, whether accompanied or unaccompanied, whether of praise or on any other subject. Thus it was quite possible for the same song to be at once *psalmos*, *hymnos*, and *ode*." Thus Thayer gives what Lightfoot says. But has not Thayer just said that *psallo* in 1 Cor. 14:15 and *psalmos* in the twenty-sixth verse are not *restricted to the Old Testament idea of these words*, where they sometimes had the instrumental idea by the law of association? Hence, since Lightfoot says *ode* is the general word for a song whether accompanied or unaccompanied, it makes Thayer's position that of unaccompanied singing. Indeed, a man is hard pressed when he thus deals with lexicons as the advocates for instrumental music in worship do!

THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITTEN IN THE LANGUAGE OF "EVERY-DAY LIFE"

The translators of "*The Twentieth Century New Testament*" say:

"The Greek used by the New Testament writers was not the classical Greek of some centuries earlier, but the form of the language spoken in their own day. Moreover, the writers represent those whose utterances they record as using the words and phrases of everyday life." Mr. Edgar J. Goodspeed, in his American translation of the New Testament, 1923, says: "The New Testament was written not in classical Greek nor in the 'biblical' Greek of the Greek version of the Old Testament, nor even in the literary Greek of its own day, but in the common language of everyday life. This fact has been fully established by the Greek papyrus discoveries and the grammatical researches of the last twenty-five years. It follows that the most

appropriate English form for the New Testament is the simple, straightforward English of every-day expression.”

But I must hasten to close the discussion based on *psallo*. Thayer, who stands at the head of the New Testament lexicography, and professor of New Testament exegesis in the Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass., and one of the secretaries in “the New Testament Company” who gave us the American Revised Version of our Bible, says, *emphatically*, that the word *psallo* has a *classical* and a *New Testament* meaning. One of the classical meaning he says is, “absolutely to play on a stringed instrument, to play the harp.” But he says “*in the New Testament*” this word means to “*sing a hymn, to celebrate the praises of God in song.*” And that you may know that the burden of his effort in his great lexicon is to give us the New Testament meaning of words, I give the following from “Prefatory Remarks” in the back of his lexicon.

“The lists of words herewith subjoined, as an aid to researches involving the language of the New Testament, require a few preliminary remarks by way of explanation.”

“In the attempt to classify the vocabulary of the New Testament, words which occur in secular authors down to and including Aristotle (who died B. C. 322) are regarded as belonging to the classical period of the language, and find no place in this list.”

“The New Testament vocabulary has thus been classified according to hard and fast chronological lines.”

MORE PROOF GIVEN

And to make the position stronger still, I here give Sophocles. He was a native Greek, bred and bom in the very language under discussion, and for thirty-eight years professor of Greek in Harvard University. He gave us a lexicon covering the Roman end Byzantine periods, from 146 B. C. to 1100 A. D., in the preparation of which work he examined a grand total of five hundred and ninety-four authors. He gives the word under controversy for this period in which our New Testament was written, “*to chant, to sing religious songs.*” Talk about making scholars stultify themselves! Indeed, you have done this when

you say *psallo* in its New Testament use, has the idea of instrumental accompaniment, and these men did not intimate such a meaning for this period and in giving it its New Testament definition.

Brother Walker says: “For it to mean ‘sing’ would put Paul at least in the very stupid and ridiculous position of saying ‘sing’ and ‘sing.’ ” And immediately after saying this he states that every one of his lexicons, “*without exception,*” “*defines this word (psallo) or some of its derivatives as meaning to sing.*” Read it on page 4 of his tract. Brother Walker, there is no reason in what you say unless you make *psallo* mean to play on a mechanical instrument. But this you cannot do; for, as you say, all the scholars, “*without exception,*” say it means *sing*. Of course, you have it meaning “to sing with or without instrumental accompaniment.” Don’t you know that no simple word—*etymon*, or root word—as *psallo*, has any such meaning as the build-up word *accompany*, which is composed of three different parts, *ac-com-panis*? For this reason *psallo* has no such meaning as the word *accompany*. It no more means to accompany the voice in singing with musical instruments than *ado*, to sing, means to accompany the music of a musical instrument with the voice.

Bagster says, “In New Testament, to sing praises,” and gives the New Testament references. (Rom. 15:9; 1 Cor. 14:15; Eph. 5:19; James 5:13).

Green says, “In New Testament, to sing praises,” and gives same references.

New Greek-English and English-Greek (Contopoulous), 1868 A. D., gives only one meaning to *psallo*, “to sing, to celebrate,” and leaves the instrument entirely out.

Vincent says:

“In New Testament, sing praises.”

Green’s Lexicon says *psallo* means:

“In New Testament, to sing praises.”

Analytical Greek Lexicon (New Testament Lexicon) says:

“In New Testament, to sing praises.”

Biblical Encyclopedia, commenting on Eph. 5:19 and Col. 3:16, says:

“Singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord, the heart moving devoutly with the voice.”

John W. McGarvey said:

“If any man who is a preacher says the apostle teaches the use of instrumental music in the church by enjoining the singing of psalms, he is one of the smatterers of Greek who can believe anything he wishes to believe.”

W. H. Kruitzienger says:

“It (*psallo*) is used five times in the New Testament, and does not include the instrument a single time.” “When used with the dative of person, it means to sing a song or psalm without an instrument.”

H. L. Calhoun, now of Bethany College, Virginia, says:

“It will be admitted that the New Testament nowhere mentions the use of an instrument in connection with the singing in the church. This fact settles beyond all dispute that the use of the instrument in connection with the singing in the church cannot be an act of acceptable worship, and that condition which it fails to fulfill is the only condition that differentiates an act of acceptable worship from an act that is not acceptable. The use of the instrument by the Jews was acceptable worship, for they were under the Old Testament, which directed them to use instruments; but people living today, under the New Testament have no direction given for their use in worship.”

Greenfield:

“By implication, to sing; and with the dative of person, to sing in honor or praise of, to sing praises to God, celebrate in song or psalm.”

Scapula's Lexicon:

“Likewise, metaphorically, *psallo* with songs and glorify the Lord with hymns. I sing praises unto the Lord.”

Professor Riddell, of the Revision Committee, in a letter to M. C. Kurfees, October 20, 1914, says:

“As you doubtless are aware, the Greek verb *psallo* is derived from the notion of thrumming on a stringed instrument. This sense it retains in the Septuagint, but in the New Testament, where it occurs five times (Rom. 15:9; 1 Cor. 14:15; Eph. 5:19; James 5:13), this etymological sense passes over to that of singing praises to God; hence in the New Testament, does not necessarily mean the accompaniment of instrumental music.”

Briney, in a letter to Kurfees, March 16, 1917, says:

“I did not ask whether *psallo* included the use of the instrument in its meaning in New Testament times, for I never believed it.”

Whatever a word does not *include*, it *excludes*.

Vincent, commenting on Col. 3:16, says:

“A psalm was originally a song, accompanied by a stringed instrument. The idea of accompaniment passed away in usage, and the psalm in the New Testament phraseology is an Old Testament psalm or a composition having that character.”

McClintock and Strong Cyclopaedia:

“The Greek word *psallo* is applied among the Greeks of modern times exclusively to sacred music; which, in the Eastern Church, has never been any other than vocal, instrumental music being unknown in that church, as it was in the primitive church.”

But this is not all. Twenty-four translations made in the last five hundred years translate the word by “sing” or “make melody,” and when translated “to make melody” it declares it is done in the heart and not on an instrument made by human hands. And let it be remembered that in one of these translations (Authorized Version) we have forty-seven scholars, and one hundred and one scholars in the other (American Revised Version). Is this not enough? Then the Greek Church, which uses the very language in which the New Testament was written, has, from its beginning till now, excluded instrumental

music. And last, but by no means least, if that word did include the instrument, the apostles themselves did not know it, for they introduced the instrument in not one congregation they established, but, rather, declared, in no uncertain sound, that the music to be made in the churches was that made with the “mouth,” with the “lips,” with the voice; and it must never be made in an unknown tongue, but in words easy to be understood; and that when made they must *psallein* in the heart, or let the singing be done with grace in the heart. Can it be believed that the apostles, if the instrument had been included in this word, would not have said so just once, or put the instrument in one congregation and settled forever this question? They had been used to them under the old law; they converted multitudes of the musicians from the old Jewish worship; instruments were plentiful. May I ask: *A thing the apostles had been in the habit of using under the old law that they could have easily used under the new law, yet refused to introduce it into New Testament worship, are we to believe otherwise than that it was deliberately left out?* Can we afford not to follow their example when we know them to be guided absolutely by our Lord?

MUST BE PROVEN BEYOND A DOUBT

Let me here say that, before you can afford to use instrumental music in church worship, it must be placed beyond a doubt with you that our Lord wants it done. Paul says: “But he that doubteth is condemned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith; and whatsoever is not of faith is sin.” (Rom. 14:23). Has Brother Walker even begun to show that we, beyond any doubt in the matter, can use instrumental music in church worship? His proposition says: “Instrumental music in church worship is scriptural.” How can a thing be scriptural when it is not “*contained in*” or “*warranted by*” the Scriptures?

He says that we “seem to labor under the impression that the apostles were Englishmen speaking the English language.”

O, no, Brother Walker, you should have known better than that when you said it. We know the New Testament comes to us in Greek; and more than this, we know what the Greek means, a thing you seem not to know and very unwilling to learn. All that he introduces from the lexicons and different translations fails the width of the heavens proving his proposition. I can admit all he says, and still his proposition would be crying for a friend to come to its relief.

HUMAN VOICE, ACCOMPANIED BY THE HEART, THE ONLY INSTRUMENT ALLOWED IN NEW TESTAMENT WORSHIP

The only instruments allowed in New Testament music in our worship are “the harps of God,” the lips, vocal cords, lungs, etc., and this must be accompanied with the emotions of the heart. “Through him then let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of the lips which make confession to his name.” (Heb. 13:15). We have heard so much said about the “restrictive clause in the deed” to property. May I say we here have *the restrictive clause in worship*? This praise is restricted to “fruit of the lips.” This shuts out instruments made with human hands, Brother Walker. If not, why not? But let us take every place where the word is found, and you can see it is restricted to “the harps of God,” the music of the human voice and all that pertains thereto. In Eph. 5:19, Paul says: “Speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord.”

Can't you see that it is the human voice that must be used in the right use of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, and both *adontes* and *psallontes* are done with the vocal cords, and it is the heart that directs both the *adontes* and the *psallontes*? And I do not care what Brother Walker makes *psallontes* mean. If he wants it to mean pluck, then it is the vocal cords plucked with the heart and breath, just as a violin is *psalloed* with my hand and bow; if he wants it to mean play, then it is the harp God himself made as a part of us that is played, but the heart is the director in this playing. The same is true of *adontes*. We do this singing with the organs God made, but it is the heart that directs it; hence it is done with the heart. “With your heart” modifies both singing and making melody in Eph. 5:19. Please note that “*adontes kai psallontes en tee kardia*” means, literally, “singing and *psalloing* with your heart”—that is, the singing is done with the heart the same as *psalloing*; and both involve speaking one to another, because both participles, *adontes* and *psallontes*, modify speaking and show of what this speaking consists. The *adontes* is done by *speakings* and the *psallontes* is just as much done by speaking; but the heart directs both, otherwise it is not worship. Now look at Col. 3:16, and you have the same thing. “Teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your heart to the Lord,” showing the heart directs both the *adontes* and *psallontes*, and both are done with the voice.

Now look at 1 Cor. 14:9, 15, “So also ye, unless ye utter *by the tongue* speech easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken?” But about what kind of “speaking” is he writing? He is talking about the speaking we do in *singing* and *praying*. Read his conclusion in verse 15: “What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will *sing (psallo)* with the spirit, and I will *sing (psallo)* with the understanding also.” It is manifest here that *psalloying* is done with the human voice. Now we go to Rom. 15:9. What does it say? “Therefore will I give praise unto thee among the Gentiles, and *sing (psallo)* unto thy name.” But read verse 6, and you find it says it is done with *the mouth*: “That with one accord ye may with *one mouth* glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.” I know he says that this is a quotation of Psa. 18:49, and that we have the Hebrew *zamar* translated into Greek with *psallo*; but *zamar* in the Hebrew, translated into Greek by *psallo*, did not mean a *mechanical* instrument in David’s day. It meant to pluck, etc.; but the instrument had to be named, otherwise they would not have known what instrument to pluck. In Psa. 147:7 we have: “Sing (*psallo*) praises upon the harp unto our God.” *Psallo* did not have the instrument inhering in it; the instrument had to be named. (See also Psa. 33:2). No one could know simply from the use of *psallo* what instrument was to be used. The New Testament names the instrument. It is the human voice, accompanied with the heart.

PETER AINSLIE TESTIFIES

And just here I think it in order to introduce Peter Ainslie, of Baltimore, the father of “the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity,” of which Brother Walker, Brother Cowden, and others are members. Be it remembered that just recently Brother Ainslie was in Nashville in conference with Brethren Walker, Cowden, and others, at the Vine Street Christian Church, in behalf of this organization; and in their report to the daily paper he is spoken of as being “known internationally, not only because of his writings, but because of his ability as an orator, having spoken in many of the educational centers of Europe as well as in this country.” Brother Ainslie, on page 9 of the tract that gives his “address delivered before the International Convention of the Disciples at Winona Lake, Ind., September 1, 1922,” takes the position that instrumental music in church worship, missionary methods, and “open membership” are

parallel. He says: "Once our motto was: 'Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent.' It is a beautiful idea, but Disciple history denies the idealism in it. There is nothing said in the New Testament about organs in churches, but we divided over organs, and, therefore, denied the workableness of our motto... Some tell me that we will divide over open membership, although there is nothing in the New Testament about open membership... But if we are so intolerant as to divide over open membership... it is altogether possible that the judgment of future generations will be to classify us among the most sectarian of the sects."

Our "digressive" brethren have split open over "open membership," the Christian Standard and other of their papers bitterly opposing it and the Christian Century and other of their papers championing it. Brother Walker, if I understand him, also opposes "open membership." If he does not, I will be glad to stand corrected if he will let me know I am mistaken here. And I want to say that Brother Ainslie has just as much authority for his "*open membership*" that he practices in his own congregation as Brother Walker has for *mechanical instruments* in worship. Brother Ainslie says: "There is nothing said in the New Testament about organs in churches." But Brother Walker is trying to prove that there is something said about them in the word *psallo*. Brother Walker says in his tract that it is "laziness, ignorance, or prejudice" that causes us to object to instrumental music in church worship. May I ask him which of the three—"laziness, ignorance, or prejudice"—it is that causes his Brother Ainslie, whom he hails as a great man, to not know that the idea of the *mechanical* instrument is in the word *psallo*? Hear Brother Ainslie once more: "It was a serious time when we divided over the organ. *It must be said to the credit of the anti-organ brethren that they had the better of the argument, for instrumental music was not used in Christian worship for six hundred years after the birth of Christ, and the Eastern Orthodox Church, the oldest church in Christendom* (and why not also say, that has ever spoken the language in which the New Testament was written? —S. H. H.), *with its one hundred and thirty million members, does not to this day use instrumental music in public worship*" (Italics mine. —S. H. H.) Brother Walker, do you agree with the head of the organization of which you are a member? If not, is it "*laziness, ignorance, or prejudice*" that is troubling Brother Ainslie? Brother Ainslie has

spoken the invulnerable truth on the music question in the words quoted above; hence, if what Brother Walker says about the idea of instrumental music's inhering in *psallo* be true, the apostles themselves used one word and died without ever knowing the meaning of it, and the Greek Church, which uses the very language in which the apostles wrote the New Testament, has never, with all its millions of members and in all these years, yet learned! Who can believe it?

BROTHER WALKER AND THE TRANSLATIONS

After introducing a number of translations, Brother Walker asks a question and gives his own answer. He asks: "Now, what does Paul say? It will depend upon the Bible one picks up from the table." He is talking about what Paul says in Eph. 5:19. Who ever heard of such recklessness? What Paul says depends upon *no* translation. What he says depends upon what is *actually* in the original Greek text. As to translations, they may be correct and they may be incorrect. He would have Paul saying just anything that a biased and prejudiced translator wants him to say. The idea of what Paul says depending upon such! I pick up Groves' Greek-English Dictionary and turn to his definition of *bapto*, and here is what he says: "To *dip, plunge, immerse*; to wash; to wet, to moisten, *sprinkle*; to steep, imbue; to dye, stain, color." Must we conclude, therefore, since this lexicon says this, that Paul, when he used *baptizo*, means to *immerse* or *sprinkle*? Would this not be just as sensible for the advocates of sprinkling to say of *baptizo* as what he has said of *psallo*? Then, is it not true that Liddell and Scott, one of the lexicons he has introduced, in their first edition, had *sprinkle* as one of the meanings of *baptizo*? Did this make *sprinkling* one of its meanings, then? No, kind reader, Paul does not depend on fallible translators for what he says; he *depends on just what he said*, and nothing else. And he said *psallo*, and the Greek-speaking people always left instrumental music out of their worship, and they have always *immersed* for baptism. I wonder if Brother Walker knows more about the *Greek* language than the people bred and born in this language. He belabors himself running after what men have said, trying to find proof for instrumental music, introducing quite a number of different statements from these different men about what Paul said. He then raises the question: "*Now, what did Paul say? It will depend upon the Bible one picks up.*" Well, Brother Walker, which one do you pick up? We are glad to "pick up" the *American Revised Version*,

which was made by one hundred and one men, the *very cream* of the scholarship of the world, and who translate this word in Eph. 5:19 “*make melody*” with whom the forty- seven scholars who gave us the King James Version agree; also Wycliffe’s translation, Cranmer’s, Macknight, Anderson, Living Oracles, Worrell’s, the Baptist translation, Tyndale’s, Wesley’s, the Geneva translation, the Catholic translation, the Douay Bible, Doddridge’s, Ellicott’s, and James Moffatt’s translation. What else could I add? The most recent translation that I have seen is Edgar J. Goodspeed, 1923, and he translates “*adontes kai psallontes en tee kardia humon to kurio*”—“*sing praise to God with all your hearts.*” Then the added fact that the Greeks, who know this language as others do not, have ever excluded instrumental music in worship, and that the inspired apostles did not know it included the instrument and never put it in any of the congregations they started, proves *to a demonstration* that we have “picked up” the right translation.

WALKER FALLS UPON HIS OWN SWORD

Now, I challenge Brother Walker to “*pick up*” any translation he ever heard of that translates it to suit his theory. The position of our “digressive” brethren is that *psallo* means “*to sing with or without instrumental accompaniment.*” See Boswell’s chart and read Brother Walker’s tract. Will you please take any translation he has introduced and see if it will “*fit in?*” We will try “Rotherham’s Emphasized New Testament,” which seems to be their favorite translation. Here are his words: “Singing and striking the strings with your heart unto the Lord.” “*Striking the strings*” is his translation of *psallo*. So we substitute Walker and Boswell’s position therefor, and here is the way it would read: “Singing and striking the strings with your heart unto the Lord with or without instrumental accompaniment.” This would compel us to take the position we do take— that “*striking the strings*” here *must* of necessity be the *vocal cords* which are used *by the heart* in praising God, as instructed by the New Testament Scriptures; for when we sing *without the accompaniment*, there would be no other strings left to strike. Brother Walker could no more find a translation that suits his theory than he could fly to the moon. But look further into the predicament he is in. Did he not say that “*absolutely to play on a stringed instrument*” in Thayer’s classical definition of this term runs into the New Testament meaning? Now, let us put those words

for *psallo* with Brother Walker's contention that *psallo* means to "sing with or without instrumental accompaniment," and here is the way it would read: "*Singing and absolutely playing on a stringed instrument with or without instrumental accompaniment.*" So if you put Thayer's words as a part of the New Testament meaning, then Brother Walker is compelled to admit that the *instrument* to be used is the one God made as a part of our very being and which is specifically named for the New Testament worship; for when we sing *without instrumental accompaniment*, there is no other instrument left but "the harps of God."

But in spite of the fact that the burden of his tract is to prove that *psallo* means to sing *with* or *without* instrumental accompaniment, hear him on page 9: "There can be no singing without the vocal cords, mutes illustrating; *neither can there be any playing* (he means *psalloing* here. —S. H. H.) *without the mechanical instrument. SOMETHING IN BOTH CASES MUST PRODUCE THE SOUND.*" By both cases he means in the case of *ado*, to *sing*, and *psallo*, to *play*. Now you have it. I want him to tell us, then, how we can obey Christ in Eph. 5:19 without the *mechanical* instrument. Watch him now answer: "*Eph. 5:19 is not a command.*" Now, we will try to "fix" Eph. 5:19 again for him. Taking all that he says, it reads: "Singing and *playing* or *striking the strings with or without* instrumental accompaniment, but there can be no *playing* or *striking the strings* without the mechanical instrument." There is the predicament that he is in. I suggest, Brother Walker, that you call all your friends together and go to *voting* on *psallo*, and see if you can *vote* yourself out of this absurdity you are in. Who can believe Brother Walker's position, when it *lassoes*, in spite of all of his twisting and turning, such a *young* and *brilliant* man as he? And name the man among them, please, who has tried to defend instrumental music in worship that did not contradict himself—*flagrantly so*—in the effort. It makes babes out of such lions as J. B. Briney. You should not expect Brother Walker to do better than he. In closing this point, may I ask again, Brother Walker, which one of the translations will you "*pick up?*"

TRIES ANOTHER ARGUMENT

Fourth—*Apostolic Example*. He contends that instrumental music was in the temple worship, and the apostles went in and worshiped with such instruments; and he also claims that when Christ cleansed the

temple he cast almost everything out, but nothing is said about his casting instruments of music out. Well, does it say anything about our Lord casting the golden altar cut, or incense, or other things that we know to have been a part of the temple service? Does this prove that such must *now* be a part of *New Testament worship*? He refers us to Luke 24:53. This proves nothing. This was before Pentecost, when the Spirit came upon the apostles to guide them into all truth, and the apostle Peter had the *keys* of the kingdom and began to *bind* on earth in church worship what our Lord has also bound in heaven. Christ cleansed the temple before his death, during his personal ministry. Did he not himself declare in Matt. 5:18 that “one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished?” But he claims that the apostles worshiped in the temple with instrumental music after Pentecost. He cannot prove any such thing. This is his assertion. When baptized believers, from Pentecost on, were in the temple, they were there with “*one accord*.” (See Acts 2:46). Brother Walker, do you know what “one accord” means? Does not “accord” mean “harmony, as of sentiment, action,” etc? Does not “one accord” mean “unanimous agreement?” Is it not true that the temple worship continued in the hands of the *infidel Jews*, and that they did not turn this service over to the *believing or converted Jews*? Will Brother Walker tell us how the *believing Jew* could have been of “*one accord!*” with the *infidel Jew*? Here let Paul refute Walker. Turning to 2 Cor. 6:15, Paul asks the pointed question: “*What concord hath Christ with Belial? or what portion hath a believer with an unbeliever?*” Tell us, Brother Walker. Paul was asking such as *you* this question—you who now, in order to save your mechanical instrument in church worship, would have us believe that the *infidel Jews* and the *believing Jews* went right on with “*one accord?*” in the temple service after Pentecost! They did no such thing; in fact, it *could not be done*. But they were there of “*one accord*.” So it is right to ask: *Of what did this oneness of accord consist?* They were there to *tell* about *this Lord* and *Saviour* for whom the Jews had been looking all these years; they were there to *preach Christ, and him crucified*, unto the people. Do you doubt it? Let the Bible settle this question: “Go ye, and stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life.” (See Acts 5:20). The apostles had been run out of the temple and even imprisoned before this because, instead of *joining in* with the infidel Jews in their temple service, they preached the *resurrection of our Lord*. (See Acts 4:1-3). We have the command from our Lord to

go into the temple and preach Christ as the Son of God. Where do we have Christ commanding them to go into the temple and *join* the *infidel Jews* in their worship? Will you tell us *where*? Again your proposition is crying loudly for a friend. But more: “Every day, in the temple and at home, they ceased not to teach and to preach Jesus as the Christ.” (Acts 5:42).

Certainly Brother Walker ought to know enough about logic to know that a thing that proves too much proves nothing. If his argument here proves anything for *mechanical* instruments in worship, does it not prove just as much for the Catholic for his incense in worship? Does it not prove that we can have animal sacrifices and other things pertaining to the old covenant? But Brother Briney tries to dodge here by saying the hour of prayer, when the apostles are spoken of as going up to the temple, was not the time for burning incense; that incense was burned at one time and the praying done at another. But, unfortunately for the advocates of instrumental music, Luke says: “According to the custom of the priest’s office, his lot was to enter into the temple of the Lord and burn incense. And the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the hour of incense.” (See Luke 1:9, 10). And if the mere fact that they went into the temple proves that they were joining the infidel Jews in their temple service according to the law, would not the fact, as stated in Acts 17:17, that Paul reasoned daily *in the market*, prove that Paul was running a market? No, they went into the temple to preach Christ and his teaching, and the infidel Jews drove them out. So did they to Peter and the other apostles, and ultimately put them to death, because they taught another way of worship. The early Christians patterned their congregational worship after the synagogue worship and not after the temple service. The synagogues never had instrumental music in them.

Kind reader, has Brother Walker proved his proposition? He must place this question beyond a doubt. Has he done so?

A SCENE IN HEAVEN

Fifth—*Instruments in Heaven*. *He* has weakened on this. He does not have so much to say in his tract as he said in his first debate with me. I give you his speech. It runs about this way, describing himself as before God in the judgment: “Lord, you taught me to pray while on earth: ‘Father, thy will be done on earth as it is done in heaven.’ I read

in the book of Revelation that there are harps in heaven. So, to answer this prayer you taught me to pray, I used mechanical instruments in my worship to thee on earth.” He called this *a scene in heaven*. I answered that I liked scenes, so would give him one or two. Using as nearly as I could his own words, but substituting “incense” for “instrumental music,” I had the Catholic before our Lord in the judgment, saying: “Lord, you taught me to pray while on earth: ‘Thy will be done on earth as it is done in heaven.’ I read in the book of Revelation (8:2, 3) these words, written by Saint John: ‘And I saw the seven angels that stand before God; and there were given unto them seven trumpets. And another angel came and stood over the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should add it unto the prayers of all the saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne.’ And seeing this, and since you taught me to pray, ‘Thy will be done on earth as it is done in heaven,’ I added incense to my prayer on earth.”

Now I ask: Is not this just as good for the Catholic and his incense as it is for Brother Walker and his instruments made with human hands? I contend that it is better. Brother Walker turns out to be a materialist in order to save his *idol*, mechanical instruments in church worship—a thing he loves better than he loves the peace and unity of the church of our Lord; for he would have us believe there will be material golden altars in heaven — real incense; for if the “harps of God” refer to mechanical instruments made by human hands, so do the golden altars and the incense spoken of as being *added* to the prayers of the saints. He seems much concerned about our Lord’s prayer, “Thy will be done on earth as it is done in heaven;” but he cares nothing for the same Lord’s prayer when he poured out his soul unto the Father and prayed that all believers today be one, as he and his Father are one. The same argument he makes for instrumental music here can be made for infant church membership. So his proposition continues to cry for a friend to come to its relief.

NOW HUNTS FOR PROOF IN ALL DISPENSATIONS

Sixth—*The Four Dispensations*. He claims that mechanical instruments are found in worship under the patriarchal dispensation, also the Jewish, then the Christian dispensation under which we now live, and finally in heaven. Miriam’s going out, with other women, and celebrating the victory over the Egyptians at the Red Sea, “with

timbrels and with dances” (Ex. 15:20), is his proof for the patriarchal dispensation. But, Brother Walker, why do you want to take the *timbrels* and leave off the *dances*? Here is your trouble: Your proof proves too much, hence nothing.

But our advocates for instrumental music in church worship try to save their cause here by saying “dances” here, and also in Psa. 150:4, refers to a certain kind of instrument that then existed, and does not mean the bodily dance. But, unfortunately for them, Thayer says that *choros*, the Greek that translates the Hebrew in these verses, means, “fr. Homer down, *a band (of dancers and singers), a circular dance, a dance, dancing*: Luke 15:25 (for the Hebrew, Ex. 15:20;... Psa. 150:4).” So you have the meaning of this word and the very scriptures in question cited by this man who knows.

So far as the Jewish worship is concerned, no one denies that instrumental music was in their worship. But I remind you of the fact that it says “the commandment” *then* “was of Jehovah by his prophets.” But we are not under that law. Paul says: “For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.” (Heb. 7:12). Where is the command to use it under this *new law*? Will you tell me *where*? If it took the commandment of the Lord to put it *in* the Jewish covenant, or old law, will it not take the commandment of the Lord to put it *in* the new law? And there was incense by the commandment of the Lord under that covenant, but we have no commandment for incense under the new law. But you say: “Brother Hall, where does the new law say, ‘Thou shalt not have instrumental music in the worship under this law?’” I answer: Where does the New Testament say, “Thou shalt not burn incense in worship under this law?” Everything is left out of the New Testament worship that is not expressly put in. Why will you add to God’s holy word a thing you are commanded not to do? Your argument on the apostles’ going into the temple as proof has already been answered. You have no proof from the New Testament Scriptures for mechanical instruments in New Testament worship, and your effort to show there will be mechanical instruments in heaven makes you a materialist.

WALKER NOT THE MAN TO MAKE A PLEA FOR THE RESTORATION MOVEMENT

Seventh—*His Plea for the Restoration Movement*. Brother Walker,

you are not the man to make it. You say we need a “restoration of the restorative movement.” Not so far as we are concerned. Tell us the difference, please, between what you call the “nonprogressives” and those great souls who brought about the “restorative movement.” Did they have instrumental music in worship? You know they did not. If space would allow, I could give you testimony from the last one of them that spoke on this question. But I confess that so far as the “restorative movement” is represented by you and your associates, it *sorely* needs to be *restored*. And just here I want to go on record as denying that we are “*nonprogressive*.” We believe in progress, but claim that the only true progress that we can have is to be found *in the truth*. You are the “nonprogressive,” because you have *digressed* from the truth. There can be no real *progress* in *digression*. You have *digressed* from the teaching of the New Testament on worship. You have *flagrantly digressed* from the work of the fathers who brought about the restorative movement. The New Testament does not allow your mechanical instrument in worship, and the fathers who fought and died for the restoration of the New Testament church and its worship left it out of the *restorative* movement, and it is *you* and *yours* that have put it in. This you know. Talk about our being “nonprogressive!” You have not even progressed as far as Pentecost, for you still worship according to the old law. You have not even progressed beyond the blood of animals, but want to hold to that dedicated with the blood of bulls and goats. (See Heb. 9:10-24).

HIS PLEA FOR UNITY CONTRADICTED BY HIS ACTS

Your plea for peace and unity is contradicted by your actions. This I will now prove. Answer the following questions, please:

1. Is the use of mechanical instruments in worship a command in the New Testament? You say it is not.
2. Since it is not a command, can you conscientiously worship without it? You first said you could not worship without it, but now you say you can.
3. Since we cannot worship conscientiously with it, and you say you can worship conscientiously without it, then who is making it a test of fellowship? The fact is, Brother Walker, you and those who stand with you love the instrument better than you love the conscientious

convictions of your brethren. Even if the instrument were a matter of indifference—a thing we deny, but you say it is “a petty thing”—you are flagrantly tramping under foot our *Lord’s blood-sealed law of love* in tearing the church asunder with it. Hear Paul on the “petty things” which you say the use of the instrument is: “For if because of meat thy brother is grieved, thou walkest no longer in love. Destroy not with thy meat him for whom Christ died.... So then let us follow after things which make for peace, and things whereby we may edify one another. Overthrow not for meat’s sake the work of God.” (See Rom. 14:15-20). When you say it is a “petty thing,” you class it with meats. Here is God’s law by which to regulate such things when they offend a brother or bring about division in our Lord’s body. The “*petty thing*” with you, Brother Walker, is *your god*. You make an *idol* out of it, and hold to it regardless of consequences. May I beg you to think here before it is too late? Paul says: “If eating meat offends my brother, I will eat no meat while the world stands.” And Paul says for us to follow him, even as he follows Christ. If you and your associates will follow Paul, peace will be restored.

CONDITIONS OF TRUE FELLOWSHIP

Now a word on the conditions of true fellowship. John gives these conditions in the following words: “If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.” (1 John 1:7). According to this, true fellowship is to be found by both Brother Walker and me walking together “*in the light*.” To walk together out of the light would be to have such fellowship as the Catholics have among themselves and the Mormons have among themselves—viz., *fellowship in error, in darkness*. The Bible teaches that the gospel of Christ, his doctrine or teaching, is *the light* in which we must walk (See 2 Cor. 4:4). It teaches us to have no fellowship with those who come with another doctrine. (See 2 John 9-11). Now, since the light in which we must walk is the teaching of our Lord, and his teaching undoubtedly, according to Brother Walker’s own admission, does not command us to use mechanical instruments in our worship in the church of God, those who insist upon such being used to the disruption of the church are responsible for breaking fellowship, for they are not walking in the light of God’s truth. Let Brother Walker clear himself here, if he can.

Kind reader, I do not use the mechanical instruments in the worship in

the congregation with which I have to do because I *cannot* prove that my Lord wants them to be used, and I am commanded to *prove all things*. This proving all things does not mean we must prove the world is round or flat, that the sun is so far from the earth; it means to prove our work and worship is well-pleasing to God. Has Brother Walker proved this? I say he has not. Who can take his blundering, illogical, and unscriptural efforts and look at them unprejudicedly and not have more doubts about the use of the instruments after reading them than he had before? His effort has increased my doubts, because I know he has done his best, with all the help of others before him, to find the proof. His failure to find it shows to a demonstration that it is not to be found.

THE “WALKINGCANE-EAR-TRUMPET-EYEGLASS” ARGUMENT

I was a bit surprised not to find Brother Walker’s “walking-cane-ear-trumpet-eyeglass” argument. I am giving it attention in order to make this tract on the music question complete. The idea is that if God had commanded us to walk and we use a walking cane to aid in the walking, we are violating no command; that the Bible speaks of our seeing with our eyes and hearing with our ears, but using eyeglasses to aid in seeing or ear trumpets to aid in hearing is a violation of no scripture. And this no one denies. But I want to call the attention of our brethren who use instrumental music in worship to the fact that there is no parallelism nor analogy between these things and instrumental music in worship. The walking cane is not a way of going, but only an aid to one way of going—viz., walking. Eyeglasses are not ways of seeing, but only an aid to the eyes in seeing. The same is true of ear trumpets. Leave the walking cane, eyeglasses, and ear trumpets alone, and may I ask: *Will they ever walk, see, or hear!* But not so with instrumental music in worship. The music made on mechanical instruments is one of the ways of making music; it is music *in* and *of itself*, disassociated with singing. When our Lord commanded music to be made in the New Testament churches, he, as specifically as words can possibly express it, named *vocal music*. This very fact excludes all other kinds of music, just as God excluded all other kinds of wood when he named *gopher* wood as the wood out of which the ark should be made. I ask if Noah would have violated God’s command by using another kind of wood. But, doubtless, our

brethren who use instrumental music would answer: "Certainly so, but we are not ruling out vocal music; we have that, and have merely added instrumental music, which is another kind, as an aid, to make the singing smoother and better." Very well; if Noah had used the *gopher* wood, then, in addition thereto, had *veneered* the ark *within* and *without* with *walnut* wood for the purpose of *reinforcing and strengthening* the ark and to give it a smoother and more artistic finish, would he have been violating God's command? I think every thoughtful soul will answer: "*Most assuredly he would.*" This is exactly what Brother Walker and his associates have done with instrumental music. They have taken it and tried to *veneer* the music our Lord *sealed with his own blood* for New Testament worship.

But I do not like this "*walking-cane-eyeglass-ear-trumpet*" argument for a greater reason than I have named. It puts our Lord in a bad light. When Christ said, "Upon this rock I will build my church," I think he referred to the most all-sufficient organization that has ever been established. Paul, in speaking of it in 1 Tim. 3:15, says: "The church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." I do not like to have the church *caricatured* as a man *crippled, blind, and deaf*. I would have you note that the church is included in that expression, "one new man," in Eph. 2:15, and in Eph. 4:13 it declares that spiritual gifts were placed in the church for the purpose of leading this institution to a "*full-grown man.*" I know of but two classes of people who use walking canes, eyeglasses, etc.; and that is the *dude*, in the first place, that uses them for *style*, and the cripple and partially blind, as aids. I demand that they tell us which they claim the church is. When our Lord established his church and started it forth as his blood-sealed institution, did he expect it to play the role of the *dude*, or did he expect it to go forth as *crippled and partially blind and deaf*? For my part, I resent the thought of the church of our Lord being represented by either. But I sometimes wonder if the trouble with our brethren who have added instrumental music is not that they are a bit too much inclined to yield to *style, fashion, and modern ideas*, and if it is not a desire to make the church "up-to-date" that makes them such ardent defenders of instrumental music in worship.

BROTHER GORSUCH TRIES TO RESCUE HIS SINKING ASSOCIATES

But I have just noticed that Brother Gorsuch furnished Brother Briney, in his debate with Brother Srygley, what he claimed to have been answers from fifty-two colleges, universities, and individual scholars to some questions he had sent them. I wish just here to give this some attention. People who are out asking questions for a specific purpose usually so frame the questions as to get the answers they want. Here are the questions that were sent to these colleges, universities, and individual scholars:

1. “Does the Greek word *psallo* permit the use of an instrument in Christian worship?”
2. “Do you think the revisers meant to exclude the instrument from worship by translating the word *sing*?”
3. “Does the translation in our English Bible exclude the instrument?”

He claims to have received “yes” as the answer to the first question and “no” to the second and third.

Now, let me ask the same parties some questions on baptism and observe their answers:

1. Does the Greek word *baptizo* permit the use of sprinkling for baptism?
2. Do you think the revisers or translators meant to exclude sprinkling by simply anglicizing the word *baptizo* and leaving it untranslated in the text?
3. Does the translation in our English text exclude sprinkling?

Now, who does not know that these same colleges, universities, and individual scholars would have answered “yes” to the first question and “no” to the last two, just as readily and with the same unanimity that they did the questions Brother Gorsuch asked on *psallo*? All of your stamps, time, and trouble were wasted. You here give an argument that proves nothing, for it proves too much for even you. I see nothing in this except an effort to gull the gullible with your

sophisticated tactics. I am glad to say that truth calls for no such efforts, and the very fact that these brethren indulge in such proves to a demonstration that their cause lies helpless upon the ground, crying long and loud for a friend. This is their latest effort. They thought Brother Payne had given them all they needed to establish their cause; but Payne's book proved a boomerang, and they soon learned it was doing them more harm than good. So Brother Gorsuch has gone out in quest of help, and here is what he brings; and who is it that cannot see the weakness of the effort?

I dare say that all those who answered these questions practice the use of instrumental music in worship. What else could Brother Gorsuch expect except the answers he received? Brother Srygley asked Brother Briney if these questions were sent to David Lipscomb College, Abilene Christian College, and some others. The answer was promptly made: "No, we knew what they would have said." From this it is just as easily concluded that they also knew what these other colleges would say, and sent questions only to those colleges that would answer to suit them. Why did they not send these questions to the Greek Church, the oldest in existence, which has ever used the language in which the New Testament was written, hence should know better than any college, university, or individual scholar now in existence what *psallo* means? Hence, I close with the timely words from their own Peter Ainslie in his address in September, 1922—*just year before last*—and one of the most recent visitors to the Vine Street Christian Church, of this city—viz.: "*It must be said to the credit of the anti-organ brethren that they had the better of the argument, for instrumental music was not used in Christian worship for six hundred years after the birth of Christ, and the Eastern Orthodox Church, the oldest church in Christendom, with its one hundred and thirty million members, does not to this day use instrumental music in its public worship.*" I have put this in italics for the sake of emphasis. Look it squarely and unprejudicedly in the face and think seriously over the matter. This one statement made by Ainslie overturns all that Brother Walker or any one else can say, if they were to pile lexicons and translations mountain high. The Greek Church, which uses the language in which the New Testament was written, should know the meaning of the word *psallo*. They leave instrumental music out. They also refuse sprinkling for baptism. May I ask again: Why did not Brother Gorsuch write them a few questions? And you note he did not

ask them to answer these questions from the standpoint of scholarship.

A REASONABLE REQUEST

Let me say again to all those who use instrumental music in church worship that I love you and so much wish we could be together. My conscience on this question will not let me join you in such worship. You can join us in doing exactly what we are commanded to do in the New Testament—viz., teach and admonish one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, using words easily understood, calling the “lips,” “tongue,” and “voice” into use, but letting it all be heart directed, singing with grace in our hearts, and making melody in our hearts to the Lord. I say you can do this, and in doing this you answer the prayer our Lord prayed for us to be one, to speak the same thing, and to have no divisions among us. Brother Walker has repeatedly said: “It is a petty thing.” If it is, will you not agree with me that the *union* for which our Lord prayed is a *big thing*, a *most desirable* thing? Am I unreasonable in asking you to lay aside this “petty thing” and give us in its stead this *big thing* that will make heaven rejoice and cause the prayer of our Lord to go no longer unanswered so far as we are concerned? To this end may I continue to hope and pray, and may our Heavenly Father let me see this consummation in my day.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

M. C. Kurfrees—Instrumental Music in Worship Joe S. Warlick and Stark Debate Otey-Briny Debate

“Instrumental Music In Psallo”—Allen