

Frank Watson

**THE
HUNT - INMAN
DEBATE**



Frank Watson 2.00 (or with Post Note for 4.00)
11-12-52

THE HUNT-INMAN DEBATE

BX 7073
C 91



CENTRAL CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
OF THE BIBLE 4067

PRESENTED BY

Frank L. Watson
JAN 23 1962

Can an Individual Consistently Use a Radio,
Song Book, Tuning Fork, etc., as an Aid in
Obeying God's Commandments and Con-
demn an Instrument of Music as an Aid?

PRINTED IN U. S. A. BY
CUMBERLAND PUBLISHING COMPANY
PIKEVILLE, KENTUCKY



JULIAN O. HUNT



ROGER C. INMAN

PREFACE

I am exceedingly happy to know that this volume shall become public property. Because within the lids of this book is found the real issue between the users and non-users of instrumental music. While there are several books in print on this controversy, this one stands in a class by itself, for it is the only one of its kind; inasmuch as it does not deal with the issue as to whether instrumental music is "IN" worship, and not so much as to whether "an aid to singing," but it is concerned with the question: "Does instrumental music aid an individual to sing acceptable praises to God?"

While some of Brother Hunt's opponents have accused him of having a "new position," it is not in reality, a new position, but the "old position" in its true light. It has merely shed the veil of metonymy in this debate. Both the users and non-users of instrumental music have been at fault in failing to apply the proper aids to the proper things. Aids do not make worship, nor are they in worship; neither do aids assist God's commandments, for they are perfect, but aids are used to assist and help individuals: persons who worship and who obey the commandments of God. The position taken in this book is not a "door step baby" but is the final and decisive issue which must be settled before unity can come among us. We believe much time has been wasted, by both sides, in discussing the questions: Is instrumental music "IN" worship and is instrumental music an aid to singing, which questions should have been settled long ago as metonymical positions.

To know the meaning of the word "METONYMY" is to understand why many have taken the position that instrumental music is in worship. Webster defines metonymy: "A figure of speech in which one word is used for another which it suggests." Now for an illustration: We often say, "the kettle boils." We mean: "the water in the kettle boils." Or we say, "the train aids traveling." We mean: "the train aids an individual to travel." Such usage of expression is metonymy. Likewise, those who have contended that instrumental music is "IN" worship have indulged in a matter of metonymy. So in reality the position argued in this book, viz: "instrumental music aids the individual," is not different from other positions formerly taken by our brethren, but is the true issue, stated in its purity, void of metonymy.

To state, as the anti-instrument brethren often do, that instrumental music is not in worship, is not the issue; we agree to this! The position taken in this debate is based primarily on a thorough understanding of worship. In the true light of worship instrumental music cannot be "IN" worship, hence it is either "an aid to the individual," or "an act of worship." However, as far as the disputants of this debate are concerned, other books have settled

as to whether instrumental music can be used as an "act of worship," therefore, they have given their time wholly to the question: "Can the instrument be used as an aid to the individual in singing praises to God?"

Much of the material on worship, usually used in other debates on this controversy, has been omitted by the disputants in this volume, because both were agreed that instrumental music is not "IN" worship. A misconception and misunderstanding of worship has been the cause of many taking the stand that instrumental music is "IN" worship. They have made no distinction between worship and its acts. Assembling, singing, reading, praying, giving, taking the Lord's Supper, etc., are not worship, but are "acts," "expressions" or "items" of worship. These acts comprise our "form of service" that we have on the Lord's Day, but this form of service cannot be worship; because worship does not have a form, and cannot have one any more than there is a form to love. Such words as worship, faith, repentance, love, sorrow, joy, hate, emotion, meditation, desire, pity, veneration, admiration, gratitude, adoration and others do not have a form. Each of these words have "acts" or "expressions" and the acts or expressions might take on a form produced by these words, but the acts or expressions are different from the thing which produces them. There can be acts without worship, and there can be worship without acts. An act of worship is not worship any more than an act of mine is me. Worship is in the heart, in the spirit, and when there is an overflow, it is known by the act it produces. In short, a person is really two persons in one—there is an outward man and an inward man. The outward man does not worship, nor does the inward man act. We can see the outward man and his works, but we cannot see the inward man; hence, we can see the acts of worship, but we cannot see worship. If we set a form for the emotions of the heart, the power is gone. The spontaneous acts of worship are but the bursting of the overflowing heart into life. We know that love was in God's heart by the expression of giving His only Son (John 3:16). Faith is in the heart, but is made perfect as it expresses itself in works (James 2:22). "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness but with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (Rom. 10:10). Here faith is said to be in the heart but is expressed by the mouth. Likewise, worship is in the heart and is expressed in singing, praying, preaching, etc., by the mouth. Worship is "IN" the heart, "CREATED IN" the heart, "DONE BY" the heart, and is expressed in the usual "form of service" that we have on the Lord's Day which is made up, as a rule, of seven acts: assembling, singing, reading, praying, preaching, giving, and taking the Lord's Supper. These acts, of course, are not worship.

I give this in order to introduce Brother Hunt's position to all concerned. It can further be illustrated by an old fashion well. The water is in the well, but it takes a bucket to draw it out. Likewise, worship is in the heart of the individual and singing, preaching, praying, etc., is God's means to draw it out. But says someone, is

not there a rope to that bucket? Yes, and thus you have aids in exercising singing, preaching, giving, etc. Now, Brother Hunt contends that instrumental music is not in worship, nor is it an aid to worship, but it aids THE INDIVIDUAL in expressing his worship in singing to God.

Since we believe that singing, itself, is not "IN" worship, of course, we believe the use of the instrument is not. Due to this fact, all the "old arguments" of our opposers fall to the ground and are useless in a discussion dealing with instrumental music as an aid.

Brother Hunt will continue to be a "thorn in the flesh" to the anti-instrument advocates in that they are unable to meet his arguments in showing that the use of the instrument is not in worship, but an aid to the individual. His position too, has given them more trouble; causing them to build "straw men" with the old arguments that instrumental music is "IN" worship, which do not even touch Brother Hunt's position, that it aids the individual. A book of this kind is needed and for the task of this accomplishment I know of no one who could more masterfully and successfully do the job, in bringing the truth to light, than Brother Hunt. All in the Churches of Christ who read this book can truly say he fully represents us as a brotherhood. On the other hand, I believe the non-users of the instrument could not have done better in selecting one to defend their belief than has been done in this discussion. Brother Inman is from Texas where he has had every chance in the world to contact all arguments made against the use of the instrument. More than this, he attended Abilene Christian College, one of the anti-instrument schools. Therefore, he stands in position to well represent his side. If he has not done so, then, in the words of Peter: "to whom shall we go?"

BURTON W. BARBER,
BENTONVILLE, ARKANSAS.

INTRODUCTION

While there is a growing tendency to look upon Religious debates with disdain, the truth has nothing to suffer at the hands of honest public and written discussion. Debate proves itself to be a valuable method of uncovering, sustaining and spreading truth; and at the same time valuable in exposing and uprooting error. Discussion is the watchman upon the walls not only of political, but also of religious freedom.

Jesus found it advantageous to debate with the religious leaders of His day. The age of twelve found him in the temple asking questions and answering those of the doctors of the Law. The Pharisees, Saducees and Scribes learned the force of his clear logic until they dared ask him no more questions. And when they had been put utterly to flight, they sought to put him to death.

Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles, deemed public discussion the most potent method of setting forth the truth. Immediately following his conversion he confounded those of Damascus with his ability of proving that Jesus was the Christ. His opponents found it advantageous to attempt to kill him. He reasoned daily in the school of Tyrannus. He withstood Peter to his face. And the fourteen Epistles contain written arguments to put to flight many false teachers.

In the present, as in the past, there is a need for honest investigation of the issues between us. We must "contend earnestly for the faith." "Give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason concerning the hope that is in you." "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits, whether they are of God." Any position that cannot survive an honest investigation should be abandoned.

The issues under discussion in this debate between Roger Clifton Inman and Julian Olyn Hunt are those which are partially responsible for a division of the body of Christ from Coast to Coast. The debate comes to you with a desire on the part of the disputants, not to widen the breach, but to examine the respective positions in hope that the causes of division, even at this late date, may be ironed out—that we may all be one.

There is no desire to discuss the merits or demerits of the arguments presented by either disputant. That is left up to the reader. But it is suggested that you make a careful, prayerful study of each side, not with the idea of confirming your opinion, but with a desire to know what the will of God is in these matters. And let it not be forgotten that we shall all stand before God to give an account for the deeds done in the body.

JACK L. LEWIS,
HUNTSVILLE, TEXAS.

August 6, 1942.

RULES DESIGNED TO GOVERN THE WRITTEN DEBATE:

1. We, the undersigned agree to engage one another in a religious discussion which is to be written and published. The publication is to be financed jointly, with each participant bearing half the expenses.
2. Some printer mutually agreed upon shall do the printing.
3. There shall be an exchange of arguments according to the following rules:
 - A. The affirmative shall write the first article and shall be free to wait until hearing from the respondent, who shall have not more than two weeks in which to reply, before writing. No reply shall be delayed more than two weeks after the date when an opponent's speech is received.
 - B. There shall be four articles by the affirmative and four by the negative on each proposition.
 - C. These articles are not to exceed ten pages in length unless a little space is needed to finish an argument already begun on the tenth page.
 - D. Each participant agrees to answer the arguments made by his opponent before making any new arguments.
4. Each participant shall be allowed to check his speeches before they are submitted to the printer. He also shall be allowed to read proof on the whole debate before its final printing.

The propositions are as follows:

"Resolved: that a mechanical instrument of music can aid an individual to sing praises acceptable to God and that he has authority to use it during Christian worship service."

Julian Olyn Hunt, Affirms.
Roger Clifton Inman, Denies.

"Resolved: that I can consistently use aids in the category of a song book, tuning fork, radio, communion set, automobile, chart, church house and colletion basket in obeying God's commandments and condemn the use of a mechanical instrument of music as an aid during Christian worship service."

Roger Clifton Inman, Affirms.
Julian Olyn Hunt, Denies.

RULES FURTHER AGREED UPON FOR PUBLICATION AND DISTRIBUTION:

1. That the books when printed shall become the property of the two participants—each receiving half.
2. That neither party shall exercise control over the distribution and handling of the other's share of the books.
3. The names of prospects which were taken at the time of our oral debate shall be divided between us as these prospects may desire.
4. That we shall sell the books for a sum to be agreed upon later.

Signed:

JULIAN OLYN HUNT
ROGER CLIFTON INMAN

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE PAPER

BY JULIAN OLYN HUNT

"Resolved, that a mechanical instrument of music can aid an individual to sing praises acceptable to God and that he has authority to use it during Christian worship service."

AN OUTLINE FOR THE FIRST SPEECH

My first speech will be a discussion on the following main points:

1. Definition of terms.
2. Setting forth what I must do in order to establish the proposition.
3. Setting forth what my respondent must do in order to defeat the proposition.
4. Why take the position that instrumental music is an aid?
5. A general statement of how and what instrumental music aids.
6. Proof that instrumental music aids an individual to sing praises to God.
 - (a). Argument number one on: 1 Cor. 14:7, 8, 15.
 - (b). Argument number two on: "Experiences, testimonies and common sense."
7. Proof that God will accept the praise while using a musical instrument.
 - (a). Argument number one: "Shows that it is not the fault of the instrument if God does not accept the praise."
 - (b). Argument number two: "Romans 12:1, different parts of the body."

DEFINITION OF TERMS

"Mechanical"—pertaining to or produced by, machines or machinery.
"Instrument of music"—such instruments as the piano or organ and so on, commonly used by the Churches of Christ.

"Can"—to be able (can is used as an auxiliary verb).

"Aid"—that which assists, helps or supports."

"Individual"—a person, one who sings.

"To sing"—to make music by vocal cords and voice.

"Praises"—Tribute of gratitude, applause.

"Acceptable"—to agree to, take or receive.

"Authority"—power derived from Christian principles; (justification or support for statement or action).

"Use"—to put into action or to exercise.

"During Christian worship service"—the form of service that we have on the Lord's Day, or any day, time or place.

Setting Forth What I Must Do In Order To Establish My Proposition.

You will notice that I have a two-fold proposition: a proposition that contains two prongs to be proved. First, I must prove that instrumental music can aid an individual to sing praises acceptable to God; second, I must show the authority for its use. The reader will notice, however, that these prongs are over-lapping. Because when I prove that God will "accept the praise" while one uses an instrument, I have given "authority for its use." Anything that God will ac-

cept, we have authority for. But to make sure that my proposition covered the whole subject in dispute, I insisted that the last prong be added to the proposition.

There are many things an individual can bring into the work and worship service of the Lord that cannot aid and on the other hand there are many things he can bring in that can aid, but he has no authority to use them. For instance one could put cake and ice cream on the Lord's table, but would this "aid" that person to take the Lord's Supper? Or he might sprinkle babies in the Church; but would this aid him to baptize believers? Of course not! The denominations use the "mourners-bench" to aid in conversion. But does it aid in conversion? It takes faith, repentance, confession and baptism to constitute conversion, and the use of the mourners-bench cannot aid one to do either, hence, it cannot aid in conversion. So the first thing an individual must do in "selecting aids" is to decide whether "this or that" (whatever he uses) can and does "aid" him. Second, he must be sure that the aid he uses is not wrong within itself.

There are a great many things that can aid an individual to obey God's commandments, yet he dare not use these things! For instance, one could go into the saloon business and use the saloon as an aid to enable him to give more money to God's work, but God would not accept it, because the saloon is "wrong within itself." An individual has no authority to use an aid of this kind.

Now in the wording of my proposition, I have considered these two things: First, "Does instrumental music aid an individual?" Second, "Do we have authority for its use?" I must establish both these prongs before instrumental music can be used according to my proposition."

Setting Forth What My Opponent Must Do In Order To Defeat My Proposition.

In order for my opponent to defeat my proposition, he has two tasks to

perform: First, he must meet every argument that is offered in support of the proposition and refute it until the reader can see its fallacy. He must "dig them up by the roots," "turn them wrong side outward," and "pluck them up and bind and burn them with the tares," so to speak. To merely mention my arguments and make a statement against them will not be sufficient. His arguments against my arguments must exceed what I say in subject matter, argumentation, clearness and, above all, in fact and truth. He must defeat my arguments to defeat my proposition.

Second, he must make counter arguments against my proposition before it is defeated. It is necessary for him to make "counter arguments" before we can know whether he has defeated my proposition. For instance, if he meets every argument I produce and defeats me on them, he still has not defeated my proposition. If I fail to submit arguments sufficient to establish the proposition this does not make the proposition untrue. My opponent might "weaken" my arguments and not "weaken" the proposition. That is, this is possible! Before he can weaken the proposition he is forced to make arguments against the proposition. So his task is two-fold: (1) He must make arguments against my arguments and defeat them; (2) he must make counter arguments against the proposition and defeat it.

BUT NOTICE THIS: "Before he can make counter arguments he must take an affirmative stand against the proposition." What affirmative stand will he take? What one can he afford to take? To determine this is the purpose of the following:

Being in the affirmative, in support of the proposition, I want to keep the issue clearly before my brother, so each will understand his task when the issue is clearly defined.

My Position—"Instrumental music aids an individual to sing praises acceptable unto God."

His Position—"Instrumental music does NOT aid an individual to sing praises acceptable unto God."

The difference in our positions hangs upon the word, "NOT." Remove the "NOT" and we will have no issue for debate. When the "NOT" is gone my friend and I will be together. But think what the "NOT" did in the garden of Eden. God said: "The day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The Devil added the "NOT" and what happened? The result was a world of sin. The "NOT" is the cause of the brotherhood of the Church of Christ being divided today, for such is the real issue between us.

I feel that my task is easy in proving instrumental music an aid to the individual; but before proceeding with the proof we want to thoroughly analyze the position of my respondent. His position of course, is the opposite of my position. He is compelled to say that instrumental music does "NOT" aid the individual in singing praises to God or there can be no debate. I have a right to ask my brother: "Why does not instrumental music aid an individual to sing praises acceptable to God? Why do you add the "NOT?" This question can be answered FOUR different ways and ONLY four! His position falls beautifully into four main prongs: Namely:

First: He can say instrumental music does NOT aid the individual because the individual does not need aiding. (This makes the individual perfect!)

Second: He can say it does NOT aid the individual because it neither helps nor hinders. (This makes the instrument neutral and not sinful!)

Third: He can say it does NOT aid the individual because it hinders him. (This he must prove and not assume, but it is impossible to prove it!)

Fourth: He can say it aids the individual but God does NOT accept the praise when it is used. (This is a contradiction of statements!)

My respondent is compelled to discuss his side of the question from

ONE of the FOUR prongs of his position for the simple reason that he cannot find another prong to his position. There might be a slight variation of these prongs, but I challenge him to find another prong independent of the ones I have mentioned. He cannot do it!

When he says: "Instrumental music does NOT aid the individual to sing praises acceptable to God," then I ask why? Why, my friend? Why? The answer to my question falls automatically into ONE of FOUR answers: (1) Because the individual cannot be aided; (2) Because the instrument neither helps nor hinders; (3) Because the instrument hinders instead of helping; and (4) It aids but God will "NOT" accept the praise when it is used. **BUT WATCH THIS: "A THOROUGH UNDERSTANDING OF THESE POSITIONS WILL SHOW THAT BY TAKING EITHER OF THEM HE CANNOT REFUTE MY POSITION."**

LET'S SEE! If he takes the first prong it will get him into trouble, because if he says an individual cannot be aided, he then makes him perfect. If my opponent takes this position the debate will develop into the doctrine of perfection and non-perfection. It will be an easy task for me to show that "none are perfect," therefore, he will lose in this argument.

If he takes the second prong and says the instrument neither helps nor hinders, but is merely a "worthless thing," he will get in bad because this makes the instrument "neutral" and anything neutral cannot be sinful, hence, loses, since he believes and preaches the use of it is sinful.

If he takes the third prong and says the instrument is a detriment and therefore hinders the individual, he can only assume this for it is impossible to prove it. He will be embarrassed by taking this stand because I can use the Old Testament as a matter of history to show that instrumental music was at one time **COMMANDED BY GOD** (See 11

Chron. 29:25) and used in His service; therefore our brother will meet his position staring him in the face with the charge that God, Himself, commanded and had used, that which hindered and was a detriment to His cause. They were also called, "musical instruments of God" (11 Chron. 7-6; Rev. 15:2). If they hinder an individual "now" they did "then" hence, our brother will charge God of commanding hindrances and detriments to be used in His services.

If he takes the fourth prong and says: "Instrumental music aids an individual, but God does "NOT" accept the praise when it is used," he will meet the following difficulties: (1) He must show that a thing (not wrong within itself) can aid an individual to obey one of God's commandments and be rejected by God all at the same time. The truth is, this contention is a contradiction in statements! If a person can use something (not wrong within itself) to help him better serve God—God will not reject it. God will not permit anything to "aid" in His work and be "rejected" as an aid in his work at the same time. To say He will is contradictory! Another difficulty is: (2) He must show under what conditions God will accept a thing as an aid and reject a thing as an aid. Just to assume God will not accept instrumental music is not sufficient. As I see it, there are only two things that would cause God to reject a thing as an aid, and neither of these debar instrumental music from being used. First, because the thing the individual uses does not really aid. For instance, he might use a "cow bell" as an aid in singing, but such would be objectionable because it would not aid. Second, God would reject something that is wrong within itself. Such as a "pool room," "saloon," etc., being used in aiding to raise money for the church. Anything which does not violate either of these principles mentioned may be used as an aid and God will accept it. If my respondent takes this fourth prong he will admit instrumental music can aid (notice how the fourth prong is stated) and

he will, of course, say it is not wrong within itself, therefore, he must admit that God will accept the use of the instrument as an aid, or else show that there are reasons other than the two mentioned that will cause God to reject a thing as an aid!

If our respondent says God will not accept the praise because the individual deliberately brings something in which God did not tell him to bring into the worship service, under this dispensation; then he meets a third difficulty; (3) He must prove that an individual has no authority to bring into the worship service any aid unless that aid is mentioned in the New Testament. Then by what authority does he bring in the song book, tuning fork, pulpit, radio, collection basket, etc.? If God will not accept the praise when an individual brings one aid, not mentioned in the New Testament, into the worship service, He will not accept it when he brings in another! This is one difficulty my opponent will never overcome. Just wait and see! So we advise him not to take the fourth prong in taking an affirmative stand against my position.

Our friend is in a worse situation than being in a dilemma. He cannot successfully go either way. Which way will he try? Jesus asked the Pharisees, "The baptism of John, whence was it? From Heaven or of men?" They answered, "We cannot tell." Had they said, "It is from Heaven," it would have been fatal to their arguments. Had they said, "It is of men," it would have been fatal. Had they remained silent, it would have been fatal. They answered: "We cannot tell," and it was fatal. If our opponent says (1) "An individual cannot be aided," it will be fatal. If he says (2) "An instrument neither helps nor hinders, but is neutral," it will be fatal. If he says (3) "An instrument hinders an individual," it will be fatal. If he says (4) "An instrument aids an individual, but God does "NOT" accept the praise when it is used," it will be fatal. If he remains silent, it will be fatal. If he answers, "I cannot tell," it is already fatal.

NOW NOTICE: Since my respondent cannot take a stand against my position that refutes or defeats it, then it stands proved by merely stating it: Namely, "Instrumental Music Is An Aid To The Individual In Singing Praises To God."

Nevertheless, even though I have shown that our brother really does not have a side to our argument and that "ALL" he can say will amount to but very little, I now proceed to more fully establish my side of the argument. My duty is two-fold: (1) I must prove instrumental music can aid an individual; (2) I must show authority for its use.

Why Take The Position That Instrumental Music Is An Aid?

Before going further into the establishment of the proposition it is perhaps, necessary to inform the reader as to why I am defending instrumental music as an aid. The reason is, **IT IS AN AID!** Regardless of what else you might say in favor of instrumental music, it is still an aid. It has always been an aid to accompany those who sang. This fact is established in 1 Kings 10:12, "And the king (Solomon) made of the almug trees—harps also, and psalteries for singers." Why did he make musical instruments "FOR SINGERS?" To aid and assist them, of course!

The scripture in Psalms 150:4: "Praise him with stringed instruments and organs," does not refer to instrumental music as praise, because the word "praise" is used as a verb with the subject understood. It should read: "YOU praise Him with stringed instruments and organs." Hence, the praise is in "YOU" and not in "the instruments of music."

The fact that God commanded musical instruments to be in His House (11 Chron. 29:25) did not debar them from being an "AID FOR SINGERS" for there are commanded aids in the scripture.

A General Statement of What and How Instrumental Music Aids

The best statement that can be made concerning the purpose of any

aid is, "to say it helps the individual." An aid is not used to aid God's commandments, because they are perfect. They do not need props nor crutches! They are not cripples! An aid is to help the individual. He is imperfect in all his parts and needs aiding in anything he does. A thing might aid several parts of the human body, either directly or indirectly, at the same time. This is true of instrumental music as the following will show:

Instrumental music aids singing through the medium of the mind! But since this is not all that instrumental music does it is better to say instrumental music aids the individual. But what part of the individual? It does not aid his feet! It does not aid his eyes or mouth! What part of the individual does it aid? Does it aid his voice? Yes, indirectly! It aids the voice in the sense that it is a means by which the individual is helped when he uses his voice to sing. Instrumental music was made and is made for the purpose of helping an individual with his voice. King Solomon made instruments "FOR SINGERS" (1 Kings 10:12). Since instrumental music is made to assist the voice it must aid the voice. But how? We answer, "Through the medium of the mind!" It really aids the intellectual part of man. The sound waves produced by the instrument strike the ear-drums and are carried and recorded on the mind of the individual. Hence, he has in his mind the proper pitch and the proper tune of the song. This enables him to get his voice on the correct pitch and the correct tune. In this sense it aids the voice, and, therefore, aids singing. The sound of the instrument carries the tune and helps the voice stay on the tune; it also assists in keeping the correct time of the song and enables the congregation to stay together.

The fact that instrumental music aids the mind of man, gives a deeper insight into the real need for it. The mind governs every part of the body. One cannot sing without first having the proper prerequisites to singing in

his mind. Instrumental music produces some of the prerequisites to singing and these prerequisites which are produced by the instrument are recorded on the intellect and from these the person is able to acquire the right pitch and tune of the song. Therefore, instrumental music is very definitely an aid to the voice through the intervention of the mind. If one can sing without having an instrument near, it is because he has had previous instrumental music training.

Such instruments as the loud-speaker and radio aid the voice directly because they amplify the voice. But instruments such as the organ and piano aid the voice through the medium of the mind in the sense that these instruments are means in helping the voice in getting and carrying the right pitch and tune of a song.

If instruments of music were not made to assist and help the voice to sing, why were they made? God commanded some of the most prominent men in the Bible to make them. Jubal was the father of those who made musical instruments (Gen. 4:21). Joseph made them (Ps. 81:1-5). Moses made them (Num. 10:1-3). David made them (II Chron. 7:6). Solomon made them (I Kings 10:12). Ezekiel, in addressing the King of Tyrus, says that "the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou was created" (Ezekiel 28:13). God said that these musical instruments were His. (See I Chron. 16:42; II Chron. 7:6; Rev. 15:2). Now, God ought to know whether instrumental music could aid an individual to sing; whether it aids singing; or whether it aids the human voice! Brother Inman, do you believe God knows whether instrumental music can aid an individual to sing or not? If you say he does not know, then God is not an all wise God. If you say He does know, then you are forced to say that instrumental music can aid an individual to sing! Or that it aids singing! Or that it aids the voice! Because Almighty God commanded instru-

mental music to be used in connection with singing; he commanded the "singers" to use them; He commanded them to be used during the worship service, and also, He commanded King Solomon to make instruments "FOR SINGERS" (I Kings 10:12).

Why was instrumental music mentioned time and time again in connection with singing if it could not and did not aid and help the singers? Note the following passages: "And all the congregation worshipped, and the singers sang, and the trumpeters sounded" (II Chron. 29:28). Here we have worshipping, singing, and trumpeting all at the same time. Note again: "As well the singers as the players on instruments shall be there" (Ps. 87:7). Why are "singers" and "players" mentioned together if instrumental music does not aid and help those who sing? (See also Ezekiel 33:32-33; I Chron. 25:5-7; II Chron. 15:12-15; II Chron. 5:12-14; Ps. 108:1-2; Isa. 38:20).

The first time the word "songs" is mentioned in the Bible, instruments of music are mentioned in connection with it. (Gen. 31:27); and the last time the word "song" is mentioned, instruments of music are mentioned with it (Rev. 15:2).

There are two ways to sing in the Bible: (1) Singing by the human voice; (2) Singing by the voice of an instrument. The Bible also mentions "the voice of a Psalm" which, of course, means "the voice of an instrument," played to the accompaniment of a song (See Ps. 98:5). The Apostle Paul commands us to "speak in Psalms" (Eph. 5:19) and in this same verse he says, "singing and making melody in the heart." Surely this is a "necessary inference" to speak with the voice of an instrument in the command to "speak to yourselves in Psalms" (See Eph. 5:19 and compare Ps. 98:5).

I want the reader to get this: "Instrumental music is singing!" They sang "upon" musical instruments. "Upon a psaltery and an instrument of ten strings will I sing praises unto

thee" Psalms 144:9. Just as there is "instrumental music" there is also "instrumental singing." (See also Ps. 92:1-3; Hab. 3:19). Instruments of music "have voices." Psalms "have voices." The word Psalm means "a song accompanied by an instrument." Therefore, our brother will have difficulty in showing that the commandment to "speak in Psalms" in Eph. 5:19, does not mean to "speak with the voice of an instrument." Instrumental music is certainly an accompaniment to vocal singing. Just as the "singing" of a song-leader aids those in the congregation to sing, so does the "singing" of a musical instrument aid them to sing.

Proof That Instrumental Music Aids An Individual To Sing Praises To God

I have given proof in a general way that instrumental music aids an individual, but now I shall state my proof more concisely in the form of arguments:

ARGUMENT NUMBER ONE: "I Cor. 14:7, 8, 15, And even things without life, giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped? For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"

My purpose in introducing this passage is not to prove that Paul mentioned the use of the harp and pipe as being in the worship service, because he did not! The subject Paul is discussing is "speaking in unknown tongues." He uses the pipe, harp and trumpet as an illustration to show the Corinthians that when a sound was made which no one understood that it was unprofitable. For when the trumpet, says Paul, gives an uncertain sound (a sound which cannot be understood as was the sound of their unknown tongues) who shall prepare himself for the battle? This is a true exegesis of this passage of scripture. But from the Apostle's illustration of the pipe, harp and trumpet we learn what "the sound" of these

instruments will do. If these "lifeless things" give an uncertain sound, nobody gets ready for the battle, says Paul, but if they give a "CERTAIN" sound, and there is a "DISTINCTION" in the sounds, all will prepare.

The same is true in singing! If the pipe or harp gives an uncertain sound, no one can properly prepare to sing. But when "CERTAIN SOUNDS" are given, the army of Christ can prepare to sing with the right pitch and tune of a song. The strings of the musical instruments which are used in the Churches of Christ are tuned to give "CERTAIN SOUNDS" so the congregation can tell (according to the Apostle Paul) what is played. Hence, we can learn the pitch and tune of the songs from the "CERTAIN SOUNDS" of the musical instruments. I affirm, in no uncertain terms, that the Apostle Paul produced proof that "THE SOUND OF AN INSTRUMENT" can and does aid an individual; whether it be for battle between nations or for battle against the Devil as we worship God in singing praises to His Holy Name! The proof is there in 1 Corinthians 14:7, 8, 15.

ARGUMENT NUMBER TWO: "Experiences, Testimonies and Common Sense prove that it is possible for a musical instrument to aid an individual to sing."

Before me is a letter from The Bureau of Census, Washington, D. C., dated August 31, 1939, which shows that those who favor instrumental music, among the Churches of Christ, have 1,597,779 members and those who do not favor instrumental music number 433,714 members. Thus the number who favor the instruments are 1,164,065 in the majority. The number of members in the United States of all denominations is 64,159,248. The point is, the experience and testimony of the majority, by far, of the Churches of Christ (also the denominational world) prove that an

instrument can aid an individual as he sings praises to God. On top of all this, many of our anti-instrument brethren are forced to say the instrument can aid.

Ask Brother N. B. Hardeman, President of Freed-Hardeman's Bible College, Henderson, Tennessee, and hear him tell you that the instrument can aid. Brother Hardeman, even though an anti-instrument believer, has a piano in the chapel room of his school. Does he have this piano there because it does not and cannot aid in their chapel singing? Does it hinder the students or help them? A great many of the Southern Churches are founded by the preachers from Hardeman's College; so all these anti-instrument Churches are forced to say the instrument can aid! Thus the point is established that experience and testimonies of millions prove that instrumental music can aid an individual to sing.

COMMON SENSE also proves it! If you should ask an anti-instrument believer how he knew that glasses were an aid to his eyes in reading God's word; he could easily and truthfully reply: "I know they do because I have used them; I am experienced in using them; it is an established fact that glasses are helpful in reading; your question is absurd, after these many years that thousands, yea millions of people have used them and have confirmed their use to be helpful and a proper aid to the eyes." I can answer my opponent by the same reasoning when he asks, "How do you know an instrument aids the individual in singing praises to God?" I can easily and truthfully reply: "I know it does because I have used one; I have experience in using one; it is an established fact that an instrument is helpful in singing; your question is absurd after these many years that thousands, yea millions of people have used them and have confirmed their use to be helpful and a proper aid to the individual as he sings praises to God." So common

sense is sufficient to prove that instrumental music can aid an individual in singing.

PROOF THAT GOD WILL ACCEPT THE PRAISE WHILE USING A MUSICAL INSTRUMENT

After proving that instrumental music can aid one to sing, it is proper to next prove that God will accept the praise of the person who uses one. That is, I am going to more fully prove this under the above heading. As I have previously stated this is really unnecessary because to say a thing (not wrong within itself) can aid an individual to better serve God and at the same time God reject that which aids the person to better serve Him is a contradiction in statements. Some things can aid an individual to serve God and God will reject them, but all these things are wrong within themselves. For instance, such things as the saloon, pool room, theater, and so on could be used as aids in obeying God's commandment (in 1 Cor. 16:2) to give; that is, one could give more money to God's work by using these things as aids but God would not accept these aids. They are "wrong within themselves." Instrumental music does not come in that category of aids. It is not wrong within itself! Why will not God accept it as an aid? I think he will and I offer the following arguments as proof:

ARGUMENT NUMBER ONE: "If God does not accept the praise of an individual while using an instrument, it is not the fault of the instrument, but the fault of either the person or the song."

If one sang "Yankee Doodle" during the worship service God would not accept such praise. The fault would be in the song. If a drunkard sang, "The Old Rugged Cross" God would not accept the praise. The fault would be in the person. But in no sense can the fault be in the instrument. The instrument does not change the words nor tune of a song. If you were singing a religious song

the instrument could not change it to a jig song. Neither could the instrument change the person. It does not make a bad man out of a good one. It does not change the person because it aids him. It could not aid him to do God's will and change him from doing it at the same time. An instrument does not prevent an individual from "singing with melody in his heart" as he is commanded to do (Eph. 5:19). Because one can play an instrument and make melody in his heart unto the Lord at the same time. Note the proof: "And they entered into a covenant to seek the Lord God with all their heart and with all their soul—and they swore unto the Lord with a loud voice and with shouting, and with TRUMPETS and with CORNETS, and all Judah rejoiced at the oath: for they had sworn with all their heart and sought Him with their whole desire." (11 Chron. 15:12-15). This passage says they entered into a covenant to seek the Lord with their WHOLE HEART, WITH ALL THEIR SOUL, WITH THEIR WHOLE DESIRE and at the same time used TRUMPETS and CORNETS. Therefore, this passage proves that instrumental music does not prevent the person from making melody in his heart. Well then! How can it keep the praise from being accepted by God? It cannot!

Notice again: "O God, my heart is fixed: I will give praise, even with my glory. Awake! Psaltery and Harp; I myself will awake early. I will praise thee among the nations" (Ps. 108: 1-3). These verses say David's HEART IS FIXED, AWAKE! PSALTERY AND HARP! Therefore, instrumental music did not keep David's heart from being fixed on God. Mark you, I am dealing with eternal principles even though taken from the Old Testament. The question is whether instrumental music prevents melody from being made in the heart and eternal principles based upon these scriptures say no! Hence, this proves that if the praise is not

accepted, it is not the fault of the instrument. If there is something about an instrument which keeps one's heart from making melody to God "now" there was "then" but since this was not true "then" it is not true "now" and eternal facts prove it.

The fault could be in the song; it could be in the person, but the fault can never be laid to the instrument. If Brother Inman contends that the fault is in the person because he deliberately brings something into the worship service (which he claims God did not tell him to bring in) then he meets a problem which he never can overcome! Notice: He must prove that the individual has no authority to bring into the worship service any aid unless that aid is mentioned in the New Testament. Then by what authority does he bring in the song book, tuning fork, pulpit, radio, etc.? If God will not accept the praise when an individual brings one aid, not mentioned in the New Testament, into the worship service, He will not accept another! THIS IS ONE DIFFICULTY HE WILL NEVER OVERCOME!

Now notice friends, if bringing a musical instrument into the worship service "corrupts" an individual and places the "fault" in him and causes God not to "accept" his praise; then bringing in a song book, tuning fork, etc., into the worship service "corrupts" an individual and places the "fault" in him and causes God not to "accept" his praise. If not, why not?

ARGUMENT NUMBER TWO: "Romans 12:1, I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service."

The thought in this argument is our bodies must be "presented holy, acceptable unto God." But how can we present our bodies "acceptable" unto God? We answer, "By obeying

God's commandments." I can present my ears acceptable by obeying the commandment God has given to my ears. I can present my eyes in the same way; or any other part of my body may be presented "acceptable" to God by obeying the commandment given to that part of the body. Hence, when we obey every commandment which God has given to every part of the body, we have "presented our bodies holy, acceptable unto God" and not until then!

My argument is this: every part of the human body is imperfect and is therefore subject to need an aid in order to be presented acceptable unto God, and God will accept these aids and be pleased with them. Note the following:

1. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear" (Rev. 2:7); We may present our EARS "holy, acceptable unto God" and use an ear-phone as an aid. Brother Inman will not deny!

2. "I charge you that this epistle be read" (1 Thes. 5:27). We may present our EYES "holy, acceptable unto God" and use glasses as an aid in reading. Brother Inman will not say no!

3. "Preach the Word" (11 Tim. 4:2). We may present our MOUTH "holy, acceptable unto God" and use a radio as an aid while we preach. Brother Inman will say yes!

4. "For as often as ye eat this bread" (1 Cor. 11:26). We may use FALSE-TEETH as an aid in chewing the loaf and be "holy, acceptable unto God." Brother Inman dare say nay!

5. "To work with your hands as we commanded you" (1 Thes. 4:11). While erecting church buildings or distributing food to widows, one's hands are called upon to render service to God. We may present our hands "holy, acceptable unto God" and use gloves, tools, etc., as aids. Brother Inman will agree!

6. "Go into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in" (Lk. 14:23). As we obey this com-

mandment we may use crutches or canes as aids and present our LEGS "holy, acceptable unto God." Brother Inman will say it is all right!

7. "As ye walk, and are sad" (Lk. 24:17). The Apostles could have presented their FEET "holy, acceptable unto God" and used shoes as aids as they walked (Acts 12:8). Brother Inman endorses this!

8. "Forsake not the assembling of ourselves together" (Heb. 10:25). We may present our WHOLE BODIES "holy, acceptable unto God" and use seats as aids in obeying God's commandment to assemble. Brother Inman will say sure!

9. "Singing and making melody in your hearts unto the Lord" (Eph. 5:19). We may present our VOICES "holy, acceptable unto God" and use a piano, organ, etc., as aids. Brother Inman says, "No! NEVER!! I DENY AND REJECT THIS !!!" But I am bound to say, "O CONSISTENCY, THOU ART A JEWEL!"

The reader is asked to turn back and read my article under the heading: "A general statement of how and what instrumental music aids." In this I show that instrumental music does and can aid the voice in the sense that it helps the voice get the proper pitch and tune of a song. It aids the voice through the medium of the mind. Hence, instrumental music is an aid that is attached to the voice in helping and assisting it. Why deny the voice an aid in singing? Instrumental music has always been used in connection with singing and therefore this very fact proves that it aids the voice.

My argument is this: If ear-phones, glasses, radios, false-teeth, hammers and gloves, crutches and canes, shoes, seats and so on will not prevent the body from being presented, "holy, acceptable unto God" then a piano, or any musical instrument that aids the individual to sing, will not. If God will accept the body when presented with one aid, He will accept it when presented with another. Dear

reader, how in the name of common sense, reason or revelation can our respondent contend that God will accept the praise of an individual while he is using an aid to his ears, an aid to his eyes, an aid to his mouth, an aid to his hands, an aid to his legs, an aid to his feet, and deny that God will accept an aid to his voice? This argument forever settles the question to any consistent mind. Not

only this, but it contains abundant proof for all prongs of my proposition: (1) It proves that instrumental music can aid the voice; (2) it proves that God will accept the praise while the instrument is being used; and (3) it shows authority for its use. Therefore, I have proved and established my proposition and yet I have three more speeches to go!

FIRST NEGATIVE PAPER

By CLIFTON INMAN

Readers, in coming to you with this paper, I come with no other purposes than the advancement of the truth and the salvation of souls. Regardless of the attitude of some toward this proposition, it is true or not true, and being thus it is vitally connected with the salvation of the souls of those who espouse and of those who deny it. The truth will make us free (John 8:32), but the truth mixed with falacious ideas ceases to be truth.

In the beginning of this discussion it is well for us to get very clearly before our minds the definitions of the terms used in the wording of the proposition. It is well also to get the exact point of controversy before us.

The exact point of controversy is not whether instruments can aid, but whether songs offered to the accompaniment of instruments of music are acceptable praise to God. The terms my opponent has defined, but his definitions are not true in every case.

In his definition of "instruments of music," he says, "such instruments as the piano or organ and so on, commonly used by the churches of Christ." This certainly says too much. In the first place, an instrument of music is any instrument which produces music. The word "mechanical" limits the type of instrument under discussion. Furthermore, such mechanical instruments are not "commonly used by the Churches of Christ." In a recent card from the "Christian Standard," the most prominent paper published by the conservative wing of the group of which Julian is a member, to a friend of mine the following information was given: "All the preachers of the Appalachian Evangelizing Association are loyal members of the Chris-

tian Church and work for the advancement of New Testament Christianity." My opponent has been preaching for and receiving money from the Appalachian Evangelizing Association. I understand that he does not believe in its scripturalness now, but he has not left their fold. In this card the organization of which he is a member is given the appellation, "the Christian Church," and that by one of its prominent members. This is the name it most generally wears from here to California and from Maine to Mexico. If my opponent wants more on this subject, let him bring it up again. I can give plenty.

The word "mechanical" he has defined as pertaining to, or produced by machines or machinery." This is not a full definition. I submit the following as a clearer one: "produced by the art or ingenuity of man; not inherent in the human organism." An instrument may be a mechanical one and never see machinery as we know it.

His definition of the phrase, "during Christian worship service," is very indefinite. He says it means "the form of service that we have on the Lord's Day or any day, time or place." According to this definition it could refer to a Masonic service. It would be better defined as the service in which God has ordained that Christians should engage for the purpose of manifesting their worship of Him. If my opponent is not satisfied with these definitions, he may say so in his next paper and give the reasons.

WHAT MUST BE DONE TO DEFEAT HIS PROPOSITION

In order to defeat my opponent's proposition, I am obligated to answer his arguments only. When I have

done this I have done all that is rightfully required of one who negates any proposition. If I do this I have proved one of two things: That the proposition is false or else that my opponent has no sufficient reason for holding it. However, it is customary for a respondent to give some affirmative, rebuttal arguments. This I shall be more than glad to do at the proper time.

By discussing what my affirmative stand shall be, my opponent has tried to force me into the affirmative. It should be understood though that if one can not prove the veracity and validity of a position which he holds, such position is, to say the least, doubtful, and has great possibility of being false altogether. If this be not true, I can prove that the moon is made of green cheese. Nevertheless, I shall be glad to oblige him by following where he has led.

THE "NOT"

The sophistry used upon this word is very transparent. He may be aware that God uses a "not" in James 2:24, but the sectarian world has endangered the souls of men, by taking it out. God had used a "not" in talking to Adam. The devil just transferred the "not" from one of God's statements to the other. It is just as dangerous to take a "not" out as it is to put one in! The whole burden of this discussion is to determine who has done which. I think that it shall be no "knotty" problem to show that my opponent and his co-believers are the guilty ones.

THE FOUR PRONGS

My opponent speaks of perfection. Of what kind of perfection are you speaking — Sinless perfection or organic perfection? He evidently confuses the two. I would ask him a question in return for his: Is that which is made by the art and ingenuity of man more perfect than that made by the wisdom of God? There may be a possibility of an instrument's aiding an individual to sing praises (I shall at least grant

that to be true for arguments sake during the discussion) but before it can one or all of the following things must be true: The knowledge of music possessed by the player (or players) on the instruments must be greater than that possessed by the one to be aided. The instrument must be in perfect tune. No discordant note must be sounded and the ones to be aided must have sufficient knowledge of mechanical music to follow the instrument. But the whole question is whether God will accept praise accompanied by the instrument. Certainly God does not accept all praise, yet this my opponent seems to assume here, while he shows it not to be the case later. There is another question I wish to ask about his question on perfection: Are the organs, used in the playing of an instrument more perfect than those used in acapella singing?

My opponent further confuses the issue by taking for granted that every thing that aids one to praise aids one to offer acceptable service. This is not true! Saul thought that the cattle of the Amalekites would aid him to praise, and no doubt they did, but God did not accept his praise, because he did not obey. For one to serve acceptably, he must obey implicitly.

Bro. Hunt sees only two reasons why God will reject anything as an aid: (1) "Because it is wrong within itself," and (2) "because it does not aid." I will submit and prove another one. God will reject a thing as an aid that He does not authorize to be so used. The truth of this my opponent virtually admits by the way he worded the proposition. He will maintain, of course, that God authorizes all aids which do not violate the rules which he has given. Where did he learn this? In what verse of scripture does he find it even remotely hinted. Nadab and Abihu used fire in aiding them to burn incense, but God condemned them. Why? Was there, or is there, anything sinful about fire? No. Did it aid them? Certainly so. If it did not my opponent may show

that it didn't. Why then did not God accept their service rendered by this aid? He had not authorized its use. See Lev. 10 for the story.

I do not have to show that all aids must be specifically mentioned before they are authorized. I shall give this sufficient attention in our next proposition as it rightfully belongs to it. The synagogue used in the days of Christ is an example to prove that I do not though. It was not mentioned specifically in the Old Testament, but Christ put His stamp of approval upon it by teaching in it. Let my opponent try to show that it and the instrument are parallel if he so desires. I shall be ready for his effort.

2 Chron. 29:25

My opponent made reference to this passage but failed to show that the purpose of the instruments here mentioned was to aid. They had a specific purpose. This purpose was to praise. "Praise Him with the sound of the trumpet; praise Him with stringed instruments and organs." (Ps. 150:3) This passage shows that in the Old Testament times instruments were used to praise. His claim that as the "you" is the understood subject in this verse, the idea of these instruments being used to praise is invalidated, is false. All of us realize that "you" is the subject, but we realize also that the instruments are the means used to do the praising.

When he tried to state the proposition at the end of his discussion of my work in the discussion, he failed to state it correctly. He stated it thus: ". . . Instrumental Music is an aid to the individual in singing praises to God." He has omitted the word "acceptable." This omission confuses the issue. He wanted to leave this word out of the proposition originally, but I insisted upon its inclusion. You see then if his statement be true by merely stating it, he has failed to state the true point at issue. He has now found, however, that I have some arguments against his reasoning offered here.

"WHY TAKE THE POSITION. . .?"

In his argument used upon 1 Kings 10:12 my opponent takes for granted that the word "for" shows that these instruments were made to aid. How did he learn this? The passage does not so state. The word "for" does not carry this meaning. It merely shows the ones for whom the instruments were intended without stating their use. My opponent seems to be very good at reaching conclusions which have no foundation in fact. No, the fact that God commanded instruments to be used in "His House" does not debar their being aids, neither does it show that this was their purpose.

"A GENERAL STATEMENT . . ."

Here again my opponent assumes what he is obligated to prove. He says, "Since instrumental music is made to assist the voice it must aid the voice." He must first prove that it is made for that purpose—this he has not done.

"KEEPS TIME AND CARRIES TUNE"

The instrument does not do what this heading implies unless the one who plays it keeps perfect time both in his mind and in motion and strikes none but the correct keys. There is twice as much chance for getting off the tune with the instrument as without it, unless those who use it are one of my opponent's perfect individuals. Since he agrees there are none, this possibility is out of the question. The statement that if one can sing without an instrument near it is because he has had previous instrumental training, has just one flaw—It is not true. Every one knows that most all music students are taught the scale and the staff and also voice before they are taught to use instruments. Thousands can sing who can not use an instrument—even some who cannot follow an instrument intelligently.

"WHY WERE INSTRUMENTS MADE?"

They were made to play and to entertain listeners. This is their chief use today. They were not first made

by those who were striving to serve God. See Gen. 4:21. My opponent cannot show where they were ever made with a stated or inferred purpose of aiding.

"GOD COMMANDED INSTRUMENTS TO BE MADE"

My opponent refers to some nine passages in support of this contention. Remember, however, that God's having commanded their making is not the question we are to ascertain, but whether we are to use them today during the Christian worship service. God also commanded censers to be made, but we are not to use them today. In only two of these passages mentioned by my opponent are we told that God commanded the instruments to be made. I realize that God's mentioning a thing once is sufficient for a lover of His word. I mention this, though, to show how carelessly my opponent handles scripture. In none of these passages does the context show the purpose of the instruments to be that of aiding individuals to sing. As a matter of fact those which God told Moses to make were made for the "calling of the assembly." (Num. 10:1-3). Yes, God knows whether an instrument aids an individual to sing. He nowhere says or intimates that it does. He knows also whether or not He wants them used in His praise today.

My opponent has referred to many passages of scripture without quoting them or making an argument upon them. He evidently wants me to waste my space and time by referring particularly to each. When he takes up each particularly and makes an argument upon it, I will answer it. But I am not obligated to notice them till he does.

"FIRST AND LAST TIMES SONGS ARE MENTIONED"

What if they are mentioned with instruments. In neither case are they mentioned as being used in Christian worship service.

The voice of a Psalm does not mean "the voice of an instrument played to

the accompaniment of a song." This is another time he has taken out the not which is imposed by God's silence. Until my opponent proves that "the voice of a Psalm" carries this meaning, I shall deem it sufficient to just deny it. My denial is just as much proof as his bare assertion.

NECESSARY INFERENCE IN EPHESIANS 5:19

My opponent should know that if he could show that there is a necessary inference for the instrument in Eph. 5:19, all the reasoning he has given previous to this statement is unnecessary. When he substantiates this contention, I shall immediately give up my part of the discussion and try my best to get an appointment in a "Christian Church" and preach a sermon against my present position the next Lord's day consequent to the reception of such substantiation. He tries to prove his contention by a claim that "psalms" are songs accompanied by an instrument. If this were true, my opponent would not be bettered, for Paul designates the heart as the instrument to be used. Furthermore, he would not have a necessary inference for the instrument, but a direct command for its use. But when he makes the claim that "a psalm is a song sung to the accompaniment of a mechanical instrument," he puts himself against the scholarship of the world.

"Meyers Commentary of the New Testament" has the following to say on Ephesians 5:19: "The distinction between psalms and eumnos consists in this, that by psalm, Paul denotes a religious song in general bearing the character of the O. T. Psalms, but by 'um, specially a song of praise, and that in accordance with the context, addressed to Christ (ver. 19) and God (ver. 20). Properly Psalms (which originally means the making the cithara sound) is a song in general, and that indeed as sung to a stringed instrument; but in the N. T. the character is determined by the psalms of the O. T., so called kata

edsoken, 'pre-eminently' (1 Cor. 14:15, 26; Jas. 5:13)." Though at one time the word carried this meaning it does not in the New Testament. The word psalmos is the word used in the original Greek in Eph. 5:19 (spelled in English letters.) Bagster's Lexicon gives as the definition of this word: "In the New Testament, a sacred song, psalm." Green's Lexicon defines it as "a sacred song, psalm." Conybeare and Howson, commenting on Eph. 5:19 in a footnote in "The Life and Epistles of St. Paul," Peoples Edition, p. 775, note 5, say, "Throughout the whole passage there is a contrast between the Heathern and the Christian practice, q. d. When you meet, let your enjoyment consist, not in fulness of wine, but psalms and hymns; and their accompaniment, not the music of the lyre, but the melody of the heart; while you sing them to the praise not of Bacchus or Venus, but of the Lord Jesus Christ."

If the word psalms means a song sung to the accompaniment of a mechanical instrument, one could not obey Eph. 5:19 without using it. If it means this, the early church nor the apostles ever carried out the command given here, for the instruments were not used in any community that even claimed to be the true New Testament church until about the eighth century A. D. "Pope Vitalian is related to have first introduced organs into some 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." (The American Cyclopaedia, v 12, p. 688). This statement is corroborated by the testimony of every reputable historian and scholar of music that is extant today. There is no evidence found in the writings of the early church fathers to show that they were used, but all of their writings upon the subject condemn its use in the worship service and some even condemn its use at any time or place.

INSTRUMENTAL SINGING

Suppose there is such singing—will my opponent contend that that is the kind of singing Paul refers to in Eph. 5:19? If he does, I promise you something interesting. If he says that it is not, his argument is worthless and my contention that the command to sing is a specific command is admittedly true. Only in rare instances is there any mention of the voice of an instrument or the song of an instrument. Those references are figurative and any effort to make them a rule is to do violence to all sound rules of fair interpretation.

"ARGUMENT NO. 1"

I am glad that my opponent finally decided to make an argument. Under this caption he twists 1 Cor. 14:7, 8 and gives it a meaning Paul never intended. An old hen gives a certain sound. I know that this is true, for when she finds food she makes a sound which is understood by her little ones and they immediately gather around her. Can we use one to aid us to offer praise? According to my opponent's reasoning we can. He may affirm loud and long either in "certain" or uncertain terms, yet the fact remains that all Paul is doing is condemning the use of such things in the worship service as are not understandable to others. The very use of instruments violates his reasoning here, inasmuch as they are not understandable to those not instructed in their use. The specific thing that Paul is condemning, of course, is the use of tongues. My opponent gives just the opposite meaning to the passage as that given by Paul. He mentions verse 15 with the other two verses. This verse further shows Paul's application. It is significant that the instrument is not mentioned in this verse.

"ARGUMENT NO. 2"

"Experience, Testimonies and Common Sense"

Under this head is introduced another sophistry. My opponent tries to count numbers, Christ said that the majority of people are going to hell (Mt. 7:13, 14). There are more Mohammedans than Christians. Does

this make Mohammedanism right? I could easily show some other things which this type of reasoning would justify that is practiced by this same majority to which Bro. Hunt refers that would not be very pleasant to him. This I shall refrain from mentioning unless he insists upon using this type of reasoning. I would like for him to quote the statement from the letter which calls these communities to which he refers as being in the majority "churches of Christ." Is there actually a statement which calls them the "churches of Christ which use the instruments?" If there is please quote it for us. Remember also that the Bible, not the United States Bureau of Census, determines whether an organization is the church of Christ.

There may be a piano in the auditorium of Freed-Hardeman College of Henderson, Tennessee, but my opponent is trying to give the public a wrong impression of its use. It is never used to accompany religious songs. The fact that they use it in their programs of entertainment does not prove the purpose of such use to be that of aiding singing. Let it be remembered, however, that my opponent has not produced any statement from Bro. Hardeman that he teaches that instruments aid one to sing or that he so believes.

A man may testify that glasses aid him when they do him harm. Testimonies alone are not proof. Man's wisdom is foolishness with God. If my opponent would be satisfied with the wisdom and testimony of God this discussion would soon be ended. Some people contend that whiskey inside them aids them to keep warm and some will even say that it aids them to drive an automobile more efficiently, but scientific investigation shows their contentions to be false. A testimony must be sustained by scientific investigation. Now if my opponent wants the testimony of someone, let us hear one who was acquainted with the scientific side

of the question. Richard Wagner, one of the greatest opera composers of all time, has this to say in his Gesammelte Werke, v. 2, p. 337, as quoted by G. Geitman in the Catholic Encyclopedia: "To the human voice, the immediate vehicle of the sacred word, belongs the first place in the churches and not instrumental additions or the trivial scrapings found in most of the church pieces today. Catholic church music can regain its former purity by a return to a purely vocal style. If an accompaniment is considered absolutely necessary, the genius of Christianity has provided the instrument worthy of such function, the organ." Notice that he does not say that he deems it necessary, but if it be considered necessary. My opponent never quoted the testimony of even one reputable musician. Will he dispute the testimony of such?

"PROOF THAT GOD WILL ACCEPT THE PRAISE WHILE USING A MUSICAL INSTRUMENT"

Surely my opponent does not mean to imply that God, himself, uses the instrument while He accepts praise, yet that is what he has said in the heading quoted above. I suppose that he means that he is to offer proof that God will accept the praise of one who offers said praise to the accompaniment of a mechanical instrument of music. If this be the case, it is the first time he has touched the real issue. For if the instrument does aid to offer praise, my opponent has to prove that God will accept the songs sung to its accompaniment. I have proved that the reasoning which he uses here is false. This I showed by the use of Lev. 10:1.

"Argument No. 1"

Anyone who uses that which is not authorized by the Lord is wrong himself. He would not so act if he were not wrong. Either his motive is wrong or his conception of what God has authorized is at fault. Not only is this true, but one may make a melody in his heart which is not acceptable to God. My opponent as-

sumes that He will accept all melodies made in the heart in his argument upon 2 Chron. 15:12, 15. This passage does not say one word about making melody in the heart, however. The people mentioned in this passage could seek God with a whole heart and offer animal sacrifices, yea, they could offer these sacrifices and make acceptable melody in their hearts. Will my opponent say that we can do as much today? Wherein would be the difficulty? This will also answer his reference to David's having a fixed heart.

"Argument No. 2"

I wish here to ask my opponent two questions:

1. Does the instrument aid any part of the body just as the shoes aid the feet, the glasses aid the eyes and the radio the auditory nerves?

2. If it does, what part of the body does it so aid?

His argument here has been answered in the earlier part of my paper.

I have now answered fully all of his arguments, so I shall grant him his wish by making an affirmative argument of my own.

Affirmative Counter Argument No. 1

"And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of

faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin." This is the statement of the Apostle Paul in Rom. 14:23. Let us grant for argument's sake that some are aided by the instrument and that they can use it with no pains of conscience. There are still others who are doubtful of the advisability of using it. If these use it they damn their souls, for they do not do it of faith. Bro. Hunt, is it right for me to use that which will cause someone else to damn his soul? We see that though the instrument may aid some, it hinders others. It hinders in another way than the one named above. Those who are not very adept in music are not able to follow the instrument very well. This fact is evidenced by the practice of letting trained choirs do all the singing in most of the churches which use the instruments. These less adept individuals are hindered by the thing which possibly aids the more adept. Is it then a Charitable action to contend for the use of a thing to aid me which hinders others?

I have not used all the ten pages allotted me by the agreements drawn up for this discussion, but I have disposed of all of my opponent's arguments and have given an affirmative argument in return, so I now rest, eagerly awaiting his reply.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE PAPER

By JULIAN OLYN HUNT

WHAT BROTHER INMAN FAILED TO DO!

1. He failed to keep the proposition under discussion in mind at all times. He objected to my definition of "during Christian worship service." I said: "the form of service that we have on the Lord's Day or any day, time or place." He said: "According to this definition it could refer to a Masonic service." Forgetting that a "Christian worship service" could not be "a Masonic service." Then again, I headed an article in my first speech: "Proof That God Will Accept The Praise While Using A Musical Instrument." He said: "Surely my opponent does not mean to imply that God, Himself, uses the instrument while he accepts praise." Had he known what the proposition was, he would have known that I was abbreviating in the above heading. The proposition said it aided an individual, not God!

2. He failed to attempt to answer some of my arguments. The ones he did attempt to answer he merely mentioned them and passed by. He must "dig my arguments up by the roots" and set his arguments against mine in a form superior in argumentation, clearness, and above all, in fact and truth. This he did not do. He seems to think that merely mentioning an argument of mine is sufficient. Note the following examples: I made an argument that the praise was not in an instrument but in the person; that when God said to "praise with stringed instruments and organs" that the subject was "you" and was understood, hence the praise is in the "you" and not in the instrument. An instrument cannot praise God, it takes a human being to do that. Brother Inman denied this by merely saying: "All of us realize that you is the subject, but we realize also that the

instruments are the means used to do the praising." Did that "mere statement" answer my argument? Again, I spent at least two full typewritten pages explaining "how and what" instrumental music aided. I proved that it aided the individual's intellect, his voice, and that it aided him to sing. And to cap it all, he said: "He must first prove that it is made for that purpose—this he has not done." Why did he not show that I had not proved it? I wrote two full pages and made argument after argument and in this one article I used twenty-five verses of Scripture using some of the verses two or three times.

Next, I made an argument that if one could sing without having an instrument near it was because he had previous instrumental music training. Brother Inman of course "plucked it up" (?) by merely saying: "This has but one flaw—it is not true." He can have this out with Fredric J. Haskins, Director, Information Bureau, Washington, D. C., who stands in position to give the best information in the world on any subject. He says: "It is possible to write music without an instrument but the composer must know the potentialities of the instrument for which the music is being written." This is true also when one sings. He must know the potentialities of a song before he can sing it. The notes which contain the potentialities were written by the aid of an instrument or they could not have been written says Mr. Haskin. Hence, it is necessary to have an instrument present or have previous instrumental training in order to sing. Charles Buttz Titus quotes an anti-instrument song leader as saying: "No one can lead vocal music successfully without previous instrumental training." (A Ten-Cent His-

tory of Music in Worship, p. 13.)

The first time instrumental music is mentioned is in Gen. 4:21. The first time singing is mentioned is in Gen. 31:27. Hence according to the written Word of God, instrumental music was in existence approximately seventeen hundred years before singing. It is likely that the first man who sang learned it by imitating the sound produced by the strings of a musical instrument. Notice what Ezekiel 28:13 says: "The workmanship of thy tabrets and of pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created." From this we learn that the workmanship of instrumental music was created in the beginning. Therefore, with the evidence of Mr. Haskin, Mr. Titus, the prophet Ezekiel, and the fact that organs were in existence seventeen hundred years before singing, we have sufficient proof that one cannot sing without previous instrumental music training.

3. He failed to answer my arguments on the four prongs. One of which he is forced to accept and defend before he can defeat my proposition. But lo, and behold, he headed an article: "The Four Prongs" and then did not even mention what they were. He never tried to answer my argument on them but went off on perfection. I suppose he figured by writing the words "four prongs" he answered my argument. My argument is that before he can defeat my proposition he must contend for ONE of FOUR things: (1) he can say instrumental music does not aid an individual because the individual does not need aiding; (2) he can say it does not aid because it hinders; (3) he can say it does not aid because it neither helps nor hinders; and (4) he can say it aids the individual but God does not accept the praise when it is used. You know, dear reader, if he cannot think of a position against my proposition that defeats it that he has undertaken a job that is impossible for him to do. I want you to see both sides of the proposition at once. You deserve to know what can be said

IN FAVOR OF IT, and what can be said AGAINST IT! Since no stand can be taken against it that defeats it, then it stands unharmable and un-touchable. We may argue a life time in a round-about-way for and against the proposition, but these four prongs are directly on the subject. Neither of these four prongs can defeat the proposition. Then the proposition is proved unless he can find another prong that will let the bars down. But this he cannot do, for there are not any others to be found. If he accepts one of the four prongs he must then refute my arguments against the prong he accepts. I made an argument in my first speech showing that neither of these prongs would stand the test. Brother Inman has not answered these arguments.

4. He failed to show under what conditions God accepts a thing as an aid and rejects a thing as an aid. I said anything that aided one to do God's will and is not wrong within itself could be used. Anything which fails to do this is rejected. He thought he had another reason why God would reject an aid. That is, anything God has not authorized to be used. Yet he says it does not have to be mentioned to be authorized. He said my principle would not stand the test and cited the case of "King Saul and the cattle," also "Nadab and Abihu." He said the cattle aided and were not wrong within themselves, hence according to my principle Saul could have used them, but God rejected them because he had not authorized them. Brother Inman you blindly failed to see four little words in my principle: "TO DO GOD'S WILL!" I said anything may be used which aid's one TO DO GOD'S WILL. Did those cattle aid Saul TO DO GOD'S WILL? No! Because God's will was that King Saul kill the cattle and not to offer them up as a sacrifice as Saul tried to do. Saul broke a commandment of Almighty God! Therefore, this is not parallel with instrumental music. Singing is doing God's will. Instruments aid one to sing, hence

aid to do God's will. It is not wrong within itself. Therefore, it does not violate the principle I laid down. But the case of Saul and the cattle does. So does the case of Nadab and Abihu. Offering strange fire was not God's will even though it aided them and was not wrong within itself. But did it aid them? If so, what did it aid them to do? If you can prove that they used strange fire to aid them in offering the fire God had commanded, then you will have a parallel with the use of instrumental music and not until. This you cannot do, because they were SUBSTITUTING strange fire for the fire God had commanded. They did not use strange fire as an aid but as a SUBSTITUTE. Instrumental music is not used as a SUBSTITUTE for singing, but to aid the person to sing. Hence, you do not have a parallel in this "strange fire story" with using the instrument to accompany those who sing. So his "other thing" he thought of in addition to my principle will not work. Come on, Brother Inman, and tell us under what conditions God will accept and reject a thing as an aid.

5. I called upon him to show that an individual has no authority to bring into the worship service any aid unless that aid is mentioned in the New Testament. Then I asked: "By what authority does he bring in the song book, tuning fork, etc.? He failed to give a sufficient reply. He merely made a statement: "I DO NOT HAVE TO SHOW THAT ALL AIDS MUST BE SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED BEFORE THEY ARE AUTHORIZED." But he did not show why they do not have to be mentioned. We have his "mere statement" for it. No proof at all!

6. He failed to answer my argument on, "Instrumental music aids singing through the medium of the mind."

7. He failed to meet my argument on, "Instrumental music aids the intellectual part of man." I argued that

sound waves produced by the instrument strike the ear-drums and are carried and recorded on the mind of the person. Hence, he has in his mind the proper pitch and the proper tune of a song. This enables him to get his mind on the pitch and tune. The instrument puts into sound the meaning of the notes of a song book. If the notes contain the proper tune of a song the sound waves that are recorded on the mind of an individual do also, because the instrument puts "what the notes contain" into sound. In other words, the song book contains, in a written form, the tune involved in the notes; while the instrument contains, in a sound form, the tune involved in the notes, because it puts the notes into sound. The notes are written in a book but are transformed into sound by an instrument. Hence, the instrument hands the correct pitch and tune of a song over to an individual's mind and because of this, he is able to sing. The player does not have to be a perfect individual to keep time and carry the tune with an instrument, as my opponent insists, either!

8. He failed to meet my argument on: "One cannot sing without first having the proper prerequisites to singing in his mind. Instrumental music produces some of the prerequisites to singing, etc."

9. He failed to answer my arguments on Romans 12:1, on the different parts of the body. But he did say: "His argument here has been answered in the earlier part of my paper." While the truth is, this argument is not remotely hinted at anywhere else in his paper. Why he said this is beyond me! I spent more than a full typewritten page on this argument and Inman spent one sentence—stating he had answered it when he had not even mentioned it. But he is not to be blamed because he is doing as well as any man could do on his side of the proposition. No man living can prove that God will accept the praise of an individual while using an aid to his ears, an aid to his eyes,

an aid to his mouth, an aid to his hands, an aid to his legs, an aid to his feet and deny that God will accept the praise when he uses an aid to his voice.

DOES SALVATION DEPEND UPON THE USE OR NON-USE OF INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC?

In the very off-set of Brother Inman's speech he warns the reader that the proposition "is vitally connected with the salvation of souls." It is a matter of salvation with him. From this fact he cannot escape the unavoidable conclusion that in this bigoted idea against instrumental music lies the groundwork and cause of all the division among the Churches of Christ on this subject. Since he considers salvation depends upon the "non-use" of instrumental music, of course, he is going to divide with them who use it; but since I consider that salvation does not depend upon either the use nor non-use of it, I will never divide with the "users" nor "non-users." Therefore, my position can never cause division while his position is a partner with division. He has added the "NOT" and caused the division by saying, "Thou shalt NOT" use instrumental music." While God used a not in James 2:24 condemning "faith only" He did not use a "NOT" condemning instrumental music. Hence, Inman's argument on the "NOT" has passed from him. He added a "NOT" that God did not add.

To me our proposition is not a discussion connected with salvation, but is more in line with what Paul says in Titus 3:9, "But avoid foolish questions and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain." I regret that one's dignity has to be lowered to a level even to a discussion on such a question. You anti-instrumental brethren have done exactly what Jesus said in Matthew 23:24: "Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel." To me instrumental music is merely a gnat. But you brethren have strained at it, until it has become a camel in division.

This "gnatty" matter has been stretched until it now becomes a MATTER OF SALVATION TO BROTHER INMAN!

Jesus said in Matthew 23:23, "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithes of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law: judgment, mercy and faith." To me instrumental music is not a "weightier matter" but only an aid which comes in the category of a song book, tuning fork, radio, collection basket, etc. Brother Inman places it in equality with judgment, mercy and faith. The reader is asked to place the position that I hold on instrumental music, beside Inman's position and decide who has caused the division. Everybody knows that the man who places the greater value upon it will cut the biggest "row" about it. Hence, he is responsible for the confusion!

IS CLIFTON INMAN A MEMBER OF WHAT HE CALLS THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH?

This article is entirely off the proposition, and I regret that my opponent has made it necessary for me to side track and make it. Hedges Rules of Logic were to govern the debate and rule 3 says: "All expressions, which are unmeaning, or without effect in regard to the subject in debate, should be strictly avoided." He failed to adhere to this rule and proceeded to make an argument that I was not a member of the Church of Christ. So it is necessary that I let the reader know how I stand. He charged me of being a member of what he called the Christian Church. But the fact is, he is the guilty one, himself! He is a member of what is known as the Christian Church. Who is judge? The teaching and practice of Mr. Inman is! Jesus said: "By their fruits ye shall know them." Brother Inman bears the fruit of what he calls the Christian Church. He practices the "one man-preacher-pastor system." He is "The Pastor" of a church in Pikeville, Kentucky. The

Christian Church practices this system. The Church of Christ does not. Where in the New Testament do we read of the Churches of Christ hiring, "Rev. Paul to be the Pastor?" or "Dr. Earnabas to be the regular minister"? This is a modern system which has been carried over from the Catholic clergy-system and adopted by the Protestant denominations. The Churches of Christ ordained "Elders" in every congregation and "sent" the evangelists out (not called them in) into new, virgin territories to establish new congregations. The church Inman terms as the Christian Church denies this, but Brother Inman is in full fellowship with them on this, hence he is a member of the Christian Church. Be careful, my dear brother, and heed the advice of Paul: "Therefore, thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things." (Rom. 2:1)

My proposition does not require me to prove that instrumental music is mentioned in the Scripture and according to Brother Inman I do not have to. He says: "I DO NOT HAVE TO SHOW THAT ALL AIDS MUST BE SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED BEFORE THEY ARE AUTHORIZED." I argue that instrumental music can be used as an AID and he has granted this also. Will he defend his "Pastor system" as an aid? Or in anyway? I advise him not to try it!

Next, he mentioned the Appalachian Evangelizing Association. My position on this is that the same arguments which condemn a Missionary Society condemn also a Bible College, Publishing House, and all agencies in the same category. They all stand or fall together. I have no desire to conceal any belief or practice that I endorse. My opinion is that if the local congregation had been preserved as the only Missionary Society, Bible College, Publishing Agency, and so forth, on earth that the Church would not stand today as a barren,

pathetic picture. The brethren of ability have been released from the oversight of the elders and freed from the local churches and have set themselves up in modern machinery and are spending their time operating it, until there are very few men left in the local churches capable of carrying it on as the Lord intended. All agencies are guilty of robbing the Churches and seizing their best men; this is not true only of Missionary Societies, but true also of Bible Colleges, Publishing Houses and all agencies. My opponent is inconsistent in his position on this question. He up-holds and endorses "all" these agencies except the Missionary Society. Bro. Daniel A. Sommer says: "The same reasoning by which these men disregard the word of God and let in the Bible College advocates can let in advocates of Missionary Societies, aid societies, etc." (Macedonian Call, October, 1936, page 5.) I heartily agree with Brother Sommer. I wonder if Brother Inman will affirm in a debate: "Resolved, that I (R. C. Inman) can consistently endorse and up-hold agencies in the category of Abilene Christian College, Gospel Advocate Publishing House, Nashville Orphans Home and condemn Missionary Societies as agencies in the category of The Appalachian Evangelizing Association?" If he will affirm this proposition, I will deny it. He ought to, or hush up about these side issues and permit me to continue with the proposition we set out to discuss.

Brother Inman failed to tell us what he means by the Church of Christ. Neither did he say what he meant by the Christian Church. I BELIEVE THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IS A CHRISTIAN CHURCH AS DISTINGUISHED FROM THE JEWISH OR HEATHEN CHURCHES. I belong to the Christian Church in this sense and often speak of the Christian Church in my preaching. All the early Restoration fathers stand with me on this. The Church of Christ is a Christian Church and therefore I contend that it certainly isn't wrong to

call a thing what it is. If Brother Inman wants to disfellowship me over this word "Christian" let him do it and depart as a heathen or publican if he so desires.

I happen to know his position, however. He sectarianizes the Church of Christ and thinks of it as being only those who do not use instrumental music. But in this he stands condemned because in this "group" there are those who deny his "one man-preacher-pastor system." They deny that Brother Inman belongs to the Church of Christ because he practices this system. They disfellowship him. Also among the "anti-instrument wing" many of the brethren use "one cup" in the communion service. They tell Inman that he does not belong to the Church of Christ. There are others in this same group who deny the use of "the radio" and brand Brother Inman with the liberals. On and on we could go until we get sorry for Brother Inman. His own brethren condemn and disfellowship him. When we analyze the situation we see that Inman has adopted "more practices" of what he calls "the Christian Church" than he has in common with "the most conservative anti-instrument brethren" of the Church of Christ. And mark you, they are nearer right than he, because they are consistent. The position he now holds is the most dangerous "religious racketeer" stand, one can possibly take. He will ever be in a racket from one side or the other and his position deserves it.

My respondent seems to think that because the brethren of the anti-instrument group were able to get a registration at Washington, D. C., entitled: "Churches of Christ," that this determines whether one is a member of the Church of Christ or not. Dear brother, Isaiah 9:6 says: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and THE GOVERNMENT shall be upon his shoulders." So we see the GOVERNMENT is upon the shoulders of Christ, not upon the

United States. I do not claim to be affiliated with either group that is registered at Washington—The Disciples of Christ or the anti-instrument group. However, my name was in the year books of both groups, but I did not put it there. I do not care to be branded an "anti" or a "modernist" either! I prefer simply the Church of Christ! Church of God! Church of First Born! Church of The Saints! etc.!

I do not endorse this "group idea" for it is nothing but ecclesiasticism. I believe in Bible government only, as executed through the local church. If Brother Inman is eager to know what Church I belong to, it is the Pine Grove Church of Christ at Bluefield, West Virginia. **WE HAVE INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC, TOO!** Suppose you tell the reader what "group" you belong to. There are more evangelists in the Church of Christ who reject both groups—the "liberals" and the "antis" and stand on the position where I stand, than there are in both groups combined. My opponent wanted to know what Churches, which I stand identified with, are called Churches of Christ. He is under the impression that all Churches which wear the name "Churches of Christ" are anti-instrumental music. **BUT THERE ARE MORE THAN TWICE AS MANY "CHURCHES OF CHRIST" THAT HAVE INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC THAN THERE ARE OF THEM WHICH DO NOT HAVE IT.** Nearly all the Churches in the North are known as Churches of Christ. Instrumental music is not a controversy in the North and should be a dead issue in the South. Plus this, at least half of the Churches in the South which use instrumental music are Churches of Christ and they have this title on their Church buildings. The Bible Colleges, such as: Cincinnati Bible Seminary, Johnson Bible College, Christian Normal Institute, Minneapolis Bible College, Atlanta Christian College, Ozark Christian College, Butler University, and many others, which are in favor

of instrumental music, produce ministers who prefer the title "Church of Christ" and due to this preference, all the congregations where they serve are "Churches of Christ." Brother Inman came from Texas and seems to be uninformed in regard to Church work elsewhere.

I regret that so much space is being taken up on the "Church question" which is altogether off the issue under discussion, but the reader will know just how I stand in spite of my opponent's effort to deceive them. It gives the anti-instrument believers a pain to know that there are Churches of Christ which use the instrument and refuse to ride their hobbies.

When Brother Inman accused me of belonging to the Christian Church he wanted the reader to believe that it was the "liberal-radical-modernistic wing" which terms itself sometimes as the Christian Church. But I happen to be here to see that he fails in his effort. He would like to pin this to me in order to lower and belittle me in the reader's opinion. But this he failed to do! This effort has been made before by those of Inman's group. Roy Hall tried his hand on the Church question in an oral debate at Belfry, Kentucky; but pursued the course of all who face defeat; he quit the second night and walked out in spite of the fact that we agreed to debate six nights. His influence has been mightily chilled because of that benighted effort.

Now getting down to "brass tacks" let's try some questions and see what Brother Inman really knows about the Church:

1. Is the Church of Christ a Christian Church? If not, what kind of a Church is it? Is it Jewish? Is it heathen?
2. Is the Christian Church a Church of Christ? If not, are those who belong to the Christian Church going to Hell?
3. What does it take to make one a member of the Church of Christ?
4. What does it take to make one a member of the Christian Church?

BROTHER INMAN ADMITS THAT INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC CAN AID AN INDIVIDUAL TO SING!

Brother Inman admitted in several places in his speech that instrumental music can aid an individual to sing. Yet, in spite of this he contended that it does not aid. He argued both ways. We are left wondering if he is rattled, lost in his thinking, undecided, or what? The following statements are taken from his paper: "The exact point of controversy is not whether instruments can aid." "There may be a possibility of an instrument's aiding an individual to sing praises (I shall at least grant that to be true for arguments sake during the discussion.)" Furthermore, he said in a letter to me dated September 16, 1941: "The question between us is not whether mechanical instruments of music aid one to sing, but whether it is right to use them in worship service. For this reason I think your proposition is not very well worded. It would make me deny that an instrument aids singing. This would allow for a lot of reasoning irrelevant to the issue." Then again, he admitted in an oral debate held in Pikeville, Ky., Court House that it aided. Still in the face of all this he denies that it aids. Hear him: "Yes, God knows whether an instrument aids an individual. He nowhere says or intimates that it does." "My opponent has not produced any statement from Bro. Hardeman that teaches that instruments aid one to sing or that he so believes." (Brother Inman admits that Hardeman has an instrument in his chapel room but says they do not use it to sing religious songs. I suppose they sing "jig" songs.) Again he says: "My opponent assumes what he is obliged to prove. He says, "Since instrumental music is made to assist the voice it must aid the voice. He must prove that it is made for that purpose." Why do I have to prove that it aids, Brother Inman, when you admit that it does? Why prove something everybody is agreed upon? We cannot take you seriously when

you argue both ways at the same time. You are "granting that it aids during the discussion." I suppose after the discussion you will continue to preach against it, when I will not have any chance to reply.

But to cap it all, after granting that it aids, he proceeds to answer the TWO arguments which I made to prove it aids. He denied that it aids by trying to refute these two arguments. I made an argument on 1 Cor. 14:7, 8, showing that from the Apostle's illustration of the pipe, harp, and trumpet that we learn what "THE SOUND OF INSTRUMENTS" does. Paul said when an instrument gives "CERTAIN" sounds and there is a "DISTINCTION" in the sounds one can tell what is piped or harped. Therefore, instrumental music aids since there are certain sounds and distinction in the sounds while playing a song. My opponent denies this argument and charged me of giving this scripture a meaning that Paul never intended. In this he accused me wrong. In my first speech I explained the intended meaning that Paul conveyed; that of the unprofitableness of unknown tongues. Paul used the pipe, harp, and trumpet as an illustration to show the Corinthians what "certain" and "uncertain" sounds do. Their native tongue was a certain sound and could edify them. Their unknown tongues were uncertain sounds and could not edify anyone. "For if the trumpet gives an uncertain sound who shall prepare for the battle" says Paul (1 Cor. 14:8). This Scripture shows beyond a doubt that the "SOUND OF AN INSTRUMENT" is an aid.

Brother Inman says: "An old hen gives a certain sound—when she finds food she makes a sound which is understood by her little ones and they immediately gather around her." Then he asks: "Can we use one to offer praise?" Everybody can see that this illustration is in my favor. I could not have thought of a better one myself. When the old hen gives

a "certain" sound it aids the little chicks to get the food just as the "certain" sound of an instrument aids us to get the pitch and tune of a song. If we bring the old hen into the worship service, as my opponent suggests, her sound would be "uncertain" to us, and could not aid us, because according to Paul, "If the trumpet (the hen) gives an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself" (1 Cor. 14:8). But since her sound is "certain" and "distinct" to the little chicks, the sound aids them. If the hen squawks, the chicks hide. If she clucks, they follow her. If she gives a sound for food, they gather around her. Whatever the "certain" sound is, the little chicks act accordingly. Hence, the "CERTAIN SOUNDS" aid the little ones. Brother Inman demanded me to use an old hen for an instrument since she gives certain sounds. He has a song leader. The hen sings. I wonder if he will use her for a song leader?

My opponent objected to my argument on "experiences, testimonies and common sense." He says he does not believe in testimonies, etc. Yet he quoted the testimony of six men, who he claims were scholars, trying to establish that a Psalm does not mean to sing by instrumental accompaniment. (See his argument on Eph. 5:19.) In bold words he said: "This statement is corroborated by the 'TESTIMONY' of every reputable historian and scholar of music that is extant today." I suppose Inman would have us believe that it is all right, and dandy proof, for him to take the testimonies of others, but wrong for me to do the same. Is this your argument dear sir? In spite of what he says against experiences and testimonies, some things have to rely upon this source of proof. For instance: how do you know the wind blows? How do you know there is a sun ball? How do you know George Washington lived? The testimonies of millions have established these questions for us. Likewise, the testimonies, experiences and common sense of mil-

lions have proved that instrumental music aids. Why do you deny it aids and then turn around and admit it. You act like a lost boy in a wilderness, meandering in every direction and going nowhere. It is not your fault, however, because when a man is standing on a sandy foundation he is subject to slip and slide and attempt to catch things in every direction.

In my first speech I asked Brother Inman this question: "If instruments were not made to assist and help the voice to sing why were they made?" He replied: "They were made to play and entertain listeners." This answer shows prejudice! Yet it shows he believes listeners are aided by them. But after writing this, he no doubt looked wise, and then turned around and wrote: "In the Old Testament times instruments were used to praise." He then cites Ps. 150:3 to prove this. Again he says: "Instruments had a specific purpose. This purpose was to praise." In one breath he says they were made to "entertain listeners." In the next breath he says they were made "to praise God." Hence, he says the praises of God were designed to entertain listeners and entertaining listeners were the praises of God. Arguing both ways again! Friends, no man with the truth will make this many contradictions in one speech. However, Brother Inman is "half right" because he is on my side arguing half of the time.

God said: "And the king (Solomon) made of the almug tree—harps also, and psalteries for singers." (1 Kings 10:12.) Brother Inman said they were made "to entertain listeners." Here we have Inman against God! Is he right? No! Instruments were certainly made for one of two classes of people—either "FOR PLAYERS" or "FOR SINGERS." Only players and singers used them! Why were they made, dear Lord? Hear Him: "And the king made of almug tree—harps also, and psalteries for singers." (1 Kings 10:12.) God says they were made "FOR SINGERS!" What use

did the singers have with them? They did not use them to praise as Inman contends, because they sang praises. There is only one other reason for which they could have used them: this is, "as an aid to them as they sang." If my opponent wants to prove that "players" use them to praise, let him prove it, if he can. He certainly cannot prove that "singers" used them for that purpose, because they had another way of praising God, that way was to sing!

To boot! Our opponent cited Gen. 4:21, to prove that instruments were made to entertain listeners. It reads: "Jubal was the father of all such as handle the harp and organ." He reasons that since Jubal was a descendant of Cain, the murderer, that this made Jubal a murderer, too; hence instrumental music came from an evil source. Cain was Jubal's great, great, great, great grandfather. There are seven generations from Cain to Jubal counting both generations in which they lived. I ask: "Had Inman's fifth grandfather been a murderer would this make Inman a murderer, too?" A man is hard up for an argument to use this story against the instrument.

Besides this, it so happened that Jubal had a brother named Jabal who was the father of such that dwelled in tents. (See Gen. 4:20.) Does this prove that tents came from an evil source? We advise our opposers to quit preaching in tents or else give up this argument against the instrument.

Brother Inman accused me of handling Scripture carelessly because I cited nine passages which proved that God commanded a number of prominent men to make instruments. I have this to say in return: it will pay the reader to turn back and read these Scriptures and not take Inman's word for it. We all know who is "reckless" in this debate. The way he handled the "Cain-Jubal Story" and his style of "arguing both ways" prove this.

SINCE HE HAS ADMITTED THAT INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC AIDS AN INDIVIDUAL TO SING THIS RELIEVES ME OF ONE DUTY. I WAS TO FIRST PROVE THAT INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC AIDED AN INDIVIDUAL TO SING, BUT THIS IS NOW ESTABLISHED! I have only one duty left to perform. I must give authority for its use. But read the following:

BROTHER INMAN SAYS AIDS DO NOT HAVE TO BE MENTIONED TO BE AUTHORIZED!

The argument was made in my first speech which showed that before he could prove that instrumental music was not an acceptable aid, when used in the service of God, that he must prove that an individual has no authority to bring into the worship service any aid unless that aid is mentioned in the New Testament. Then by what authority does he bring in the song book, tuning fork, pulpit, radio, collection basket, etc.? Brother Inman came back in a rattled fashion and "gave the victory over to me" by saying: "I DO NOT HAVE TO SHOW THAT ALL AIDS MUST BE SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED BEFORE THEY ARE AUTHORIZED." (Capitals mine.) How one of the anti-instrument brethren can make a statement like this one is beyond me. After parading up and down the land and country preaching: "Go not above that which is written;" "He that abideth not in the doctrine hath neither the Father nor the Son;" "If any man speak, let him speak as the Oracles of God;" "God hath given all things that pertain unto life and Godliness;" "The Scripture thoroughly furnishes us unto every good work;" "Faith comes by the word, no word, no faith, and that without faith is sin;" and many other passages have they used to deceive the hearers and readers with a line of sophistry against instrumental music. But lo, and behold, we have one of them "cornered" and he comes out in bold words, with his name signed to it, and says: "I DO NOT HAVE TO

SHOW THAT ALL AIDS MUST BE SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED BEFORE THEY ARE AUTHORIZED!"

Thanks for the admittance! However, with this in mind we are left wondering if the doctrine of "special calling" or "election" is not true. Not only does Brother Inman, but all the anti-instrument brethren, without an exception, contend that one must not "go above that which is written" and then apply this to instrumental music. How is it that "we," dear reader, must give book, chapter, and verse for instrumental music and the "opposing brethren" do not have to show "THAT AIDS MUST BE SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED BEFORE THEY ARE AUTHORIZED?" Are they God's "elects" and abiding in a "special calling?"

In one statement he demanded me to give "the testimony of God" for instrumental music and in another, he said that he did not have to show that aids had to be mentioned in the New Testament. Compare the following: (1) "I do not have to show that all aids must be specifically mentioned before they are authorized;" (2) "If my opponent would be satisfied with the wisdom and testimony of God this discussion would soon be ended." These statements are flatly contradictory (in a discussion on aids) or else Brother Inman demands more of me than he does of himself. According to him, aids must be mentioned in the New Testament before I can use them, but they do not have to be mentioned before he can use them. Is this what he is asking the reader to believe?

By the way, we have instrumental music authorized according to the following statements taken from Brother Inman's paper: (1) "I shall at least grant that instrumental music can aid during the discussion;" (2) I do not have to show that all aids must be specifically mentioned before they are authorized;" (3) "Yes, God knows whether an instrument aids an individual to sing. He nowhere

says or intimates that it does." First, he says the instrument is an aid. Next, he says aids do not have to be mentioned. Then he says, the instrument is not mentioned. Well then, since instrumental music aids, and aids do not have to be mentioned to be authorized, and the instrument is not mentioned, then why is it not authorized?

This has cut instrumental music entirely from the New Testament and still we have authority for its use. It is unnecessary now that we appeal to the written Word to justify the use of instrumental music. Therefore, WE SHALL SEE THAT BROTHER INMAN DOES NOT DEMAND THAT WE GIVE ANY SCRIPTURE TO AUTHORIZE ITS USE. IF HE DOES ANY TIME FROM NOW ON TO THE END OF THIS DISCUSSION WE SHALL CALL HIS HAND! This places this discussion out in the "realm of Christian principles" where a discussion on "aids" rightfully belongs.

According to our opponent, "AIDS DO NOT HAVE TO BE MENTIONED IN THE SCRIPTURE TO BE AUTHORIZED." Since he says instrumental music is an aid, it does not have to be mentioned. Why then should I fool away time arguing with him over Scriptures? Listen, friends, do not think hard of Brother Inman for this statement, because every anti-instrument believer has to make the same statement when he is "cornered." He may resort to the mountain peaks, when nobody is around to take issue with him, and declare that he "speaks where the Bible speaks, and is silent where the Bible is silent," but when we get one of them in a debate he takes "back water" and says: "I DO NOT HAVE TO SHOW THAT ALL AIDS MUST BE SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED BEFORE THEY ARE AUTHORIZED!" Not only Brother Inman, but each and every one of them has to say this, and they do say it too, when pressed for "a hole to crawl out."

They cannot show where song books, radios, etc., are mentioned in the New Testament. If we are guilty of adding to God's word, they are! They use aids not mentioned in the New Testament as well as we. If they have authority for the aids they use, then we have authority for the aids we use. They should get the beam out of their own eyes, before attacking the mote in ours! What do you think, reader? Plus this, they should read Rom. 2:1, "Therefore, thou art inexcusable, O man, whosever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest does the same things."

BROTHER INMAN'S QUESTIONS ANSWERED!

1. "Is that which is made by the art and ingenuity of man more perfect than that made by the wisdom of God?" Answer: No. Neither the organ of the throat nor instruments of music are perfect. God commanded both to be made by the instrumentality of man. (See Gen. 1:28; 9:1 and Chron. 7:6; 1 Chron. 16:42; 1 Kings 10:12.) If instrumental music were not as near to perfection as the voice, it would not prove that it did not aid. This question is merely to muddy the water.

2. "Are the organs used in playing an instrument more perfect than those used in acappella singing?" Answer: It depends upon the instruments and voices used. The organs of the throat are subject to colds and diseases. Instruments are nearer perfection in this case if they are in tune. The New International Encyclopedia, Volume XIII, Year 1926, Page 668, under the heading: "Leading of Voices," says: "There is greater freedom in the progression of voices in instrumental compositions than in vocal, because pure intonation of difficult intervals is more easily attained by means of an instrument than by the human voice." Nevertheless, this question has nothing to do with the issue. If instrumental organs were less perfection, or nearer, than the

organs used in acappella singing they could aid one to sing in either case. A mouse can aid a lion and a lion can aid a mouse. The greater does not always count.

3. "Does the instrument aid any part of the body just as the shoes aid the feet, the glasses aid the eyes and the radio the auditory nerves?" Answer: It aids the voice, "through the medium of the mind." Everything aids in this way—the radio, glasses, etc. It is unnecessary for instruments to aid in every detail the same as the radio, shoes, etc. The question is: Do they aid at all? Brother Inman admits that they do! They assist the voice in getting the correct pitch and tune of a song. What right do you have to deny the voice the aid of an instrument and permit the eyes, feet, and auditory nerves to have an aid? This is my argument and this is the point at issue! Get around it if you can!

A REPLY TO BROTHER INMAN'S FIRST COUNTER ARGUMENT!

"And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith and whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Rom. 14:23). He says some have doubts about the use of the instrument, hence cannot use it with faith, and would commit sin if they used one. He asks: "Bro. Hunt, is it right for me to use that which will cause someone else to damn his soul?"

I want to say, that this is the weakest and poorest type of reasoning one

can offer in support of an argument. Anything can be proved to be sinful in the realm of religious controversy by this argument. Plus this, it will not stand the test for anyone, anywhere. It proves too much to prove anything. Nobody believes this argument and nobody will accept it. Brother Inman does not believe it, himself. Will he give up everything that his brethren have doubts about? Let's try him and see! I doubt his "one-man-preacher-pastor system" to be right; will he give up the practice? Daniel Sommer doubts his Bible Colleges to be acceptable unto God; will he give them up? J. N. Cowan doubts his class-system in the Lord's Day Bible Study to be right; will he please stop offending him? Some of the brethren doubt that we should use more than one cup in the communion service; in our opponent's own words: "Is it then a charitable action to contend for the use of a thing to aid me which hinders others?" You do not believe this argument yourself, Mr. Inman, how do you expect the reader to? It is the vilest wresting of Scripture to use Romans 14:23 against instrumental music. You twisted this Scripture and gave it a meaning Paul never intended and are now found guilty of violating your own interpretation of it. "Thou art the man!" You are guilty of offending your brethren, therefore, I demand you to answer your own question: "Bro. Hunt, is it right for me to use that which causes someone else to damn his soul?"

SECOND NEGATIVE PAPER

By Clifton Inman

My friends, I come to you with my second paper upon this mooted question with confidence of being able to cause many to see the truth. I want it understood that I have no other feeling for my opponent but of love. I have no where questioned or impugned his motives. He has acted very unwisely by using the abusive and vituperative language which is evident in his last paper. His insinuations that I am bigoted, prejudiced, vile, blinded and a religious racketeer are certainly violations of the rules of honorable controversy. I shall notice as few of these references as possible in the course of my paper. We are not debating the merits or demerits of one another's character. The truth on the question under discussion is (or should be) our sole object.

I want again to state the proposition that we may keep clearly before us the exact point at issue. "Resolved, that a mechanical instrument of music can aid an individual to sing praises acceptable to God and that he has authority to use it during Christian worship service." The two key words in this proposition are "acceptable" and "authority." If my opponent can show that the use of the instrument is authorized he has won the discussion, for that which is authorized is acceptable. If he shows it to be acceptable, he has won also, for if it is acceptable, it must be authorized. This is the exact point at issue.

Now let us come to his second affirmative paper. In answering this paper I shall use his topic numerals and captions as much as possible and as is necessary—I shall add sub-topics at my own discretion.

"WHAT BROTHER INMAN FAILED TO DO"

1. Julian says that I have failed to keep the proposition in mind at all times. In support of this contention he cites my objection to his definition of "Christian worship service." He says that I forget that a Masonic service cannot be a Christian worship service. No, I did not forget it—that is the very point I wanted to emphasize. It was not the wording of the proposition that I questioned but the definition given by my opponent. He should have defined the terms so clearly that there would have arisen no question as to their meaning. I showed that in this case his definition left in question the real meaning of the terms under consideration. It allowed room for more misconceptions than that given above. I merely used this one to illustrate its incompleteness. Further, some think that a Masonic service is a Christian one.

His second citation in proof that I had not kept in mind the proposition was my reference to his heading, "Proof that God will accept the praise while using a musical instrument." I know how the proposition reads. I also know the idea his caption conveys. They are not identical. The fact that he was abbreviating does not obviate the error. People know what we mean by what we say. I was charitable enough to make clear to the readers what I think he really meant.

FAILURE TO ATTEMPT TO ANSWER HIS ARGUMENTS

I did not only attempt to answer his arguments—I answered them.

"Praise in the Person Not In The Instrument."

Praise is either audible or visible. We must make our praise either heard

or seen. (The possible exception that it may be felt adds nothing to the proposition.) We must have some means of making it visible or audible to spectators and auditors. We may have more than one means; e. g., singing, praying, teaching, etc. In Psalms 150:3 we see that the people are there commanded to praise God with mechanical instruments. The word "with" used in this passage is a proposition of agency, showing the agency by which or through which the praise was to be offered (or made audible). We may adore within ourselves, but praise is that coming out of or from us.

My opponent laments that he used "two full type-written pages explaining 'how and what' instrumental music aided." He seems to think that I have to use as much space in refuting his arguments as he uses in setting them forth. This is not necessary. He further says, "And to cap it all, he said, 'He must first prove that it is made for that purpose—this he has not done.'" He makes this apply to a different part of his article than that to which I referred. You remember that he stated in his first paper "Since instrumental music is made to assist the voice it must aid the voice." In this statement he assumes the purpose of the invention of instruments to have been that of aiding an individual to sing—he failed to offer anything to prove what he assumed. All I had to do was to call the readers attention to the absence of all proof. I realize that this argument is foreign to the real issue. It becomes necessary, however, to call attention to all fallacies in the premises of an opponent, for if he be allowed to make false premises, he may build upon them any conclusion he may desire.

Singing Without an Instrument Near

I proved that the argument made upon this point by my respondent is false by more than a mere statement. He now says that I can have this out with Frederic J. Haskin; whereupon he proceeds to misuse this man's statement. Mr. Haskin says

(according to Mr. Hunt), "It is possible to write (there is a difference in writing and singing—R. C. I.) music without an instrument but the composer must know the potentialities of the instrument for which the music is being written." Notice this man says that one can write music even without the instrument near. The word "potentialities" means possibilities. What Mr. Haskin says then is this—that in writing for any certain instrument one must know the possibilities of that particular instrument. If he is writing for the organ, for example, he must know its possibilities. If he does not he may write something which the organ cannot do. Most religious compositions are written primarily for the human voice. One, to write for the voice must know the possibilities of that instrument. This is a far cry from the argument of my opponent.

It may be that a song director of the church of Christ made the statement quoted from Titus. The quotation from Haskins shows it to be a fallacious statement.

First Mention of Singing and of the Instrument

Because instruments are mentioned in Gen. 4:21 and songs not till Gen. 31:27, my respondent deduces the following: "Hence according to the written Word of God, instrumental music was in existence approximately seventeen hundred years before singing." His conclusion has a false second premise implied, namely, that all things mentioned first in the Bible are first in existence. This is not true for Adam is mentioned before Christ, but Christ is first. Neither does the age of a thing give it favor with God or preeminence over other things of less seniority. Murder is mentioned before praying—Does this prove murder to be acceptable to God?

Ezekiel 28:13

Ezekiel is, in this passage, talking of the country of Tyre. He uses a common figure of speech by referring to the country by the name of its ruler. He shows the blessing that God

has bestowed upon this country and also foretells its fall. In reminding Tyre of how He had blessed it, God said through Ezekiel, ". . . the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created." From this statement my opponent makes the deduction that ". . . the workmanship of instrumental music was created in the beginning." Mr. Hunt, Ezekiel is speaking of the creation of that country—not the beginning of time. Furthermore, he is not speaking of the Christian worship service, neither does He mean to intimate that God created these instruments by his own hands. Instruments are often symbols of rejoicing. God is showing that if it had not been for Him Tyrus would never have rejoiced.

"The Four Prongs" Again

3. My opponent is the one who mentioned perfection. I merely showed that he confuses organic and spiritual perfection. Read the first of his "four prongs." All can readily see which of his prongs I took. Neither of them states the real issue. My position is that the instrument does not aid one to offer acceptable praises unto God. It may in rare instances aid one to sing, but God does not authorize its use in the Christian worship service and for that reason will reject its use. It will do no good for my opponent to try to claim that I am trying to argue both sides at the same time, for I showed in my last article the little likelihood the instrument has of aiding. It may aid to sing, but only if the ability and knowledge of music possessed by the player is greater than that possessed by the one to be aided, if the instrument be in perfect tune, if no wrong notes are sounded and the one to be aided is sufficiently adept in music to follow the instrument. I used almost these exact words to qualify my statement that I would admit for the sake of argument in the discussion that the instrument can aid. All praises are not acceptable unto God. This my opponent admits.

Conditions upon Which God Accepts or Rejects a Thing as an Aid

In discussing this subject, Mr. Hunt states, "Brother Inman you blindly failed to see four little words in my principle: "TO DO GOD'S WILL!" Either I am blind or these words are not stated by him in his principle. See page four of his paper.

Singing alone is not doing God's Will. Singing as God authorizes is doing His will. He says my "other thing" which I thought up will not work. Notice that the other thing I mentioned was, "God will reject a thing as an aid that He does not authorize to be so used." Now his statement is tantamount to saying God will accept a thing as an aid whether He has authorized it or not. You may be the judge of the truth of such an idea. If this be true my opponent certainly got up a poor proposition for discussion—he is the one who drew it up.

Nadab and Abihu

My opponent contends that the case of Nadab and Abihu and the instrument question are not parallel as these men substituted strange fire for the fire God commanded and the users of the instruments do not substitute instrumental music for singing.

Nadab and Abihu used the fire to aid them to burn incense. God had commanded the burning of incense. They were supposed to get the fire necessary for this act from the altar of burnt offering. They got it elsewhere instead. Julian, would it have been right for them to get some other fire and use it to aid them to make a fire more rapidly and larger if at the same time they would have used some fire off the altar? You would never answer this question in our oral debate. Will you now? He changed his position on this passage about four or five times in our discussion here in the Pikeville court house and then stated that he had just been playing with me on this argument. Are you still playing?

5. Authority for Bringing in Things Not Specifically Mentioned in the New Testament

I showed that an individual may use things not specifically mentioned in the New Testament regardless of my opponent's contention that I did not. I cited the case of the synagogue. He later admits my argument to be true. Why then raise a smoke screen about it?

6. "Instruments Aid Through the Medium of the Mind"

If instruments did so aid it would have nothing to do with the proposition as that is not the question under discussion. If the instrument did aid some it hinders others. This fact I showed plainly in my first paper. Mr. Hunt never touched it. I again ask, Is it right for me to use that as an aid which will be a hindrance to others?

7. and 8. Each of these numbers contain the same idea as that of number six. The instrument does not put the tune in one's mind—it must be in the mind before it can be played. A man is subject to mistakes while playing the instrument or else he is perfect in at least one respect. I would like for my opponent to name me one prerequisite of singing that the instrument provides.

Romans 12:1

9. Most of the argument made upon this passage belongs to our next proposition: "Resolved, that I can consistently use aids in the category of a song book, tuning fork, radio, communion set, automobile, chart, church house and collection basket in obeying God's commandments and condemn the use of a mechanical instrument of music as an aid during Christian worship service." My argument upon Nadab and Abihu as well as arguments six and seven answer this also.

"DOES SALVATION DEPEND UPON THE USE OR NON-USE OF INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC?"

My opponent says that he will not divide with the users or non-users of

the instrument. The Samaritans did not wish to divide with their heathen wives or the Israelites either. This does not prove that the Israelites were responsible for the division made between them, though. There was no division in the church of our Lord over the instrument until the late 1850's when it was first introduced. He says that to him the proposition is not connected with any one's salvation. Why then is he making all the fuss about? Why does he not avoid the "foolish questions" as he pleases to call them? He said during our discussion at Pikeville that he was aiming to challenge us for debates until the last one is out of Sandy Valley—yet he deems the question unimportant!

Mr. Hunt further assumes that God must say not to do a thing before He will condemn the doing of it. If this were true, I could gamble, play pool, drink a little whiskey occasionally, etc. My respondent will reply, "yes, but these do not aid. I refer only to those things that aid." Well and good. Let's see about that. The taste of unleavened bread is repulsive to some. I have seen those who would not take it for that reason. Would it be all right to add some strawberries to this bread to make it more palatable to them and thereby aid them in taking it? That would not be substitution either my friends. God does not name all those things which he does not want us to do. He sets forth certain principles. We may do those things which do not violate these principles.

The Gnat and the Camel

In Matthew 23:24 Christ does not condemn straining out the gnat. It is good sense and cleanliness to keep such out of what we drink. It is foolish to strain out such a small object and leave in something which is worse and larger. In straining out the gnat or the camel there is naturally a division made between them and the good ingredients. Before my opponent can make anything from

this passage he must show us the camel that we are swallowing. He implies that the instrument is the gnat. Gnats are dangerous in what we drink. We should strain them out. One who is careless in allowing them to stay in will soon become careless and swallow worse things.

Matthew 23:23

Christ told the Jews mentioned in this passage that they should have tithed as they had done. Their trouble was that they left off something else more important. If they had been guilty of neglecting their tithes, they would have been guilty of the other things also, for James says that he who is guilty of the least is guilty of the whole. Paul places the greater importance upon fellowshiping the Gentiles and "cut the biggest row about it," but those with Peter were the ones responsible for the division. (Gal. 2:14.) It pays to be careful to do all that God requires as God requires.

Am I a Member of the Christian Church?

Julian accuses me of bringing up this subject. I am not guilty. He places it in his definition of instruments of music and brought it up again by trying to count numbers. Was his inclusion of this in the definition meaningful or of effect in regard to the subject under discussion? Did your counting of numbers add anything to the discussion?

"The One-Man-Preacher-Pastor System"

If my opponent wants a separate debate upon this subject I am willing and ready. He assumes that because I am working regularly with the congregation here that I am a "one-man-preacher-pastor." The congregation here does not have any elders. It is a young congregation. I have been with the people here about six months. I am the servant of the people, not their boss. I rule in no way. The contention that the time that a preacher works with one congregation makes him a "one-man-preacher-pastor" is

not founded in fact. Paul stayed at Ephesus two years and three months. He later sent Timothy there. (Elders were at this time already appointed.) (Acts 19; 1 Tim. 1:31.) All historians agree that later John came to this city and abode there. Study of the condition in the church at Antioch as described in Acts 13 and in Gal. 1 will show that preachers labored there after elders had been selected. This shows what the church of Christ practiced in apostolic times. I will take that for my guide.

Yes, I will readily accept the challenge for a debate on the college, publications, and orphan's homes question. However, I know nothing of a Nashville Orphans Home. I will not defend it unless I find that its function is not contrary to New Testament principles.

The Church of Christ is the institution founded by Jesus Christ, and is governed by the teaching of the New Testament. If its members do as they are directed they will withdraw from all those who teach or practice things contrary to Christ's teaching. (Rom. 16:17.) If my respondent wants to take the anti-radio, and the one cup stand, I'll meet him on that also. The contentions of men are not the deciding factors as to whether one is a member of the church of Christ. The teaching of the New Testament decides this.

He seems to forget that he is the one who mentioned the Census Bureau. I merely asked for the exact quotation. He failed to give it. I happen to know something of the condition in the North also. Neither group has a very strong following there, but we who refuse to use the instrument have a pretty fair showing there. My opponent's insinuation that I have not traveled enough to know much is unworthy of my notice. I could travel in Texas alone and cover as much territory as my opponent has. There are some 4,000 additions to the Church of Christ reported in five months in the "Gospel Advocate"

alone. This is only a small percentage of the whole number. This seems to be proof that we are doing right well, thank you.

The church of Christ is not a Christian church in the strict sense of the word. The church is composed of Christians and of Christ also. We cannot rightly speak of Christ as a Christian and for the same reason cannot speak of the church as being a Christian Church. There are those in the church who are not Christians in the full sense of the word. We cannot for this reason rightfully speak of the church of Christ as a Christian Church. However, I see how some may refer to it as a Christian Church and have some grounds for so doing. Calling those who follow Christ and God the church of Christ and calling others by the same designation are two different things, though. There are those who call themselves the church of God, but their calling themselves that does not make them such.

Julian, you are debating me, not Roy Hall. If you persist in mentioning him, I may feel justified in telling the readers why Roy quit the discussion at Belfry.

The Questions

1. This question is answered above.
2. The first part of this question is also answered above. Those who practice those things contrary to the Bible are going to Hell if they do not change, the Bible being true. Those who are members of what is commonly known as the Christian church practice those things which are contrary to the Bible.
3. It takes obedience to the commands of the Gospel; hear, believe, repent, and be baptized, to make one a member of the church of Christ.
4. It takes the aforementioned things (sometimes) plus a willingness to engage in the singing to the accompaniment of instrumental music, the approval of missionary societies and other unscriptural practices to

make one a member of what is commonly known as the Christian church.

All of those organizations, colleges, seminaries, etc., mentioned by my opponent are backed by what he is pleased to term the modernist wing.

"BROTHER INMAN ADMITS THAT INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC CAN AID AN INDIVIDUAL TO SING"

Yes, I admitted this possibility. In my statement that "God knows whether an instrument aids an individual" and that "He nowhere says or intimates that it does," I was absolutely right. My opponent has not shown and cannot show otherwise. I was here referring to his question in which he tried to leave the impression that God had the instruments made for the purpose of aiding one to sing praises unto Him. I have shown that he misrepresented Bro. Hardeman. He seems not to realize that there is opera, classical, semi-classical, and popular music and ballads which belong neither to the field of religious or of "jig" music.

Let's hear him further in his quoting of statements. He says, "Since instrumental music is made to assist the voice it must aid the voice." He must prove that it is made for that purpose. "Why do I have to prove that it aids, Brother Inman, when you admit that it does?" I did not in this question ask him to prove that the instrument aids. I asked him to prove his contentions; viz., it was made for that purpose. He was trying to slip in the idea that God had instruments made for the purpose of aiding one to sing His praises. I did not let him get by with it. Neither shall he. I question these things because if one is allowed to make premises, he may make any kind of false conclusion upon them. I try his premises as well as his conclusions.

1 Cor. 14: 7, 8

I am glad that my respondent has admitted that my illustration concerning the hen is parallel with his argument upon the passage given above. What does the voice of the

hen aid? It aids little chicks to find food. What does the trumpet aid? It aids soldiers to know when to prepare for physical combat. If he can bring in that which aids in one case, I can bring in the other. We may even get us a bugle to sound as a signal for the beginning of each song according to such reasoning.

Paul was condemning the use of those things which were meaningless but was not recommending the use of all those things which have meaning. His reference to the song leader is not parallel, for the song leader must sing and so must every Christian with whom song is physically possible.

I did not say that I do not believe in "testimonies, etc." I said that these alone are not sufficient. I showed that they must be supported by fact or scientific data. It was the findings of scientific research that I gave on Eph. 5:19. The men from whom I quoted have made research into the subject. Why did he not answer my arguments made upon intoxicating beverages and glasses?

Instruments were made in the beginning to entertain listeners. They were used by the Jews years later to praise. This is what and all I taught in my last paper. Any effort to confuse the answers to two widely divergent questions does not change this fact. My last statement was not made in the "next breath" after the first as he contends. It followed quite a while after. It concerned an altogether different thing.

I am not against God in what is recorded in 1 Kings 10:12. 1 Kings 10:12 does not state the purpose for which the instruments named were to be used, but merely tells the recipients. The fact that singers sang praises did not keep them from praising in other ways. The singers were also the players. Psalms 150:3 tells us what they did with the instruments.

I did not contend that Jubal was a murderer. I said that upon which all

Bible scholars are agreed; namely, Cain's descendants were not a commendable group. Most will agree that they are the ones called "the daughters of men" in Gen. 6:2. None of his descendants were spared during the flood. It was not until the birth of Seth's first son that the Bible says men began to call upon the name of Jehovah. I did not contend that it is wrong to use instruments because Cain's descendant first made them. I was showing that God did not command him to make them as my opponent argued. It is also very improbable that he used them in God's service.

I did not accuse Mr. Hunt of being careless because he "cited nine passages which proved that God commanded a number of prominent men to make instruments." I said he was careless because only two of these passages even approached being proof of this. One of these passages shows the purpose of the instruments to be that of calling together the congregation.

"BROTHER INMAN SAYS AIDS DO NOT HAVE TO BE MENTIONED TO BE AUTHORIZED!"

Yes, I made this statement with the exception that I used the word specifically. I can admit this and still use each of the arguments which he has mentioned that my brethren use. In saying that he has me cornered he reminds me of two boys of whom I have heard. These boys were wrestling and a passerby asked which was winning. At this the one who was fastened securely on the bottom replied, "I am. I have him down." That is the way he has me cornered. I can and will give chapter and verse that authorizes song books, collection baskets, etc., at the proper time. That is what I ask of my opponent as regards the instrument. I do not ask him for a verse that mentions it specifically as being used in the Christian worship service. A sound Bible principle that authorizes it is sufficient. He has not and cannot do it. He may "call my hand," but he had better be spending

his time hunting his authority, for he will need it badly. Julian, what is the beam in my eye? You seem to infer that the use of radios, collection baskets, etc. is. If this be true will you not show me that they are wrong that I may cast them out instead of trying to add the instrument, which you infer is the mote, to the already incumbered eye?

"Questions Answered"

God did not command the organ of the throat and the instrument to be made by the instrumentality of man. He made the throat. Certainly that which God made is less susceptible of being inaccurate than that which is made by the art and ingenuity of man.

In answer to this question my opponent missed the whole question. The organs used to play the instrument are the eyes, the hands, the feet and the mouth along with others. My opponent never considered these. All of these may not be used on any one instrument but more than one is required for any one. This gives a greater chance of inaccuracy in playing than in singing. If the throat is subject to disease, so are the other organs. An aid must be more nearly perfect in its ability to do the thing necessary to aid another thing than that thing is to perform the act to be aided. The very fact of aiding presupposes an inability. The idea of an aid presupposes an inability. The idea of an aid presupposes an ability on the part of the aid to meet the need arising from such inability. If the voice needs an aid to sing it must be presupposed that it is incapable of doing the singing well without such aid. The instrument in order to meet this inability must be better capable of aiding the voice to sing than the voice is of singing without it. The mouse mentioned is as nearly perfect as is the lion. But when we realize that there is as much likelihood of the instrument's being incapable as there is of the voice's being so, it should make us slow to try to use it as an aid. Add to this the fact that

God has not authorized us to use it and we are compelled to leave it out. If the voice has a cold, medicine will do it more good than will all the mechanical instruments of music under the sun.

3. When it is seen that the instruments cannot aid the voice when it has a cold, the fallacy of the argument based upon Rom. 12:1 is made plain. This was the purpose of my asking this question.

A REPLY TO BROTHER INMAN'S FIRST COUNTER ARGUMENT

My opponent says that my argument from Rom. 14:23 is "the weakest and poorest type of reasoning one can offer in support of an argument." If he is right, Paul is guilty, for he is the first to use it. It is a good thing that I did not give a strong argument, for my opponent is not able to meet this "poorest" and "weakest." What would he do with a strongest and best? I expected him to try to make this argument condemn Bible classes, colleges, etc. There is a vast difference in the two, however. They are authorized—the instrument is not. To take the most favorable attitude possible toward the instrument, it will fall in the same class with the eating of meats. He says that I gave the passage a meaning which Paul never intended. Will you please give Paul's meaning?

Affirmative Counter Argument No. 2

We are a spiritual priesthood and are to offer spiritual sacrifices. (1 Pet. 2:5.) These sacrifices must be such as please God. (Ibid.) Not all sacrifices are pleasing to God. Saul's sacrifice of the animals of the Amelkites was not acceptable. God said concerning Saul's action, "To obey is better than sacrifice and to hearken than the fat of rams." (1 Sam. 15:22.) In order for our sacrifices to be acceptable unto God they must be given in accordance with His will.

We are told to give the fruit of our lips as sacrifice to God. (Heb. 13:15). That is the type of music to be offered

to God. Since he has specified that type music, we are not to offer any other. If God had specified any certain manner of teaching, all others would have been wrong. If God had specified any certain type seats, all others would have been wrong. If he had specified any certain way of providing acoustics by which to make our voices heard, all others would have been wrong. We could not have used others in either case and still have obeyed God. When he has specified the type music we are to make we cannot make other kinds and be pleasing to Him. We fail to obey when so doing. We fail to do just as Nadab and Abihu failed to obey and just as Saul failed to obey.

I have proved this argument from scripture. I wish to further show that it is true from every day life. Suppose that a man should send his child to the store and say, "Son, get a box of matches, a package of razor blades and some soap." The boy goes to the store. He gets these things—everyone

of them. He gets in addition two pockets full of candy. When he comes home his father reprimands him for getting the candy, but he replies, "Daddy, you didn't tell me not to get it." What do you think would be the result? Certainly the boy would be reprimanded severely, and justly so. When I made this argument in Pikeville, my opponent replied that the child did wrong, but he did so because he did not do his father's will. That is exactly the point. Why did he not do his father's will? Because he added another element to that which his father had authorized him to get. His father would not have complained had he brought the things required in a sack or in a box. Those would have been legitimate aids. The candy can not be ruled out because it would not aid, for the boy needed energy to carry the required things. Candy provides energy. The candy has just as much chance of aiding as does the instrument. Both have some.

I thank you.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE PAPER

By JULIAN OLYN HUNT

WHY THE MISREPRESENTATIONS?

Are they necessary to save your belief? If not, why make them? I believe you knew that the following accusations of yours misrepresent what I have said and believe.

1. You say, I said: "God will accept a thing as an aid whether he has authorized it or not." I deny this charge! Instrumental music is authorized by God. "An individual has authority from God to use anything that aids him to do God's will, provided the thing he uses is not wrong within itself."

2. You say: "Mr. Hunt further assumes that God must say not to do a thing before He will condemn the doing of it." I did not assume any such thing, I simply objected to your adding a "NOT" that God never added. You tried to parallel instrumental music with some illustrations in which God had used a "NOT." I called upon you to find the "NOT" that God made against the instrument, or else you failed to have parallels to the instrument. You used the story of King Saul and the cattle. But God said: "Spare them NOT." (1 Sam. 15:3.) You used James' story on faith and works. But God said: "NOT by faith only." (James 2:24.) You used an illustration of putting strawberries on the Lord's Table to make the unleavened bread taste better. But God said: "When ye come together this is NOT to eat the Lord's Supper." (1 Cor. 11:20.) These Corinthians were adding other foods to the unleavened bread, but God added a "NOT" against it. You used the story of Nadab and Abihu offering strange fire. But God said: "And thou shalt make an altar to burn incense upon—Ye shall offer NO strange

incense thereon." (Exodus 30:1, 9.) Nadab and Abihu, "put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord." (Lev. 10:1.) Offering "strange incense" and offering "strange fire" refer to the same act. (Compare Exodus 30:1-9 with Lev. 10:1.) So God added a "NO" against them offering "strange fire." But where is the "NO" He added against instrumental music? Until you find the "NO" or "NOT" against the instrument you do not have any parallels in the above stories.

3. You say: "All those organizations, colleges, seminaries, etc., mentioned by my opponent are backed by what he is pleased to term the modernist wing." Reader, I mentioned Johnson Bible College, Cincinnati Bible Seminary and other loyal schools and Inman cares so little for his word that he says they are modernistic. This has gone beyond a misrepresentation, and I consider it too far beneath truth to merit a reply.

4. He infers that I am anti-radio and anti-communion set. This is a deliberate misrepresentation. Brother Inman knows better. He needed something to say!

In his argument on Rom. 14:23, he said the instrument cannot be used because some doubt the use of it. I replied that he did not believe this argument himself, because he is not willing to give up everything his brethren have doubts about. I mentioned the one cup and radio for examples. I said his argument on "doubts" was the poorest and weakest reasoning that can be offered against the instrument. Brother Inman said Paul used it. But he misrepresented Paul. Paul did not use Rom. 14:23 against instrumental music and for

Inman to do so is vile wresting of the Scripture. Paul used this verse against eating meats offered to idols in the presence of weak brethren. Meats were authorized everywhere else only when "weak brethren" were offended. If you are going to use this against the instrument then you are forced to say that it can be used where there are not any weak brethren. That was Paul's argument against eating meats. It was wrong to eat meat in the presence of weak brethren but right everywhere else. Brother Inman ought to accept both sides of this Scripture or not accept either. Will you use the instrument where there are no weak brethren, Brother Inman? Paul ate meat where there were none. Let's see what Brother Inman has to say about this: He says: "To take the most favorable attitude possible toward the instrument, it will fall in the same class with eating meats." In this statement of his, we have the instrument authorized. It is in the SAME CLASS with eating meats; he says! When were meats authorized to be eaten? Answer: when there were no weak brethren around to get offended! When is instrumental music authorized, Brother Inman? Hear him: "When there are no weak brethren around to get offended!"

If this is the only objection you anti-instrument brethren can offer against instrumental music, then I will do my best to "round up" a few of our brethren to indoctrinate you fellows so you may no longer remain "weak brethren" and then WE WILL ALL USE INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC!

A FEW OTHER THINGS!

1. I have permitted Brother Inman to blunder along until the present without much exposure of his style of debating. I am sure that he has failed to make his arguments clear and understandable to the reader! I have to refer to my own speech time and time again in order to know what part of my speech he is trying to answer by what he says. For instance,

he says his argument on Nadab and Abihu answers my argument on "the parts of the body" based on Rom. 12:1. I see no connection whatever with the story of Nadab and Abihu and my argument on Rom. 12:1. His style is to make arguments and fail to apply them.

2. He says Adam is mentioned before Christ, yet Christ is first. How do you know this? Because John 1:1, says so. Now if you can give a verse that says singing came into existence before the instrument I will concede you this point, but not until. The only way we have of knowing what came into existence first is by knowing what is mentioned in the Bible first, unless a verse elsewhere informs us otherwise. Instrumental music is mentioned seventeen hundred years before singing. (See Gen. 4:21 and Gen. 31:27.) He said: "Murder is mentioned before praying—Does this prove murder to be acceptable to God?" No! But it proves murder was in existence before praying. You missed the point! Likewise, I have authority for saying instrumental music was in existence before singing since it was mentioned first, unless you can show otherwise. Therefore, my argument is true that one cannot sing without first having previous instrumental music training. Singing may be handed down from generation to generation but when you trace it back it will have its origin from instrumental music—at least, notes, tunes, written music, etc., will.

3. He has constantly contended instrumental music hinders an individual, but has never brought one iota of proof. We have his word, that is all!

4. He assumed time and time again that instrumental music is not authorized by the Lord, YET HE SAYS IT DOES NOT HAVE TO BE MENTIONED TO BE AUTHORIZED! I offered A PRINCIPLE which authorized the use of aids, not only instrumental music, but song books, tuning forks, etc. I said: "AN INDI-

VIDUAL HAS AUTHORITY TO USE ANYTHING THAT AIDS HIM TO DO GOD'S WILL, PROVIDED THE AID HE USES IS NOT WRONG WITHIN ITSELF." Brother Inman must do one of two things: He must show that the use of the instrument violates the principle or else show that the principle is not true.

5. He informs me that I am debating Clifton Inman, not Roy Hall! I predict that before this debate is over, he will wish it was Hall instead of him, Mr. Hall got enough and quit the Belfry debate because he saw his defeat before the time dated to close. Mr. Inman infers that he knows why Hall quit, when he did not even attend that debate. Your insinuations will not shield your group from the defeat of that debate! The victory is mine!

6. He next says he will debate the pastorship and society questions so I submit the following propositions:

"Resolved, that there is "a one man-preacher-pastor system" set up in the local churches, known as churches of Christ, which is and has overthrown the work of elders and evangelists and is therefore unscriptural." (I affirm)

"Resolved, that I can consistently and Scripturally endorse and uphold agencies in the category of Abilene Christian College, David Lipscomb's Bible College, Gospel Advocate Publishing House and condemn agencies in the category of The Appalachian Evangelizing Association." (He affirms).

7. Next, my opponent said everyone in the Church, the body of Christ, is not a Christian. He said, Christ belongs to the Church. This is all news to me. The Church belongs to Christ, not Christ belongs to the Church. His position is Baptist doctrine. Not only have you adopted practices of the Christian Church, but of the Baptists. The very idea of him saying that one can belong to the Church without being a Christian. According to him there are two kinds of material in

the Church—those who are Christians and those who are not!

It would have been much better for Brother Inman to have conceded the point and admitted that the Church of Christ is a Christian Church than to have tried to squirm out of it and been left in such an ugly predicament.

8. Next, he tells us a joke about two boys wrestling; the one on the bottom saying he had the other one down, and in like manner, says Mr. Inman: Mr. Hunt has me cornered. Well he admits he is cornered in some sense of the word. But I do not know how to reply to wit, unless it is by wit. My opponent argues both ways! First, he says the instrument can aid and next he says it cannot aid. He cannot make up his mind about it. He reminds me of the boy who went to buy a pig. On his way back home he stopped to play marbles with his chums and while absorbed in the game they removed the pig from the sack and put a pup in its stead. Upon returning to his home his father looked inside the sack and exclaimed: "I sent you after a pig!" "I got a pig," said the boy! "No, it is a pup! Take it back and get a pig," demanded his father. On his way back the boy stopped to play marbles again. His chums this time removed the pup and put the pig back in the sack. When he came to his neighbor's he told him he had made a mistake and sold him a pup when he wanted a pig. The neighbor opened the sack and exclaimed: "Why you have a pig!" In astonishment the boy cried: "Well, I would to God you were either a pig or a pup!" So it is with Brother Inman; I would that he remain a pig or pup in his arguments and not be so changeable.

HE FINALLY ACCEPTED ONE OF THE FOUR PRONGS!

Brother Inman says: "All can easily see which of his prongs I took. My position is that the instrument does not aid one to offer acceptable

praise unto God." While he was forced to accept this prong it will do him no good until he refutes my arguments against it. My arguments are these: "If he takes the fourth prong and says God does "NOT" accept the praise while one uses an instrument, he meets the following difficulties: (1) He must show that a thing (not wrong within itself) can aid an individual to obey one of God's commandments and be rejected by God at the same time. God will not permit anything to "aid" in his work and be "rejected" as an aid in his work at the same time. To say he will is contradictory! Another difficulty is: (2) He must show under what conditions God accepts a thing as an aid and rejects a thing as an aid. This Brother Inman has not done! He says anything God has not authorized is rejected. To this we all agree! But you have not told us what determines what is authorized. I gave a PRINCIPLE! You have not given anything! Until you do so, you have not made a fair effort to prevent me from establishing my proposition. The third difficulty: (3) If you say God does not authorize, that which he has not mentioned in the Scripture, then by what authority do you use the song book, tuning fork, etc.? You say you will give book, chapter, and verse for these things. Please look in the next verse where you find a song book, tuning fork, etc., and you will find instrumental music.

Dear reader, since he has taken the fourth prong and says: "Instrumental music aids an individual but God does not accept the praise," he has surrendered his side of our argument, because this stand cannot refute my proposition. — THERE ARE TOO MANY DIFFICULTIES IN HIS WAY AND HE CANNOT REMOVE THEM WITHOUT CONDEMNING HIS OWN FAITH AND PRACTICE!

A REPLY TO INMAN'S SECOND COUNTER ARGUMENT!

He says: "We are told to give the fruit of our lips as sacrifice to God.

(Heb. 13:15). That is the type of music to be offered to God. Since he has specified that type of music we are not to offer any other."

In reply I file two objections: First, he assumes that "the fruit of our lips" refers to singing in this passage. It might refer to preaching, praying, reading, exhorting, or even whistling.

Second, granting that it does refer to singing, it does not contradict nor oppose anything that I believe or practice. I believe God commanded us to sing. We must sing! We must offer "the fruit of our lips" unto God. But this verse does not debar us from using instrumental music as an aid to help and assist us in singing and sacrificing the fruit of our lips unto God. If so, does the commandment to preach debar a radio from being used as an aid? Is not the commandment to preach just as specific as the commandment to sing? If not, why not? The commandment to teach is very specific to the elders; even to the degree that it is listed as one of their qualifications: "Apt to teach" (1 Tim. 3:2). How did the New Testament elders do their teaching: orally or through a religious journal? They did it orally, of course! Did this then exclude teaching through religious journals? If so, why do you favor religious journals? If not, then are you not forced to say that a specific commandment does not exclude aids, even though, they be THE SAME QUALITY as the commandment?

Your contention in this argument on Heb. 13:15, is that there are two kinds of music (singing and playing) and the Scripture specifies singing as the kind of music that God wants. Is not this your argument? How then can you retain this argument without giving up religious journals, as a method of teaching, which the Scripture is silent about? Is not teaching a specific commandment? We learn by Scriptural example that they taught by oral method only. But the fact that singing is specific does not exclude instrumental music from

being used as an aid; neither does teaching orally exclude journal teaching.

One kind of teaching can aid one to do another kind of teaching just as one kind of music can aid one to do another and visa-versa. Now let us illustrate: God commanded Noah to build the ark out of gopher wood. Of course, this excluded oak, beech, hickory, pine, chestnut and every other kind of wood. But this did not exclude other kinds of wood from being used as aids. Noah could have used "an oak work bench," "a chestnut log cart," "a hickory hammer-handle," "a beech axe-handle" to aid him in dragging in and cutting and working up the gopher trees so as to build the kind of an ark that God wanted built. Likewise, we may say that there are two kinds of music (singing and playing) and when God commanded singing to be used as an act of worship, this excluded instrumental music as an act of worship (and this I admit) but notice, friends, this did not exclude instrumental music as an aid to the individual as he sings. No man can give arguments sufficient to establish that one kind of music (even though not commanded) cannot be used to aid a person to make another kind which God has commanded. So Brother Inman's argument on Heb. 13:15 has completely passed from him. It has nothing to do with the use or non-use of aids. It fails to touch the issue!

Our opponent's illustration of the boy with his candy is not parallel to using instrumental music as an aid in singing. Notice: the earthly father gave a commandment to buy razor blades, matches and soap. Our Heavenly Father gave a commandment to sing. Instrumental music aids us to sing, hence aids to do what our Heavenly Father commands. The candy which the boy got in addition to the razor blades, etc., does not aid him to do what his father commands. The candy aided the boy to go back home, but going back home is not the commandment of his father. In-

strumental music does not aid us to go home from the house of worship, but aids us to sing while there, hence aids us to obey the commandment of our Father in Heaven. It does not serve the same purpose that the candy does for the boy, therefore, the candy story is not parallel with the use of the instrument.

Then again, this candy story is not parallel in several ways. The earthly father did not object to the boy getting the candy in addition, but because the candy was bought at the father's expense. The father objected to the extravagance. Had someone given the boy some candy would the father have objected? No. So he did not object to the boy eating the candy but the expense. This story of Brother Inman's forces him to object to instrumental music on the ground that it is expensive. It forces him to say that when the church buys instruments it is at our Heavenly Father's expense. Well, then according to this he cannot object to them being used when they are donated. This illustration does not fit against instrumental music where Brother Inman intended it to fit. It fits against the cost of them and not their use. Therefore he can have no objections to using an instrument when donated. If the boy really needed the aid of the candy to build energy, his father was inconsistent in objecting to him using it. To give the boy a commandment and deny him the necessary aids in carrying out that commandment would have been inconsistent. If the boy did not need the candy then it is not parallel to instrumental music. Since our Heavenly Father is not inconsistent and since we need the aid of the instrument in carrying out the commandment to sing then we conclude that your "candy story" is not parallel with using the instrument.

THE AUTHORITY FOR USING INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC AS AN AID

In my first paper I set forth and showed that my task was two-fold in establishing my proposition. First,

I was to prove that instrumental music can and does aid an individual to sing. Second, I was to give the authority for its use. I have no fear but what every person who reads this debate will say that I have thoroughly and abundantly established the fact that instrumental music can aid one to sing. What I have said, what Brother Inman has said also, ought to have established this fact. Brother Inman says it can aid; I say it can aid; we all say it can aid; therefore, we all agree that I have established the first part of the proposition, namely: Instrumental music aids an individual to sing. Plus this, while proving that it aids I have given arguments sufficient to establish the authority for its use. I gave two arguments to prove that "the praise is accepted while one uses an instrument." And by proving this, I proved that we have authority for its use. Because that which God accepts is authorized. Furthermore, I stated the conditions which determine when a thing is accepted and rejected as an aid. I said: "AN INDIVIDUAL HAS AUTHORITY TO USE ANYTHING THAT AIDS HIM TO DO GOD'S WILL, PROVIDED THE AID HE USES IS NOT WRONG WITHIN ITSELF."

This principle states an unrefutable fact. Brother Inman failed to see the breadth and depth of it. This is very evident from the quality of arguments he offered against it. It stands as the rock of Gibraltar as far as his arguments are concerned.

In a further discussion on the authority for the instrument, I have decided to re-state this principle and arrange it in what I consider a more precise and concrete form in order to assist Brother Inman to see the real worth of it. I shall then thoroughly analyze every detail of it, and elaborate upon it, until not a stone is left unturned. Just now, however, I submit the following:

I contend that the same authority that we have or our respondent has

for using a song book, tuning fork, radio, church house, collection basket, chart, communion set, blackboard, notebook, reference book, lights, seats, ear-phones, shoes, crutches, canes, false-teeth, automobiles, trains, ships, airplanes, and all aids that we use in carrying out the commandments of God we have for the instrument. If we have authority for one, we have authority for all. They all stand or all fall together. When our opponent comes to his affirmative he will tell us what authority he has for using all the aids he uses and by so doing he will give authority for instrumental music, provided the authority he gives for aids is really authority. What authority do we have for using a church house in obeying God's commandment to assemble (Heb. 10:25)?

What authority do we have for using a song book and a tuning fork in obeying God's commandment to sing (Eph. 5:19)?

What authority do we have for using a radio in obeying God's commandment to preach (11 Tim. 4:2)?

What authority do we have for using a collection basket in obeying God's commandment to give (1 Cor. 16:1-2)?

What authority do we have for using glasses in obeying God's commandment to read the Word (1 Thes. 5:27)?

What authority do we have for using aids, aids, and more aids, that we use in obeying the commandments of God? We could go on and on asking our respondent to justify the aids he uses and call on him for the authority for using them and when he gives the authority for aids he will have the authority for instrumental music. All aids can be justified on the same ground or condemned on the same ground. When our brother condemns us he condemns himself for we read in Rom. 2:1, "Therefore, thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest for wherein thou judgest another,

thou condemnest thyself: for thou that judgest doest the same things."

Yes, we will expect our respondent to give authority for the use of aids when he comes to his affirmative; what will he say? What authority does he have? We will wait and see! But since I am at present in the affirmative I will proceed to give authority, not only for instrumental music, but for the use of all aids to the individual.

WHAT AUTHORITY DO WE HAVE FOR AIDS?

We do not have a direct commandment in the New Testament for the use of all aids that we use!

We do not have an apostolic example in the New Testament for the use of all aids that we use!

We do not have a necessary inference in the New Testament for the use of all aids that we use!

What authority do we have then? We do not claim to have "a direct commandment," or "a Scriptural example" or "a necessary inference" for the use of all aids that we use today in carrying out God's commandments. My respondent will tell you, that these three ways are the only ways that we have to justify anything, but in this he is wrong. Where does he have a direct commandment, Scriptural example, or necessary inference for using a song book, radio, tuning fork, glasses, pulpit, loud speaker and thousands of aids that he uses? He has none, and neither do I. But I do not claim to have!

All aids cannot be justified in the realm of "a direct commandment," "Scriptural example" and "necessary inference" and I deny that they have to be. This is a mistaken idea of the anti-instrument brethren, and their own practice proves it to be. What authority do we have for aids then? Shall we pass on to some other PRINCIPLE? Yes, we shall! Or give

up the use of hundreds of profitable aids, that not only the congregation to which I belong but also the congregation to which my opponent belongs and all religious organizations on earth use.

I SHALL NOW STATE THE AUTHORITY FOR AIDS: "AIDS ARE JUSTIFIED OR AUTHORIZED BY THE LAW OF INCLUSION, AND ARE REJECTED BY THE LAW OF EXCLUSION."

But what are the laws of inclusion and exclusion? They are nowhere written in the New Testament. So how are we to determine what these laws are; or what they contain? **WHAT IS THE LAW OF INCLUSION? WHAT IS THE LAW OF EXCLUSION?** What comprises these laws? It so happened that none of the inspired writers saw the necessity of writing down these laws and including them (in a written form) "in all things that pertain to life and Godliness," or "the faith that was once and for all delivered unto the saints," or "the whole counsel of God," so what can we do to determine what these laws are? We know and are sure, that in the law of inclusion we justify the song book, radio, tuning fork, chart, and instruments of music. By the law of exclusion we reject the saloon, pool room, theater, etc., from being used as aids. **THE LAW OF INCLUSION** takes in all proper aids, while **THE LAW OF EXCLUSION** cuts out the use of all improper aids. **SO OUR NEXT STEP IS** to find out what these laws are. Let's do it now!

These laws have been stated by many preachers, scholars, teachers, philosophers and instructors in many forms and ways, but I consider the following PRINCIPLE a fair statement of them:

"Any law or precept of the New Testament, whether it be a Commandment, ordinance, act of worship or work, permits an individual to aid himself by the use of any or

all aids in exercising the will of God as long as the aids do not change the law or precept, or do not usurp authority over it, provided the aids are not wrong within themselves."

This principle is identical in thought with the one I previously used, but I consider it superior in form. For this reason I submit it as my final authority. Any aid that does not violate this principle is AUTHORIZED. Any aid that violates it is rejected. Before an aid can be used, according to the above principle, three things must be considered:

First, The aid must not change God's law or precept.

Second, The aid must not usurp authority over God's law or precept.

Third, The aid must not be wrong within itself.

That is, any aid may be used, such as the radio, song book, collection basket, instrumental music and so on, and used by the **LAW OF INCLUSION**, provided it does not violate either of the prongs of the above PRINCIPLE. But if it violates either of the three prongs of the above principle, then it is cut out and cannot be used because of the **LAW OF EXCLUSION!**

WHEN GOD COMMANDED A THING TO BE DONE, ANY AID MAY BE USED BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE ABOVE PRINCIPLE AND IS THEREFORE INCLUDED IN THE GIVING OF THE COMMANDMENT AS LONG AS THE AID DOES NOT CHANGE THE COMMANDMENT, NOR USURP AUTHORITY OVER IT, PROVIDED THE AID IS NOT WRONG WITHIN ITSELF. But if the aid changes the commandment or usurps authority over it or if the aid is wrong within itself, then that aid is excluded in the giving of the commandment and is not to be used. It is therefore, in this principle that the authority for all aids is found. Not only the use of

instrumental music but the use of the song book, the radio, tuning fork, loud speaker, automobile, collection basket, communion set, pulpit, notebooks, blackboards, reference books, chapter and verses numbered in the Bible and hundreds of aids that are used in carrying out and obeying the commandments of Almighty God!

Erother Inman must do one of two things: He must either destroy the truthfulness of my principle or else show where using instrumental music violates it. But in advance I proceed to show that using instrumental music does not violate the principle. Bear in mind that instrumental music must do one of three things before it violates the principle. It must change the commandment to sing, or usurp authority over singing, or the instrument must be wrong within itself.

First, It does not change singing. If so, what part of it does it change? It takes two things in order to sing. It takes words and it takes a tune. The instrument does not change the words of a song. Neither does it change the tune. So it cannot change singing. If one were singing a religious song the instrument would not change it to a jig song. If a good man were singing, it would not change him to a bad one. So the instrument cannot change either the song or the man. You might bring the charge that God commanded us to sing and we change that commandment when we play. This objection will not stand the test for several reasons. (1) We do not substitute playing for singing. This would be necessary before the commandment to sing is changed. It is necessary to remove the original before the substitute can be used. We do not remove singing because we sing when we use the instrument, hence both are in use at the same time, therefore the charge of changing the commandment is untrue. (2) Instrumental music aids an individual to obey God's commandment to sing. It could not aid

him to obey the commandment and change the commandment at the same time. This is impossible! Let's illustrate: If an individual were commanded to go to Cincinnati he could use an automobile as an aid to go. But the automobile could not aid him to go to Cincinnati and change his course of going and take him to New York at the same time. Likewise, since instrumental music aids (and Inman admits it does) an individual to obey God's commandments to sing, it cannot change the commandment and aid one to obey it at the same time.

Second, Instrumental music does not usurp authority over singing, because one can sing and play at the same time, and too, as a rule during the worship service, we have only one to play the instrument, while the whole congregation sings. Now, since there is only one "player" and the whole congregation "singers" the "player" is so far in the minority to the "singers" that it is impossible for the music of the instrument to usurp authority over the singing.

Third, Instrumental music is not wrong within itself. If so, why do you anti-instrument brethren have it in your homes?

So we see that using a musical instrument does not violate the Principle. Because it does not CHANGE the commandment to sing, nor USURP authority over it, nor is it WRONG WITHIN ITSELF. The use of the instrument does not violate either prong of the principle, hence the law of exclusion is not violated. NOW WE ARE READY TO CONCLUDE, THAT WE HAVE AUTHORITY FOR USING INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC AS AN AID TO THE INDIVIDUAL AS HE SINGS PRAISES TO GOD DURING CHRISTIAN WORSHIP SERVICE AND THAT AUTHORITY IS BY THE LAW OF INCLUSION!

THEREFORE, WE HAVE PROVED BOTH PRONGS OF THE PROPOSITION,

NAMELY: **FIRST, INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC AIDS ONE TO SING PRAISES ACCEPTABLE UNTO GOD. SECOND, WE HAVE AUTHORITY FOR ITS USE.** I am glad that this fact has gone down in capital letters before the eyes of the reader!

There is not much left for our respondent to do. The reader is asked to bear in mind that a MERE OBJECTION to instrumental music is not sufficient. We want our brother to take my arguments up one by one and show the fallacy in them if there is any. We want him to show that the use of the instrument violates the principle of inclusion and exclusion or else show that the principle which I have introduced will not stand the test, as a law for inclusion and exclusion.

BUT WAIT A MINUTE: The very moment he shows that the use of instrumental music violates the laws of inclusion and exclusion I will show that the radio violates the same laws by the same arguments. I can also show by his own arguments that the song book, tuning fork, collection basket, violates them; and on and on and on from aid to aid I will go showing that each and every aid that he uses in exercising and obeying the commandments of God violates and transgresses these laws. When Brother Inman comes to the affirmative on his proposition I will show that I can do what I say I can. I can actually do it! But our anti-instrument brethren can never show that using instrumental music violates these laws, that is impossible! So I am not afraid I will be employed in the task of proving that all other aids violate them. I FEEL SAFE, SIR!

IS MY PRINCIPLE MAN-MADE AUTHORITY?

Perhaps, someone might wonder what authority I had to use a principle which cannot be found in the Scripture (in written form) anywhere. Did I make my own authority

and then proceed to justify instrumental music by it? The answer is no, absolutely NO! THE PRINCIPLE IS GOD GIVEN! At least, the Scripture involves a "God given" principle which authorizes the use of aids. I merely stated the principle that I think the Scripture contains.

When God gives a commandment, that commandment involves an eternal principle, yet that principle is not stated in words in the Scripture. Who will deny? If you do, how then would you justify the use of aids? I did not originate the principle, I merely stated it. God gave the commandments; the commandments involve a principle; the principle justifies or rejects the proper and improper aids. This seems to be the divine order!

If I have failed in my effort to state the right principle then it is up to my opponent to set it forth and expose it. Brother Inman will not deny that the commandments involve a principle which justifies and rejects the proper and improper aids. In fact, he said in his last paper: "A sound Bible principle that authorizes it is sufficient." So we have his approval!

Now, to convince the reader that we are not alone in our efforts in stating a principle I will give you what other preachers have said and done along this line. Note the following:

The principle as J. N. Cowan stated it: "WHEN GOD GIVES A COMMAND AND DOES NOT GIVE THE METHOD OR CONDITION OF CARRYING OUT THAT PLAN, THAT COMMAND, THEN THE METHODS WE ADOPT FOR THE CARRYING OUT OF THAT, THEN THEY BECOME A PART OF THAT COMMAND IN THAT SENSE, SO THEY ARE AUTHORIZED." — (Cowan-Sommer Debate Page 184; also Page 182.)

The principle as Daniel A. Sommer stated it: "CHRISTIAN LIBERTY LIES IN NON-ESSENTIALS TO

SALVATION; AND IN DETAILS WHICH GOD HAS NOT GIVEN OF ESSENTIALS (COMMANDS) WHICH HE HAS GIVEN, WITH THESE DETAILS IN HARMONY WITH THE REST OF THE NEW TESTAMENT." (In his pamphlet on

Christian Liberty, page 3.)

The principle as J. B. Briney stated it: "WHEN A THING IS COMMANDED TO BE DONE, AND THE METHOD OF DOING IT IS NOT PRESCRIBED. THOSE COMMANDED ARE AT LIBERTY TO USE THEIR BEST JUDGMENT IN DIVISING WAYS AND MEANS TO CARRY OUT THE COMMAND, AND THEY ARE TO ACT UNDER THE PRINCIPLE LAID DOWN BY PAUL IN 1 CORINTHIANS 14:40, "LET ALL THINGS BE DONE DECENTLY AND IN ORDER." (Otey-Briney Debate, page 162.)

The principle as Alexander Campbell stated it: "NOW THE LAW OF EXPEDIENCY IS THE LAW OF ADOPTING THE BEST PRESENT MEANS OF ATTAINING ANY GIVEN END." (Christian System, page 96.)

It might be well to state that J. N. Cowan and D. A. Sommer both are anti-instrumental music. J. B. Briney was once anti-instrumental music but was converted and in his debates, he justified instrumental music by the law of expediency, which authority is contained in his principle. He made the instrument parallel with the tuning fork, song book, etc., as I have done. Alexander Campbell had a personal dislike for music of any kind and due to this he said that instrumental music was like "a cow-bell in a concert." However, his arguments on the law of expediency show that he would have, and could have, justified the instrument by "the law of expediency." (Read my next article written by Campbell).

Now, if I have given man-made authority by stating a principle for

authority for the use of aids, these men were guilty also. Yea, these men and scholars were guilty! But every Bible student realizes that there is a "LAW OF EXPEDIENCY" or "LAW OF INCLUSION" or "PRINCIPLE OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY" which the Scriptures involves that authorizes the use of aids. Hundreds have written, in their own words, what they considered the law of expediency is, and I have done no more than they, or more than all had a Scriptural, legal right to do.

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL ON THE LAW OF EXPEDIENCY!

"Still there are many things left to the law of expediency, concerning which no precepts are found in the apostolic writings. To ascertain these is the object of this chapter. They are, then, in one sentence, those things, or forms of actions, which it was impossible or unnecessary to reduce to special precepts; consequently they are not faith, piety, nor mortality; because whatever is of faith, or the worship or of the morality of Christianity, was both possible and necessary to be promulgated; and is expressly and fully pronounced in the sacred scriptures. The law of expediency, then, has no place in determining the articles of faith, acts of worship, nor principles of morality. All these require a "thus saith the Lord" in express statements, and the sacred writings have clearly defined and decided them. But in other matters that may be called circumstantial of the Gospel and of the Church of Christ, the people of God are left to their own discretion and to the facilities and exigencies of society. Many things, indeed, that are of vital importance to the well-being and prosperity of the Kingdom of Christ, are left to the law of expediency. A few examples will suffice—Next to these are meeting-houses, baptisteries, Lord's tables, the emblematic loaf and cup, times of convocation, arrangements for the days, etc., etc., Acts of parliament, decrees of synods and councils, but no apos-

tolitic enactments, statutes, or laws, are found for any of these important items. There is neither precept nor precedent in the New Testament for building, hiring, buying, or possessing a meeting-house, for erecting a baptismal basin, font, or bath; for chancel, altar, table, leavened or unleavened bread, chalice, cup, or tankard, and many other things of equal value. There is not a law, rule or precedent for the manner of eating the Lord's Supper, nothing as to the quantity of bread and wine to be used by each participant; nothing said about who shall partake first, or how it shall be conveyed from one to another. These are all discretionary matters, and left to the prudence and good sense of the Christian communities—in other words, to the law of expediency. Touching these and very many other such matters and things, nothing is enacted, prescribed, or decided by apostolic authority.

But here arises a practical and all-important question, viz: who shall ascertain and who shall interpret this law of expediency? We all agree that expedients are to be chosen with regard to times, seasons, and other circumstances. Changes in these must always change expedients. The mariner's compass, the art of printing, new modes of traveling, banks and their commercial operations, new forms of government, etc., etc., have changed the order of society and all human expedients. Now the law of expediency is the law of adopting the best present means of attaining any given end. (Bold type mine. J. H.) But this is a matter which the wisdom and good sense of individuals and communities must decide. This is not, this cannot be, a matter of standing revelation. Now if the church were always unanimous in opinion as in faith—if all its accumulated wisdom gave one uniform decision on all such questions—then the whole church is by one voice to ascertain the law of expedience on any given point. But this is not the case. No class of men, apostles, teachers, privates,

ever did agree on questions of expediency. Paul and Barnabas dissented and differed without any breach of communion, on a question of this sort. Hence arises the necessity of the spirit of concession, subordination, bearing, forbearing, submitting to one another." (The Christian System, pages 94, 95, 96.)

I adopt all that Campbell has said in his argument on the law of expediency and make it my own. His argument on expediency shows the position he would have taken on instrumental music had he been pressed to an issue on the question. My major reason for quoting Campbell is to show the reader the parallel or similarity that my arguments for instrumental music (and all aids) has with Campbell's article on the law of expediency. Campbell says: "Many things, indeed, that are of vital importance to the well-being and prosperity of the kingdom of Christ, are left to the law of expediency." I contend that instrumental music is one of these things. God did not take time to write every detail of every commandment. The Apostle John says: "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written, every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written" (Jno. 21:25). Had every aid that is helpful in carrying out the commandments been recorded in the word of God the commandments would have been covered up and engulfed until it would have been impossible to have found and understood them.

Should a father send his son to a store to buy some razor blades, matches and some soap, it would be unnecessary for the father to mention: a bicycle, a sack, a box, etc., but such matters of expediency would be left entirely to the judgment of the boy. Likewise, it is with us and our Heavenly Father in obeying his commandments.

HALL L. CALHOUN, FORMERLY ANTI-INSTRUMENT, ACCEPTED MY POSITION!

N. B. Hardeman, who is anti-instrument, quoted the following letter from Brother H. L. Calhoun, one of the greatest preachers and professors of his day, as saying: "Dear Bro. Hardeman: Replying to your letter of April 19, I would state first, I do not believe that instrumental music is authorized by the word of God as a part of his worship. Neither do I think the Greek word Psallo furnishes any argument for the use of instrumental music. Perhaps I ought to say, I think instrumental music accompanying the singing is not wrong. I think it, however, a matter of personal opinion or of preference, like the note books. Remembering with pleasure our former association and with love and best wishes, I am, very cordially yours, H. L. Calhoun." (Hardeman-Boswell Debate, page 162-163.)

This shows that Brother Calhoun made instrumental music parallel with note books and therefore had my position!

THIRD NEGATIVE PAPER

By CLIFTON INMAN

Friends, this is the last paper in which I shall be permitted to make any new arguments. The rules of debate and fair dealing do not allow me to make any in my last paper. I am well satisfied with my part in the discussion. I believe that people will be led to see the truth on this discussion if they will study carefully the things which have been written. I am confident that I have remained on the side of truth.

In the course of this paper I shall continue to use my respondent's paragraph headings and numerals, as I think that this will aid you in comparing our articles. First, let us notice my friend's heading,

"WHY THE MISREPRESENTATIONS?"

To this question I sound an echo—WHY? I further ask in his words—"Are they necessary to save your belief? If not, why make them?" This is a question which he should answer. He, not I, is guilty.

He has declared that I accused him of saying, "God will accept a thing as an aid whether He has authorized it or not." Julian, the rules of fair dealing demand that when we quote a man that we quote all of a sentence or else use some means of letting the reader know that we have not quoted it all. Above all things we are not to give it a meaning not given by its author. You did not observe this in this quotation. You had given two reasons which you claimed were the only ones which would cause God to reject a thing as an aid. To these I added another—"God will reject a thing as an aid which He has not authorized to be so used." You misrepresented the facts on this issue first by saying that I "blindly" failed

to see the words, "TO DO GOD'S WILL!" These words were not in his "principles." He also maintained that the other thing which I "thought up" would not work. Since this other thing was that God will not accept a thing as an aid which He has not authorized to be so used, I said, and do maintain, that his objection is "TANTA-MOUNT" to saying that God will accept a thing as an aid whether He has authorized it or not. Tantamount means equal to. This word is included in my original sentence.

2. He says again that I misrepresented him because I said that he assumes that God must say not to do a thing before He will condemn the doing of it. This is not a misrepresentation, but a plain statement of fact. You have asked me to produce the scripture that says, ". . . do not use the instrument." If you do not make such an inference in this question, the question is meaningless. Your first argument along this line from the devil and the "not" is also meaningless. You have made this inference even stronger in your last paper by arguing further upon the "not." If you cannot show where God has authorized the use of the instrument, it stands to reason that God does not want it used or else you don't know that He wants it used. This answers your argument upon the "not" since you have failed to show where God has authorized it. In my reference to James in my first paper I was merely showing that it is as dangerous to remove a "not" as it is to insert one. This proved all that I claimed for it.

It seems strange that my opponent would accuse me of misrepresenting him and then make other arguments which are based upon the same as-

sumption which he claims he did not make. He labored to prove that Saul was told not to do the things which he did. In this my opponent is right, but in his claim that God told Nadab and Abihu not to use strange fire my friend is greatly at fault. He claims that strange incense and strange fires are the same, and that offering strange fire and offering strange incense are the same act. This just "ain't" so. He could not prove this were he to live a thousand years. The Jews had to make a liquid out of stacte, onycha, galbanum and frankincense. (Ex. 30:34.) Under this liquid they were to make a fire. For the building of this fire they were to get fire from the altar of burnt offering. When they heated this mixture it gave off a sweet smelling odor. The statement to which my opponent referred to in Ex. 30, condemns the use of other mixtures and not other fire. In his discussion with me at Pikeville he even went so far as to say that the incense was the lamb, bull, etc., offered upon the altar of burnt offering and that these were also called fire. People get into some awful predicaments when they try to prove false ideas.

Along with these other things which Mr. Hunt asserts that God forbade to be used, he thinks he has a scripture which proves that God said not to use anything on the Lord's table except the bread and the wine. This passage is 1 Cor. 11:20. I don't know how my respondent ever learned that this passage mentions other things than the bread and the wine. There is not the least shadow of a hint that they are even intimated. The reason the Corinthians were not taking the Lord's supper and the reason for Paul's rebuke is explained in the following verse and in the course of the remainder of that chapter. They would not wait for one another. They had factions in the church. One faction would take the Lord's supper before the other. Some would partake to excess. The 27th verse says, "Wherefore whosoever

shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." This shows that the things they were taking were the bread and the wine. In the 33rd verse we read, "Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another." He did not tell them to leave off some of the things which they were using. He condemns them for the quantity which they used and for not waiting for one another. The way for them to partake of the supper worthily was to discern the Lord's body and blood.

Julian quotes my statement that "All those organizations: colleges, seminaries, etc., mentioned by my opponent are backed by what he pleased to term the modernist wing." He then says that I say they are modernistic. I said no such thing. Your statement and mine just do not agree. They do not carry the same idea. They are supported (or backed) by the modernist wing. I don't know whether there are modernists in the personnel of the faculty or trustees, but money is solicited for their maintenance from the churches which are modernistic. Remember that I did not say and have not said that any of those in these organizations proper are modernistic.

I did not try to infer that my opponent is anti-radio or anti-communion set. He tried to use the arguments of those who are to prove that I am not a member of the Church of Christ but of the Christian church. If he does not accept their position, his argument is worthless and he should not use it. He should either accept it or reject it. I wanted the readers to see that he was merely throwing up a smoke screen. He refuses to accept the anti-radio and anti-communion set position and shows thereby that all his argument on that score is worthless. In his discussion with me at Pikeville, he had a whole chart showing how the radio fails to do what the Bible demands of us in the command to go and

preach the Gospel. I completely exposed his chart. He then came to the platform and said that he does not oppose the radio. I know that he doesn't and would not infer that he does, but it does seem that he would not make some of the arguments which he makes if he doesn't oppose it.

He contends that I said that Paul used the reasoning found in Rom. 14:23 against the instrument. Some one else is misrepresenting here as elsewhere. Julian said that my reasoning was the poorest and weakest that could be offered in support of "an argument." This means any argument if I am any judge of the meaning of language. Paul used this reasoning, so I reassert that he has accused Paul. Maybe he didn't mean what he said though. He has now tried to get around the force of my argument here by saying that if my reasoning is right, it is all right to use the instrument if there are no weak brethren around. This statement is not sound, however. Paul said in the first verse of the chapter to receive the weak. If my opponent and his cohorts follow this admonition they will receive us. (I do not admit that we are weak. I am merely showing that my opponent's arguments will not work even if we were admitted to be weak.) Accepting us they cannot use the instrument, according to his own argument. Paul said that if eating meats would cause his brother to offend he would eat no more meats so long as the world stands. My friend says, "I will challenge them till the last one is out of Sandy Valley." Quite a contrast don't you think? Now we would appreciate very much being indoctrinated. Some big men have been rounded up in the past to indoctrinate us. Some have given up the job and have decided that it is wrong to try. Others are now strong preachers contending for the same things as do I. Among this number are C. C. Morgan, Floyd A. Decker, Joe H. Morris, D. H. Hadwin and a host of others.

"A FEW OTHER THINGS"

1. It is surely not my fault that my respondent does not remember what he has said sufficiently to keep him from having to refer to his previous articles. His having to do this does not prove my style of debating to be at fault. It seems to me that it must be his memory.

My argument on Nadab and Abihu do answer my opponent's argument from Rom. 12:1. It shows that there is a class of aids which can be used and a class which cannot be used. I showed from my second affirmative, rebuttal argument that the instrument belongs to the latter class.

2. Before my friend's principle "an individual has authority to use anything that aids him to do God's will provided the aid is not wrong within itself," can be lawfully used to support the use of the instrument, it must be proved that all singing is doing God's will. My opponent is trying to assume this point. It is the whole point at issue.

3. He says that I have offered no proof that the instrument hinders some when aiding others. I did prove this. I showed that those who are less adept in music cannot follow the instrument. This fact is evidenced by the use of trained choirs to do the singing for many of the congregations which use the instrument. I also quoted Wagner and Rom. 14:23 to prove this point. For the benefit of the readers I submit another quotation. This quotation is from a letter of 1912 written by Per M. Krantz of the Conservatory of Music of Dresden, Germany, to A. R. Kepple. It reads, "We cannot possibly advise the use of instruments in connection with voice culture, for they are always a detriment, and create a state of dependency." Notice that he does not say the detriment is that they create a state of dependency but he says "and they create a state of dependency."

5. All references to Roy Hall are foreign to this discussion and should

not be included here. I was not at Hardy, as Julian says. Neither was I at Valley Forge with Washington but I know something of what happened there. I was not at Hardy but I know something of what happened there. Several men of proven honesty and integrity have informed me of the happenings there. Two of Julian's blood brothers have come to the Church of Christ since that discussion and one of them informs me that he has a high regard for Roy.

6. The proposition which Mr. Hunt has submitted on the "one-man-preacher-pastor system" is unfair. It does not touch the real issue. I could affirm with the apostle Paul that there were fornicators in the church which he had established at Corinth. My friend has accused me of being a "one-man-preacher-pastor." This accusation and part of a private conversation which I have had with him lead me to believe that he has a false conception of what constitutes a "one-man-preacher-pastor." I submit the following proposition which I think clearly represents us both: "Resolved: that a preacher may not scripturally labor full time over a space of months with a congregation which has scripturally ordained elders." (Will he affirm?)

His second proposition I will affirm.

7. I am glad to bring some news to my opponent. He says that my statement that there are people in the church who are not Christians in the strict sense of the word is such to him. He further contends that this is Baptist doctrine. If the Baptists teach this, it is one time that they teach the truth and I cannot help it. I have never and shall never refuse to teach a thing just because the Baptist teach it. The question uppermost in my mind is not whether the Baptist teach it, but "Does the Bible teach it." The Bible does in this case and it does not mean "once in grace; always in grace." It means the very opposite. A Christian is a follower of Christ. A member of the church is one who

has believed the Gospel, repented of his sins, confessed that Jesus is the Christ and has then been scripturally baptized. One may do all of this and then later fail to follow Christ in all things. Simon the sorcerer is an example. The church and the kingdom are the same institution. Matt. 13:41 shows that some will be gathered out of the kingdom and burned at the judgment. They cannot be gathered out unless they are in. If these are Christians, then some Christians will be burned. My opponent may choose either horn of this dilemma that may please him.

He misrepresents me by saying that I said that Christ belong to the church. This is not what I said. I said that the church is composed of Christians and Christ. Christ is said to be head of the church, Eph. 1:23. He is the king of the kingdom, Acts 2:30; and He is the foundation of the Church, 1 Cor. 3:11. It takes a king to make a kingdom. It takes a head to make a complete body and it takes a foundation to make a complete house, so we see that under any of these figures by which the church is represented in the Bible that Christ is a part of the church.

8. If Hunt wants the consolation of thinking that he has me cornered because I am standing toward the middle of the room holding him securely in front of me in the corner, he may have it. I shall not begrudge him that pleasure. He continues to assert that I have argued that the instrument cannot aid. I challenge him to produce the statement from my paper which so says. I have showed that it may, but have maintained that it has a small possibility for so doing. I have never contended that it does not aid at all. I will further aver that it does not aid as a whole. It may aid an individual, but it does not aid all individuals. It hinders some. For this reason, it hinders the singing as a whole. My friend would do better were he to come back from chasing the pups and pigs and debate the issue.

"HE FINALLY ACCEPTED ONE OF THE FOUR PRONGS"

There was no finally to it. In the very outset of my first paper I said, "The exact point of controversy is not whether instruments can aid, but whether songs sung to the accompaniment of instruments of music are acceptable praise to God." You see that I was not forced to take this position as my opponent would have you believe, but I emphasized it at the beginning. As a matter of fact I insisted (and had to insist) that this be included in the proposition. "The four prongs" do not get at the real issue before us for they fail to take any consideration of the word "acceptable." In this immediate discussion I am under no special obligation to offer a principle which the use of the instrument violates. My opponent insisted that we have an extra proposition to take care of that. Regardless of this, I have given two principles in affirmative arguments which the use of it violates. My friend is very anxious to get to the next proposition. When we get to it he may not be so anxious.

"A REPLY TO INMAN'S SECOND COUNTER ARGUMENT"

Suppose the fruit of the lips mentioned in Heb. 13:15; does not refer to singing. There are other passages, plainly showing that vocal music is the kind authorized by the New Testament. Heb. 13:15 may refer to prayer and preaching, but it certainly includes singing.

Julian offers a very poor sophism on religious journalism. He shows that an elder must teach, and then says, "We learn by scriptural example that they taught by the oral method only." Peter was one elder who taught by the written method. (1 Pet. 5:1) This argument is found further to have no force when we realize that those who edit and write for the papers are not elders. (Very few are) Julian, did you ever read the twenty seven books of the New Testament. These are not oral.

His argument on the log cart, the hammer handle and axe handle is not parallel to his argument for the use of the instrument. These things did not go into the structure of the ark. We may use a bell to signify the time of assembly for worship. We could even use a bugle. These would be parallel with the things mentioned above, for they would not be in the worship service just as these would not have been in the ark. If we bring the bell and bugle into the worship service we have another thing. If Noah had used hickory pegs to hold planks or logs in place or beech beams to brace the structure or oak mangers in which to feed the animals, he would have then violated God's commandment. These would have then been in the ark. The instrument is in and a part of the worship service as practiced by its users.

He tried to evade my argument upon the boy and the candy, by saying that going back home was no part of buying the required articles. No one said that it was. The father's command was to go and get the articles. Taking them home was part of the command. It took energy to perform this act. It also takes energy to buy a thing.

He says that the father's objection was to the expense and not to the addition. He added that if someone had given the boy the candy there would have been no objection. Julian, does someone give you and the other users of the instruments all of those instruments which you use? You know they do not. They are bought with money that could be much better expended in preaching the Gospel to some dying soul or in feeding and clothing someone who has not enough of this world's goods to do this for himself.

Let us hear another statement from my opponent: "To give the boy a commandment and deny him the necessary aids in carrying out that commandment would have been inconsistent." Who said that the candy was

an essential? The implication in this statement is that the instrument is a necessary aid. I have not known of anyone who is so irrational as to so maintain. If it is essential, the apostles and early christians got along without an essential, for the instrument was not used for at least six centuries after Christ in any service which claimed to be a christian one. This fact, Mr. Hunt cannot get around.

"THE AUTHORITY FOR USING INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC AS AN AID"

Julian says that he has no doubt that all who read this debate will agree that he has established the first part of his proposition—".... instrumental music aids an individual to sing." Friends, I wish to call your attention to the fact this is not the first part or any part of his proposition. The first part of the proposition is that a mechanical instrument of music aids an individual to sing acceptable praise unto God. He has continually ignored this word, "acceptable." He mentions it sometimes but, like the man and the mirror, he straightway forgets it.

"AIDS ARE JUSTIFIED OR AUTHORIZED BY THE LAW OF INCLUSION AND ARE REJECTED BY THE LAW OF EXCLUSION"

No one could question this statement. The question is to determine what this law is. My opponent thinks he has stated it in the following words: "ANY LAW OR PRECEPT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, WHETHER IT BE A COMMANDMENT, ORDINANCE, ITEM OF WORSHIP OR WORK, PERMITS AN INDIVIDUAL TO AID HIMSELF BY THE USE OF ANY OR ALL AIDS IN EXERCISING THE WILL OF GOD AS LONG AS THE AIDS DO NOT CHANGE THE LAW OR PRECEPT, OR DO NOT USURP AUTHORITY OVER THEM, PROVIDED THE AIDS ARE NOT WRONG WITHIN THEMSELVES." This is very little more than a restatement of the caption given above. The whole question

under discussion is whether singing to the accompaniment of an instrument is doing God's will. This principle given by my opponent assumes that it is, or rather assumes that all singing is doing God's will. It just takes us around in a circle and gets us nowhere. We need some additional principle to tell us what God's will is regarding the proposition under discussion.

My opponent now claims that the instrument does not change singing. If this be true, he has given up his argument that it aids. Does it make the singing better? If it does not, it does not aid. I am very much persuaded that it changes the singing—taking every thing into consideration, it changes it for the worse. The reasoning about going to Cincinnati used by my respondent is not parallel. Going from here to Cincinnati, one may go by way of Huntington, W. Va. and contend that he did so because he could get some cheap gasoline at Huntington which would aid him to go to Cincinnati and make the trip cheaper. All could readily see, however, that his aid was a superficial one. He could have saved money and time were he to have omitted the detour. We would surmise that he had some other reason for wanting to go to Huntington and merely used this as an excuse. That is what the users of the instrument have done. People began to use it. They were asked for their authority. They offered many excuses and finally one hit upon the idea it was an aid. That has been the excuse ever since. The use of it during the communion service, the prayer, the preaching and the prevalence of instrumental solos, duets and other special arrangements manifested in many congregations which use it show this charge to be true.

My friends ask why we have the instruments in the homes. We may have many things in our homes which we cannot use in the worship service. As for singing religious songs to the accompaniment of instruments in the

home, I am sure that it is wrong. Singing is either worship or entertainment. If it be worship we should not use the instrument. If it is entertainment some other type of song should be used. Songs which praise God should not be reduced to the level of entertainment. If we use them for this purpose, we take the name of the Lord in vain.

IS THE PRINCIPLE MAN MADE AUTHORITY?

J. N. Cowan, Daniel Somner and Alexander Campbell certainly are better able to interpret their own principles than any one else. Neither of them believed or believes that the use of the instrument is authorized. As for Briney's principle—I can readily accept it and know that it will not authorize the instrument's use. The means of carrying out the command to sing is specified in the Bible. The instruments by which it is accompanied are said to be the understanding, the spirit, and the heart. (1 Cor. 14:15; Eph. 5:19).

I should like for my opponent to quote his authority for saying that Campbell had a personal dislike for music of any kind. Campbell said concerning the Lord's day, "From the Acts of Apostles and from their Epistles, we clearly learn that the first Christians consecrated this day to the Lord in all their communities by . . . songs of praise and hymns triumphant." (Mil. Harb. Abridged, V. 2, p.153) Does this sound as if he had a dislike for music of any kind. Mr. Hunt says that Campbell was never pressed to an issue or he would have taken the same stand as he takes. Campbell was pressed to an issue. He was referring to the religious world around about him when he said that the instrument in the worship service is like a cowbell in a concert. Some may wonder how Campbell knew anything about a concert when he disliked music of any kind. My opponent will answer that for you.

Calhoun's making the instrument parallel with the note books does not prove it to be such. He later realized

this. He left the church of Christ for a while and went with those who use the instrument. Later he returned, however, and spent his last days preaching in the church of Christ. He labored with the Central church of Christ of Nashville, Tenn. until his death. Many have heard him preach often over radio station WLAC.

A RECAPITULATION

I have called the attention of the readers to the fact that this is the last paper in which I have a chance to make any new arguments, for that reason I wish to give now a recapitulation of the discussion thus far that you may get a mental panoramic view of the whole. I shall conclude with another rebuttal argument if space permits.

1. In the beginning my opponent tried to place me in the affirmative by telling what he thought my job was. He contended that I must meet his arguments and give some rebuttal arguments in return. This I have done to the satisfaction, I am sure, of all the readers and to the chagrin of my opponent.

In speaking of what my affirmative stand should be he offered "four prongs" which failed to get at the real issue. They took no cognizance of the word, "acceptable" upon which the whole proposition depends. When I showed his error in confusing organic and spiritual perfection, he tried to accuse me of getting off the subject. I merely followed where he led and he didn't like the way I showed up his error.

2. He next tried to give us the only two things that would cause God to reject a thing as an aid. I showed that these would not work by using the case of Saul and of Nadab and Abihu. All I tried to prove by these references was that his contention, that God would accept anything as an aid which is not wrong within itself provided it really aids, is not true. These illustrations clearly prove this. That is all I claimed for them. He has

since tried to dodge the force of this argument by trying to prove that God told them not to do the things which they did. Had God told them not to do these things, it would not have changed the truth of the thing which I was proving; i. e., that God does not accept a thing as an aid merely because it is not wrong within itself. However, he has not shown and cannot show that God ever told Nadab and Abihu not to offer strange fire. My opponent first declared that their case is not parallel with the use of the instrument because it was substitution and the instrument is not. I asked him if it would have been acceptable had they used both the fire from the altar and the strange fire that they might make a bigger and more ready fire. He tried to dodge this question by saying that fire and incense are the same. I have showed the utter falsity of such an idea.

3. I offered in addition (or rather in the place of) his two supposed reasons why God will not accept a thing as an aid another principle. My opponent declared that it would not work. I showed that if it would not work, we may use a thing as an aid whether it is authorized or not. He then accused me of misrepresenting him, but we all know now who has done the misrepresenting. My friend's effort to change what I said has lost all its force.

4. Since I showed up his arguments so completely upon these supposed principles, he has "taken his flight" to another principle, which indeed is not another but a rehashing of these. I have showed that if his new principle be true, his position is not bettered, for it leaves the whole question still to be settled. His effort to show that Campbell, Calhoun and others stand with him on his principle I have also exposed. They, with the exception of Calhoun who later changed his views, and Briney certainly did not use their ideas concerning expediencies to justify the use of instrumental music, but to the contrary, contended against such an idea.

5. In telling why he takes the position that instruments aid, my opponent referred to several passages in the Old Testament. From these he tried to prove that instruments were first made for this purpose and that God commanded them to be made for this purpose. Because I showed this contention to be false, he accused me of arguing both ways at the same time. When I showed the unfair way in which he had dealt with my statements on this score, he resorted to the use of the story of the pig and the pup. This use of stale humor did not relieve him of the full force of his failure.

6. In further support of his claim that the instrument aids, he used the fact that there is a piano in the chapel room of Freed-Hardeman College. I called his contention here in question because his argument left the wrong impression with the reader. It would lead them to think that this instrument was used in the chapel exercises to accompany religious songs. I showed his wrong impression. He again tried to dodge the force of my reasoning by charging that I was trying to argue both ways at the same time. The reason I called him in question here and also on his use of the Old Testament scriptures is that he was trying to build false premises.

8. As another evidence that the instrument aids and is acceptable in the christian worship service, he used 1 Cor. 14:7-8. I have proved that I can use an old hen to aid in the worship service and justify it by the reasoning which he used on this passage. He made an effort to patch up his argument, but when I made my answer a little more forceful he left it alone.

9. Another argument he made was based upon the superiority of numbers of those who use the instrument. I pointed out that numbers do not count. I also asked for the quotation from the census bureau. He failed to give it and tried to hide his failure by accusing me of bringing up the

church question. The record shows that he is the guilty party. He also broached this subject in the very outset in his definition of terms. He made a big gusto of wanting to take me on on the church question. I gave him such a dose in my last paper though that he has not seen fit to say much more about it.

10. He used a final argument to prove that the instrument aids based on "common sense and experience." If he had been right on this score it would not have been pertinent to the issue. However, I showed that his reasoning here was not sound. Every thing which people claim will aid them does not so do. To prove this I made an argument from glasses and whiskey which he has not even attempted to answer. He quoted not one man to prove his argument here and then accused me of not quoting anyone to prove that the instrument sometimes hinders.

11. All through the discussion he has tried to bring in the radio, collection basket, etc. This is to make you readers think that I am afraid to notice these. I have paid them little attention, for the reason that we have another proposition which covers them. If we spend all the time and space in this discussion debating about them, the next discussion is needless. Just stay with us and I will show you that I am not afraid to meet his arguments on them.

12. Another argument of my opponent is that one can not sing without an instrument near unless he has had previous instrumental training. I showed this to be false. When I did so, Julian cited Frederic J. Has-kin as proof. I have showed plainly that he misused this man's statement. He now contends that the instrument was in existence before singing and that its so being proves that one cannot sing without former instrumental training. Folks, if you can see any connection, you can certainly beat me. Job 38 tells us that in the creation the morning stars sang for joy.

This singing was before the making of the musical instruments.

13. He quoted Ezekiel to prove that the instrument was made by Jehovah in the beginning. I showed that this passage does not refer to the beginning of time, but to the creation of the country of Tyrus. He has had nothing further to say concerning this passage.

14. He had maintained that the instrument produces some of the pre-requisites of singing. I have asked him to name one. He has failed to do so.

15. He tried to accuse those who refuse to use the instrument of sowing division. In doing this he used the parable of the gnat and the camel and Jesus' condemnation of the Pharisees for neglecting the weightier matters of the law. I turned these passages against him with such telling effect that he failed to give them further notice.

16. He submitted four questions to me. These I answered and he has had no further use for them.

17. He claimed that instruments were not used in Old Testament times for the purpose of praising. He first tried to prove this by saying that "you" is the subject in Psalms 150:3. I showed that the instruments were the means used by the "you" to do the praising. He then said that the singers praised by singing and therefore did not praise by playing. In this he presupposed that an individual may use only one means of praising. I have exposed this argument and he has had nothing else to say.

18. I asked him if the organs of the body used in singing are less perfect than those used in playing the instrument. I asked him this question because he had inferred that one must be perfect before he can sing without the aid of an instrument. He replied to this question that that which is less perfect may aid

that which is more perfect. He then mentioned the lion and the mouse. I pointed out that the mouse is just as perfect as the lion and also that an aid must be more perfectly suited to aid another thing to perform the act to be aided than that thing is in doing that act without such help. He left this argument entirely alone.

19. He has called my argument from Rom. 14:23 a vile wrestling of

the scriptures and said that I gave the passage a meaning which Paul never intended. I am still waiting for him to tell us Paul's meaning.

20. He has accused me of being a "one-man-preacher-pastor." I have showed that my practice is scriptural. He did not notice my argument.

21. He has accused me of misrepresenting him. I have proved him to be the guilty one.

LAST AFFIRMATIVE PAPER

By JULIAN OLYN HUNT

I shall refute the statements of Brother Inman by following the order of his arrangement.

First, he says: "I am well satisfied with my part in the discussion." This reminds me of a story of two Irishmen who saw a turtle with its head cut off, yet the turtle was walking. Said one, "That turtle is dead!" "No, it isn't," said the other, "he is still walking!" Replied the first one, "He is dead, but doesn't know it!"

At the beginning of each paper he has deemed it necessary to inform the reader of his sincerity in what he is arguing. Perhaps, this is necessary since the reader will wonder how he can contend for everything else in the world and then condemn the instrument. When he uses dozens of aids not mentioned in the Bible. Plus this, boldly declares: "AIDS DO NOT HAVE TO BE SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT TO BE AUTHORIZED!" I CHALLENGE HIM TO PRODUCE THE STATEMENT FROM MY PAPER THAT SAYS THE INSTRUMENT CANNOT AID!" "THE INSTRUMENT IS NOT AUTHORIZED!" "BE SATISFIED WITH THE WISDOM AND TESTIMONY OF GOD!" All this looks suspicious; does it not?

"WHY THE MISREPRESENTATIONS?"

He says: "He, not I, is guilty." Then failed to show wherein I misrepresented him. He knows he misrepresented me when he accused me of saying: "God will accept a thing as an aid whether he has authorized it or not." Why should I prove the instrument is authorized if that is true? I said that, "AN INDIVIDUAL HAS THE RIGHT TO USE ANYTHING THAT AIDS HIM TO DO GOD'S

WILL, PROVIDED THE AID IS NOT WRONG WITH ITSELF." He said: "I will submit and prove another one: "God will reject a thing as an aid that He does not authorize to be so used." To this I agreed, and replied: This "other thing" will not work for him. Contending that his "other thing" was the "same thing" as my principle, hence was not "another thing" but the "same thing" and therefore, it failed to work (meaning for him). Inman saw this for he said: "He will maintain, of course, that God authorizes all aids which do not violate the rules which he has given." This I do contend! Why then did you throw up a smoke screen and say: "His objection is "TANTAMOUNT" to saying that God will accept a thing as an aid whether he has authorized it or not?" You knew better!

Again you misrepresented me when you said I assumed: "That God must say not to do a thing before he will condemn the doing of it." You know I have better sense than that. If that principle be true one could ride a billy goat or sprinkle babies, etc., in the worship service because God has said nothing against it. The fact I asked you to produce a statement which says: "Thou shalt not use the instrument," is not identical with the above charge when put with its context. You took my statement out of its setting and made the charge. I simply asked you to produce a statement where God said "NOT" to use the instrument, SINCE God used a "NOT" against the action of Nadab and Abihu (Ex. 30:9); a "NOT" against Saul and the cattle (1 Sam. 15:3); a "NOT" against strawberries on the Lord's table (1 Cor. 11:20). God said: "THOU SHALT NOT DO

THESE THINGS!" But not a word did God utter against the instrument—Your stories, Brother Inman, are not parallels!

This forever defeats you in this debate because these three stories are the only objections you have submitted which would in any way touch the issues for which I have contended. Not one of these stories will hold water against my principle. THE INSTRUMENT IS AUTHORIZED, THEREFORE THERE IS NOT ANY "NOT" ENJOINED AGAINST ITS USE!

I did not say that offering strange fire and offering strange incense were the same. I said they refer to the same act. And they do! The priests were commanded to use perfume stacte, onycha, galbanum, and pure frankincense for incense. All incense which were not made of these ingredients were forbidden in Exodus 30:9, and were known as "strange incense." While on the other hand, they were commanded to get fire off the altar with which to heat the incense. Fire obtained elsewhere than from the altar was called "strange fire." But it took the "incense" plus the "fire" to make an offering, hence, offering incense and offering fire refer to one and the same act—that of "making an offering" unto God. Therefore, when God added a "NOT"

in Exodus 30:9, against "strange incense" the same "NOT" was added against "strange fire" since the incense and fire were connected with the same act—that of making an offering unto God. You cannot get around that "NOT" which God enjoined against your Nadab and Abihu story if you were to live a thousand years, Mr. Inman! It is there to stay! Your meager efforts to remove it, plus making that story parallel to instrumental music has been a miserable failure!

Besides this, if God had not added a "NOT" against offering strange fire—it is beyond me why Brother Inman keeps on using this story. Do you not know that the reader can see that Nadab and Abihu were **SUBSTITUTING FIRE** known as "strange fire" for "the fire on the altar" which God commanded them to use? Before you have a parallel to the instrument you will have to prove that **WE SUBSTITUTE INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC FOR SINGING. THIS WE DO NOT DO!** Plus this, show the "NOT" against the instrument; plus this, prove that the strange fire was used as an aid.

A man deaf, dumb and blind ought to see the difference in the use of instrumental music and the use of strange fire offered by Nadab and Abihu. Note the following diagram:

Strange Fire Offered By Nadab and Abihu VS. Use of Instrumental Music

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| 1. God added a "NO" against it Ex. 30:9. | 1. God did not add a "NO" Eph. 5:19. |
| 2. Strange fire was a substitute. | 2. Instrument not a substitute. |
| 3. Did not use strange fire as an aid, but as an act of worship. | 3. Instrument an aid, not an act of worship. |

Now, do you see the difference? Is your story parallel to the use of the instrument? No, a thousand times NO! Then to cap it all, he says: "My argument on Nadab and Abihu shows that there is a class of aids which can be used and a class which cannot be used." Then he says: "This is all I claim for it." Holy horrors! Why

bring that story up if this is all the use you had for it? Did I not say in the very off-set of my first paper that there were aids that God accepted and aids he rejected? Your "strange fire story" proved nothing! Because we were already agreed upon what you claim for your argument.

He accused me of saying in our oral debate that a lamb, bull, etc., were offered upon the altar by Nadab and Abihu. I said no such thing sir! I was simply illustrating to show the various ways which strange fire could be produced. I said, if God commanded a lamb to be offered and a pig was offered instead, it would be strange fire. You denied in your last paper that a lamb and bull when offered were called fire. Please read Exodus 29:15-18; 22-25; 39-41; also Ex. 30:20. In your own words: "People get into some awful predicaments when they try to prove false ideas."

Next, he denied that the Corinthian Church was using foods other than the bread and wine in connection with the Lord's Supper as recorded in 1 Corinthians 11:20-34. He says: "There is not the least shadow of a hint that they are even intimidated." This certainly ought to create sympathy for him. Adam Clark's Commentary says: "The teachers which had crept into the Corinthian Church appear to have perverted the whole of the Divine institution; for the celebration of the Lord's Supper appears to have been made among them a part of an ordinary meal.—At the conclusion of this irregular meal they appear to have done something in reference to our Lord's institution, but more resembling the Jewish passover." Again he says: "They did not come together to eat the Lord's Supper **EXCLUSIVELY**, which they should have done and not have made it a part of an ordinary meal.—They should have taken their ordinary meal at home, and have come together in the church to celebrate the Lord's Supper." His comments on verse 33, "When ye come together to eat the Lord's Supper, tarry one for another—do not eat and drink in parties as ye have done heretofore; and **DO NOT CONNECT IT WITH ANY OTHER MEAL.**"

What do you think of this Brother Inman? Adam Cark, one of the greatest Commentators who ever lived, said that God added a "NOT"—"DO

NOT CONNECT IT WITH ANY OTHER MEAL!" In other words, "DO NOT ADD STRAWBERRIES TO THE UNLEAVENED BREAD IN THE LORD'S SUPPER!" Now Mr. Inman are you going to walk over top and blindly ignore Almighty God's condemnation of your strawberries on the Lord's table? Are you? Answer me!

Jamieson's-Fausset's Brown's Commentary says: "The love feasts usually preceded the Lord's Supper (as eating the passover came before the Lord's Supper at the first institution of the latter)." Their comment on verse 29, upon, "not discerning" is: "not duly judging; not distinguishing in judgment from common foods, the sacramental pledges of the Lord's body."

Bengel says: "Therefore, you Corinthians ought to separate common meals from the Lord's Supper." Now, Brother Inman is your strawberry story parallel to the instrument? Where has Almighty God come out in bold words and said: "When ye come together, do **"NOT"** use the instrument?" But when the Corinthians added other foods he did say: "When ye come together this is **"NOT"** to eat the Lord's Supper" (1 Cor. 11:20). So your strawberry story has completely passed from you, but since I consider this the best thing you have offered I proceed further with the following:

STRAWBERRIES IN THE LORD'S SUPPER VS. MY PRINCIPLE

The principle: "An individual has authority to use anything that aids him to do God's will, provided the aid he uses is not wrong within itself."

I used this principle from a chart during our oral debate, yet Brother Inman says "TO DO GOD'S WILL" was not in it. His memory is bad. He offers an argument which appears to him to be a refutation of this principle. He says: "The taste of unleavened bread is repulsive to some. I have seen those who would not take

it for that reason. Would it be all right to add some strawberries to this bread to make it more palatable to them and thereby aid them in taking it?" He reasons: (1) Taking the Lord's Supper is doing God's will; (2) If we put strawberries on the unleavened bread it would aid it to taste better; and (3) Strawberries are not wrong within themselves. Therefore, according to my principle (thinks he) he can add strawberries to the Lord's Supper. While Brother Inman seemed unable to make his "strawberry argument" as clearly as I have now stated it; it is nevertheless, what he is trying to say.

On the surface this argument looks very well, but when we draw the line between truth and error, it stands over on the left with the goats condemned. It is not parallel with using instrumental music as an aid in singing. There are several differences. Putting strawberries on the bread changes the supper, while using instrumental music as an aid does not change singing. Herein, my friends, is a big difference. Note the proof: Brother Inman says: "Strawberries would make the bread more palatable." Palatable means: "agreeable to taste." Hence, strawberries would change the taste of the unleavened bread to "a more agreeable taste." The unleavened bread would now be leavened. Webster says leavened means: "An admixture or element that modifies or tempers the whole." Hence, strawberries would "modify or temper" the Lord's Supper. The mixture (of strawberries with the unleavened bread) would make the Lord's Supper a regular meal.

The fact it **CHANGES THE LOAF** is definite proof it cannot aid one to take the loaf. Brother Inman's illustration of the strawberries has involved a principle which he cannot get around. It is this: "A THING CANNOT AID ONE TO DO SOMETHING AND CHANGE THE THING THAT IS BEING DONE ALL AT THE SAME TIME." (Brother Inman, however, argued that unless the in-

strument changed singing it could not aid, but the opposite is the truth. The instrument aids the individual to sing. In order for it to change singing—singing would have to be in existence and the instrument would have to change the words and tune of a song. The individual (not the instrument) changes singing for the better or worse). Now to illustrate the principle: An automobile could aid an individual to go to Cincinnati, but could not aid him to go to Cincinnati and change him from going at the same time. (Going to Huntington for cheap gasoline was a poor excuse in reply to my illustration on going to Cincinnati). It could not aid one to go to Cincinnati and change him over on the route to New York City at the same time. That would be impossible! Likewise, strawberries cannot aid one to take unleavened bread and change it from being unleavened bread at the same time. It cannot be done! Strawberries cannot aid the taste of unleavened bread because the moment you add strawberries it no longer tastes like unleavened bread, but tastes like strawberries. Hence, you have strawberries aiding the taste of strawberries, or else, you do not have it aiding at all. To add strawberries to the Lord's Supper would also change it into a feast (1 Cor. 11:20-34). Hence, I file three objections to using strawberries on the bread in the Lord's Supper: (1) Strawberries change the unleavened bread, hence change the Lord's Supper; (2) They do not aid the taste of the unleavened bread, since they change it, because they cannot aid the taste of the bread and change that same bread at the same time; (3) Strawberries and all other foods in addition to the bread and cup are condemned in the Scripture 1 Corinthians 11:20-34.

Neither of these three objections made against strawberries in the Lord's Supper can be made against instrumental music when used as we sing. Now watch: (1) The instrument does not change singing as strawberries change the loaf. In

order to be parallel the instrument would have to change the words and tune of the song just as the strawberries change the taste of the unleavened bread; the instrument would have to change a religious song into a jig or worldly song just as the strawberries change the Lord's Supper into a regular feast; this of course, is not true! (2) Instrumental music aids one to sing and we have Brother Inman's admittance on this point. In his last paper he comes out boldly, seemingly with anger, and says: "He continues to assert that I argued that the instrument cannot aid. I challenge him to produce the statement from my paper which so states." (This is as good as we want Brother Inman, so why ask us to do more?) But strawberries change the Lord's Supper into a feast 1 Cor. 11:20-34, hence cannot aid and change what they aid too. Therefore, not parallel in this respect to the instrument; (3) Strawberries are condemned in the Scripture while the instrument is not, hence not parallel in this respect. Instead of the instrument being condemned it is **AUTHORIZED BY THE LAW OF INCLUSION** because it is not wrong within itself, does not change the law of God nor usurp authority over it.

Do you see the difference now, Brother Inman? Are you still satisfied with your part in this discussion? I am persuaded that you are unlike the turtle by now, because you are defeated and "you know it!" Strawberries on the Lord's Table violate every part of my principle. Now watch: (1) They do not aid; (2) It is not God's will to use them; (3) To use them in this way is wrong within itself, because Paul proves that such a feast is sinful 1 Cor. 11:20-34. Instrumental music does not violate a single part of my principle. Now don't you see that your story of Nadab and Abihu or the strawberry story either, touch my principle? How about the one on Saul and the cattle? God in speaking to Saul concerning the cattle said: "Spare them not" (1 Sam. 15:3). It

is needless for me to elaborate upon this story to show that it is not parallel, because I have previously shown that it is not, plus this, Brother Inman admitted himself that it is not parallel.

SO HIS STORIES FALL TO THE GROUND AND ARE LEFT BLEEDING AT EVERY VEIN. WHILE MY PRINCIPLE STANDS AS THE HOUSE BUILT UPON THE ROCK LAUGHING AT THE WIND BLOWING AGAINST IT. SINCE MY PRINCIPLE STANDS, MY AUTHORITY STANDS, THEREFORE I HAVE PROVED THAT INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IS AN ACCEPTABLE AID UNTO GOD, DURING CHRISTIAN WORSHIP SERVICE!

Furthermore, everything else he has said during the entire discussion falls to the earth because all other statements he made were irrelevant to my proof on authority for the instrument, hence were worthless. His stories of Nadab-Abihu, Saul-cattle and strawberries were the only arguments he offered directly against my principle, which was my authority. Therefore since all three of these stories have been "rooted up" the rest of his contentions stand as barren trees. He has nothing left worth while.

Next, he took back one misrepresentation regarding the Bible Colleges being modernistic and then made another one. I will give you to understand sir, that those colleges are not supported or backed by the modernistic wing. Cincinnati Bible Seminary is not backed by the church at all.

Next, he denied accusing me being anti-radio and communion set after offering to debate me on them in his second paper. Brother Inman handed me the charge that I should give up the instrument since some have doubts about its use. But I fed him out of his own spoon by asking him to give up the radio and communion set since his brethren (some of them) have doubts about them. The fact he re-

fuses to do so, proves he does not believe his own argument on Rom. 14:23. He charges that the instrument hinders some. Likewise, the charge can be made that the radio and communion set hinder some. "Sauce good for the goose is good for the gander." That is why I mentioned the radio and communion set. Not that I am against them, but to show the INCONSISTENCY in his doctrine and practice. I expect to use my chart on the radio in our next proposition and we will see how "completely he exposed it." I will show that every argument he can make in favor of the radio can be made in favor of the instrument and every argument he can make against the instrument can be made against the radio. His position is inconsistent and anything inconsistent cannot be the truth!

Next, he says Paul did not use Rom. 14:23 against the instrument and accused me of misrepresenting him because I charged him of so saying. Brother Inman, how in the name of common sense can you use this passage against the instrument when you boldly declare that Paul did not? Now we have your admittance that you wrested this Scripture and have given it a meaning Paul never intended! All Paul meant by it was to instruct the Church at Rome how to deal with "weak brethren" concerning eating meats offered to idols. They could eat meat everywhere there were not any weak brethren to get offended. You are forced, my brother, to permit the use of the instrument where there are no weak brethren or else give up your argument on this passage. You have made the instrument parallel to eating meats offered to idols. And too, you must admit that you are weak. But I don't think anybody will deny it! So the thing for us to do, is not to give up the instrument, but to indoctrinate you fellows until you become strong enough to use the instrument. Your mentioning Rom. 14:1, proves nothing. Why not use the third verse, "Let not him

that eateth (plays an instrument) despise him that eateth not (plays not); and let him which eateth not (plays not) judge him that eateth (plays)." This forever kills your argument on doubts. This shows that the weak brother was not to judge the strong brother who ate meats. Neither are you weak brethren supposed to judge us who play the instrument. But you do, thus commit sin because you violate this scripture. I cannot help it if your arguments fall in my favor, try to select better ones!

"A FEW OTHER THINGS!"

Our brother says his argument on Nadab and Abihu answers my argument on Rom. 12:1. He says: "It shows that there is a class of aids which can be used and a class which cannot be used." If this is what your Nadab and Abihu story actually shows it certainly shows the wrong thing and therefore misses my argument on Rom. 12:1, entirely! My argument was not to show that "all classes of aids could be used." Did I not mention the saloon, pool room, theater, etc., and state in my first paper: "There are a great many things that can aid an individual to obey God's commandments yet he dare not use these things!" My argument on Rom. 12:1 was, since God will permit one to use an ear-phone to aid his ears to hear the word, glasses to aid his eyes to read the word, false-teeth to aid in chewing the bread in the Lord's Supper, a radio to aid his mouth in preaching, shoes to aid his feet in going, that he will permit a piano to be used to aid him with his voice in singing. This argument is not to prove that all classes of aids are acceptable (which you claim your argument refutes) but that God will permit the voice to have an aid as well as the rest of the body. I am frank to admit, that I could see no connection with the story of Nadab and Abihu with my argument. Now since you have attempted to make the connection and have found it proved the wrong thing, all you have said about this story during the de-

bate has been useless, worthless and without profit.

My brother, you have contended throughout this debate that Nadab and Abihu offered strange fire as an aid. Where did you learn this? Book, chapter and verse please! They SUBSTITUTED strange fire for the fire on the altar. If you are willing to stand this argument beside mine on Rom. 12:1, and risk the cause which you represent upon this SUBSTITUTING ARGUMENT you are at liberty to do so. I know your brethren will be ashamed of such a weak argument offered against mine "On The Different Parts of the Body!" Besides this, my argument on Rom. 12:1, is sufficient to establish my proposition within itself. It proves that an instrument aids one to sing; that God will accept it; that we have authority for its use. You have not even touched this argument at any time during our oral or written debates and it is too late for you to do so now.

Next, he claimed that my principle assumed that all singing is acceptable. This is not so. Singing that is "DOING GOD'S WILL" is acceptable. Have you forgotten again that those words are in my principle? I have made several arguments on the word "ACCEPTABLE" and have never shunned this word, as my opponent accuses. MY PRINCIPLES and ARGUMENTS ON AUTHORITY WERE TO PROVE THE INSTRUMENT TO BE ACCEPTABLE.

Next he quotes an authority from Dresden, Germany to prove the instrument creates a state of dependency. This is not any argument. The song leader, song book, communion set, seats, lights, etc., create a state of dependency. Imagine Inman quoting Richard Wagner to prove that the instrument hinders. "Wagner believed that the singer should also be an actor and should adapt both song and gesture to the orchestra." (World History, P. 648, by Hutton Webster, Ph., D.). Trained choirs do not prove

that the instrument hinders the less adept anymore than trained choirs prove that a song leader hinders. Kind sir! You are charging Almighty God with commanding hindrances in the Old Testament. Remember He commanded the instrument to be used (11 Chron. 29:25). If there is something about the "less adept" that causes the instrument to be a hindrance "now" there was "then." Since when has man's mind and body changed? Or has the instrument changed? This proves the instrument does not hinder. Plus this, Psalms 108:1-3, proves the instrument does not prevent "making melody in the heart" therefore, cannot hinder the very part of an individual which praises and esteems God.

Next, his charge that two of my brothers went off anti-instrumental music is simply an untruth. I have only two brothers. My brother, Ben Hunt is minister at Bethel, Ohio and is decidedly in favor of the instrument. Homer Hunt will give any of you anti-instrument advocates a threshing any time or place conveniently arranged. He rejects the instrument as an act of worship but believes it can be used as an aid. In fact, I give him credit for most of the arguments and principles used in this debate.

Next, his proposition on the one man pastor is negative. Remove the "NOT" and I will affirm it. It does not state an issue. He does not deny that there is "a one man preacher-pastor system" set up in the churches of which he is a member. I submit: "Resolved, that the modern office known as "The Pastor" or "The Regular Minister" existing in the Churches, known as Churches of Christ, has overthrown the work of elders and evangelists and is therefore unscriptural." (I affirm).

Next, he tried to twist out of his predicament by denying that the Church of Christ is a Christian Church by getting off on the hypo-

crites and claiming they are in the church. Bro. Inman the Kingdom spoken of in Matt. 13:41, does not refer to the church, but refers to the world as a whole. Those things which "offend" and "work iniquity" do not refer to hypocrites nor backsliders in the church, but refer to the sinner world. They are tares, which Jesus said were sown by the Devil. You have the Devil in the "Kingdom of God" sowing seed. The good seed and tares were both sown in the field. The field is the world. The harvest must take place where the seed was sown. The tares were gathered out of the kingdom, hence gathered out of the field (the world) from whence they had been sown. Therefore this makes the kingdom and the world the same in this passage. This passage proves nothing more than a separating of the goats from the sheep as recorded in Matt. 25:31-46. Those in the Church are Christians. The Devil is bound and cannot get into the kingdom to harm us. We can deliberately step over into the Devil's territory, however, and sin. But Paul says: "Every sin is without the body" (1 Cor. 6:18). Your position is simply "once in grace always in grace" whitewashed. It is Baptist doctrine. Neither is the church composed of Christians plus Christ—but simply of Christians! The Baptists say John baptized Christ and this made him a member of the Church. You are with the Baptists on this and against the Scripture. Certainly there can be a kingdom without a king! There can be a house without a foundation! A body without a head! Brother Inman you do not know the position of the Church of Christ!

Next, he says the "FOUR PRONGS" do not get at the real issue, because they ignore the word "acceptable." Brother do you know which side of this debate you are on? I admit that the four prongs do not get at the real issue for my side of the debate, but they do for yours. The word "acceptable" has nothing to do with your side, but with mine.

The four prongs has nothing to do with my side, but with yours. If the four prongs have nothing to do with the issue why did you accept one of them? You say: "All can easily see which of his prongs I took." By this you admit that you did not get at the real issue. I showed that neither of the prongs you might accept would or could possibly prove my proposition to be false. You never met my arguments on these prongs. MY PROPOSITION HAS BEEN PROVED TO BE TRUE FROM MANY VIEW POINTS!

A WORD FURTHER ON INMAN'S SECOND COUNTER ARGUMENT

I showed that teaching is a specific commandment as well as singing. Therefore, if the fact that singing is a specific commandment excluded the instrument; the fact that teaching is a specific commandment excluded religious journals. He called this "sophism." He said they taught by the written method and cited the twenty-seven books of the New Testament to prove it. In other words he made the inspired written word parallel to religious journals today. The New Testament is no precedent for religious journals. It was written by God; religious journals by man. This makes something entirely different. Religious journals are used as aids to help us teach the word just as the instrument is used as an aid to help us to sing. If one is excluded by a specific commandment the other is. His argument on Heb. 13:15, falls to the ground since he is in favor of religious journals.

Next, he says if Noah had put wood other than gopher wood in the structure of the Ark it would have been wrong. To this I heartily agree. Likewise, if instrumental music is used on equality with singing I would rebel. Instrumental music is not "IN" worship as your hickory pegs and oak beams were "IN" the ark. H. Leo Boles said: "Anything that is an aid to worship or an expedient to worship cannot be said to be in the worship."

(Clubb-Boles Debate P. 26). Since Brother Inman's "hickory pegs" and "oak beams" were a part of the ark, but instrumental music not a part of worship, then he missed the point. But since the "hickory hammer handle" and "beech log cart" (that I mentioned) were not used in the structure of the ark but as aids in dragging in and working up the gopher trees; the instrument bears the same relationship to singing as they did to the ark. Therefore a specific command to use gopher wood did not exclude other wood from being used as aids; just as a specific command to sing does not exclude other music from being used as an aid.

Next, he continues to assume that the apostles did not use the instrument and that it was not used until the eighth century. There are ten scholars to one against him on this. I refer to the Clubb-Boles Debate for proof. Bro. Clubb gave scholar after scholar proving that the instrument was used during the first century. I could "flood" Inman with scholarship on this point if I desired and like Mr. Boles he could cite only a few who contend otherwise. But should I do so, it would contribute nothing to this discussion on aids. Was the radio, communion set, tuning fork, etc., used before the eighth century? The tuning fork was invented in 1711. (European Musical Instruments, By Galpin, P. 48). If Brother Inman were to invent the first musical instrument tomorrow and hand it to me the next day, I would have authority for using it as an aid to help me sing if it were not wrong within itself, did not change a law of God nor usurp authority over one. The early Christians knew about instrumental music for it is mentioned forty-four times in the New Testament (See Matt. 9:23; 24:31; Lk. 15:25; 1 Cor. 14:7, 8:15:52; 1 Thes. 4:16; Rev. 1:10; 4:1; 5:8; 8:1-2, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13 9:1, 13, 14; 11:15; 14:2; 15:1-7; 18:22). This array of evidence proves that Christians knew something of instrumental music before the eighth century. Should he

bring the charge that it was not used during the worship service: I ask, "Was it necessary for the Apostles to take time to mention every aid they used during the worship service?" His argument that the instrument was not used until the eighth century is erroneous, plus being off the subject.

Next, he contends that the first part of my proposition was not to prove that the instrument aids. It was too! He kept trying to deny that it aided and it was therefore necessary for me to prove that it aided. He was first a pig then a pup on this point. **"AIDS ARE JUSTIFIED OR AUTHORIZED BY THE LAW OF INCLUSION AND ARE REJECTED BY THE LAW OF EXCLUSION."** To this he says: "No one could question this statement." But he denied this during our oral debate. Plus this, he said the law of inclusion was not the same law as necessary inference. To this I agreed. Your brethren will see how you have taken "back water" when they read this.

Next, we have the principle which states the law of inclusion and exclusion: **"ANY LAW OR PRECEPT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, WHETHER IT BE A COMMANDMENT, ORDINANCE, ACT OF WORSHIP OR WORK, PERMITS AN INDIVIDUAL TO AID HIMSELF BY THE USE OF ANY OR ALL AIDS IN EXERCISING THE WILL OF GOD AS LONG AS THE AIDS DO NOT CHANGE THE LAW OR PRECEPT, OR DO NOT USURP AUTHORITY OVER IT, PROVIDED THE AIDS ARE NOT WRONG WITHIN THEMSELVES."**

In an oral debate, Roy Hall said this principle was as sound as new money and laboured to show that the use of the instrument violated it. But Brother Inman had my reasoning before his eyes which proved beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the instrument does not violate this prin-

ciple; so he meagerly and softly says in a low tone, "this principle is not true." He claimed we needed an additional principle. He handled this principle as if he were afraid someone might notice what he said.

My principle does not assume "that singing to the accompaniment of an instrument is doing God's will," as he charges. **IT DETERMINES WHAT GOD'S WILL IS CONCERNING SINGING WHILE USING AN INSTRUMENT!** It also determines what God's will is concerning preaching and using a radio; giving and using a collection basket, etc. It determines what God's will is concerning the use of any aids. At least, it is designed for that purpose. His contention that we need "an addition" or "another thing" to my principle has lost its force and left him begging the question. I contend: (1) a thing not wrong within itself; (2) a thing that aids us; (3) to do God's will, is authorized by Almighty God. The instrument does all of this. I put this principle in another form and said: (1) Anything which does not change God's law (2) nor usurps authority over it; (3) is not wrong within itself, is authorized by God. The use of the instrument harmonizes with this too.

Brother Inman said I will submit and prove another prong to that principle. He said: "God will reject a thing as an aid that he does not authorize to be used." But I am bound to say, with all respect to Brother Inman, to offer what he called his "other thing" is simply idiotic! Why Brother Inman the "other thing" you submitted and my principle are the same. It is not "another thing" but "the same thing." Because that which can be used according to my principle is authorized and that which is authorized can be used according to my principle. You talk about "going in a circle and getting nowhere" thou art the man! **YOU MADE A DISTINCTION WHERE THERE IS NOT ANY DIFFERENCE! AND DUE TO**

THIS FACT, MY PRINCIPLE STANDS! MY AUTHORITY STANDS!

While on the other hand, this demands all you have said during this debate to fall to the ground while my arguments stand, as a monument undisturbed!

A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE ENTIRE DISCUSSION

Brother Inman's bold "RECAPITULATION" sounds humorous beside the arguments he actually made. Had he done half as much as he claimed he did the debate would have been more interesting. His charges: "He left arguments alone;" "had no more to say;" "the force of his failure;" etc., add nothing to his summary because they are untrue. The following summary of mine will expose the conceit of his recapitulation and prove he claimed for himself too much!

(1). My duty was two-fold. I proved that the instrument could aid an individual to sing by 1 Cor. 14:7-8. This proved that when there was a **DISTINCTION** in the sounds one could tell what is piped or harped. Hence one is aided in getting the pitch and tune of a song by the sound of an instrument. Inman asked me to use an old hen for an instrument since she gives certain sounds. I turned his own illustration against him and showed that the "sound of the hen" aided the little chicks, as the "sound of the instrument" aided us. I asked him to use his hen as a song leader since she sings and forced him to despise his own logic on the hen.

(2). I showed the testimony of millions proved the instrument could aid. He said "a man" might say glasses aided, or whiskey aided, when they did not. This proved nothing. Millions have said whiskey hinders and the testimonies have established this fact, hence this is against him. Millions have not testified that glasses hinder, even though "a man" might. With this he accused me of counting

numbers and brought in the "church question" and attempted to be little me with modernism. But I gave him a dose worth while, showing that he had adopted "more practices" of the modernists and Baptists than he has in common with the Church of Christ. After rejecting testimonies as a source of authority, he quoted testimonies of some who he claimed were scholars, hence refusing to extend me the same courtesy he retained for himself.

(3). I gave two arguments to prove the instrument to be "ACCEPTABLE" but Inman came back and said I ignored this word "acceptable." My first argument showed that it could not be the fault of the instrument but the fault of either the person or song. Inman never did meet this. I next used Rom. 12:1, and proved that we could "present our bodies, holy, acceptable unto God," and use aids to each and every part of the body. Inman offered his "SUBSTITUTING ARGUMENT" of Nadab and Abihu, which he claimed showed that there was a class of aids which could be used and a class which could not be used. That miserable effort did not meet my argument, since we were agreed there were two classes of aids.

(4). My second duty was to give authority. Plus my arguments which proved the instrument to be acceptable, I stated A PRINCIPLE in two forms which proved the instrument to be authorized by the LAW OF INCLUSION. Inman offered three stories against my principle as I first stated it, but when I re-stated the same principle (in a superior form) he passed on by saying, "we ought to have an additional principle." I completely exposed all of these stories and showed that they did not defeat my principle, neither were they parallels to the instrument. In spite of this he held on to "the strange fires" because they were the last and only straws he had. He had nothing else to offer. He did give

up Saul and the cattle story admitting that God said, "Spare them not" (1 Sam. 15:3).

(5). Plus this, I brought in the principles of Cowan, Somer, Briney and Campbell showing that the instrument could be authorized by either of their principles. Also that my principle was not man-made authority, but that even SCHOLARS saw the necessity of stating a principle by which to justify the use of aids. Campbell condemned the instrument "IN" worship, but if he had been pressed to justify it as an aid, he would have done so by the law of expediency, as all can see by reading his articles on expediency. Briney justified the instrument by his principle and I did the same. Sommer says Christian liberty lies in NON-ESSENTIALS and in DETAILS which God has not given of the commandments, with these in harmony with the New Testament. The instrument is a non-essential, a detail, (an aid) of the commandment to sing and it certainly is in harmony with the rest of the New Testament; because it does not violate any commandment.

Knowing Cowan's attitude, I am led to believe he would justify the instrument by his principle, were he to meet the aid argument. The reason most of these men are anti-instrument, in spite of their principles, is not because their principles do not authorize the instrument as an aid, but BECAUSE THEY HAVE ALWAYS MET THE POSITION THAT THE INSTRUMENT IS "IN" WORSHIP. They tell a different story when you approach them with the aid argument. Inman misrepresented Brother Calhoun by claiming he was anti-instrument at his death. I gave a statement from N. B. Hardeman to prove that Brother Calhoun made the instrument a parallel with notebooks. Had Calhoun been anti-instrument at his death, Brother Hardeman, being anti-instrument himself, would have mentioned it. These men tell me that I am right in my position sir!

(6). I set forth "FOUR-PRONGS" which thoroughly showed the task of Brother Inman in trying to defeat my proposition. He tried to ignore these prongs, but I forced him to accept one. It did not do him any good as I previously showed the impossibility of him refuting my proposition by either prong. He was left in a worse shape than the Pharisees who approached Jesus with the question of John's baptism.

(7). I gave a general statement of WHAT and HOW the instrument aided, using 1 Kings 10:12, which said they were "FOR SINGERS." I showed that the instrument did not "prevent making melody in the heart" hence could not hinder an individual, but the instrument helped individuals, evidenced by the fact that God commanded them to be used. Instruments were mentioned with the first and last songs (Gen. 31:27 and Rev. 15:2). "Players" and "singers" are always mentioned together. He never met this, but used Job 38, to show that the stars sang before instruments were made. This miserable wresting of the Scripture did not prove that people (but stars) sang before instruments were made—the silence of God's word sounds an echo—you are wrong!

I used Ezekiel 28:13, showing that only things "created" were during the beginning of time, that everything else was "pro-created." Therefore, the pipes, tabrets, etc., mentioned in Ezekiel 28:13, were created in man at the beginning. Inman said this passage referred to the beginning of Tyrus; not to the beginning of the garden of Eden. But the Bible says: "Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God" (Ezekeil 28:13). Verse 15 says: "Thou wast perfect until iniquity was found in thee." Adam was perfect until iniquity was in him. Also he was in "Eden the garden of God." Such expressions as: "was perfect," "was created," "in Eden the Garden of God," "until iniquity was found in thee," etc., cannot be said of

any man except our father Adam. Since the workmanship of instruments was created in Adam, they came into existence before man ever sang (Compare Ezekiel 28:13-15 and Gen. 4:21 with Gen. 31:27). This proves that instrumental music was in existence before anyone ever sang. Hence, those who sing have had the benefit of the aid of an instrument from the very beginning of time.

Mr. Haskin said one must know the "potentialities of an instrument in order to write music for it." The same is true in singing. One must know the potentialities of a song before he can sing. The song, written from an instrument, places certain potentialities in the song. According to Mr. Haskin the instrument can aid him to sing that song.

(8). I showed that the instrument produced some prerequisites to singing by "putting into sound what the notes of the song book contain" hence giving us the pitch and tune which are prerequisites to singing. He replied that one must have the tune in his mind before he can play it. This is so far from truth that it does not merit a reply.

(9). I showed that salvation does not depend upon the use nor non-use of instrumental music, hence his brethren cause division by preaching that it does.

(10). He tried to pull off a joke about "being cornered" but I exchanged wit with him by showing that he is first a pig, then a pup in his arguments and he begged me to please use something else.

(11). He offered two affirmative arguments which I completely exposed by turning his own reasoning against him. He was found guilty of offending his brethren. I showed that meats were authorized everywhere except where there were weak brethren; hence to make this parallel to the instrument it is authorized in like manner. He begged to be received in-

to "our fold" as a weak brother. And I guess we will take him and give him "the milk of the word" until he, at least, leaves the Baptist doctrine and the modernists. His argument on a specific commandment does not exclude the use of aids, hence does not exclude the instrument.

(12.) He demanded me to give the Scripture to authorize the instrument. Then turned around and said aids did not have to be mentioned to be authorized and challenged me to show where he ever denied the instrument being an aid. No one could have the truth and make one contradiction after another throughout the whole discussion.

(13.) In concluding this proposition I will say that Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; Rom. 15:9; 1 Cor. 14:15; James 5:13 and other passages contain the commandment to sing. The commandment to sing involves a principle, known (as stated by many) as the **LAW OF INCLUSION, LAW OF EXPEDIENCY, CHRISTIAN LIBERTY, etc.** This principle involves all proper aids. The law of exclusion cuts out all improper aids. I have shown that instrumental music is a proper aid, hence **INCLUDED IN THE GIVING OF THE COMMANDMENT TO SING AND THEREFORE AUTHORIZED BY THE NEW TESTAMENT SCRIPTURE!**

FOURTH NEGATIVE PAPER

By CLIFTON INMAN

For the profuseness of abusive language and of aspersions of the character of an opponent I have never witnessed any thing superior to my opponent's papers. I also have not seen anyone who so badly misrepresents his opponent and twists his statements. In his last paper he says that I have deemed it necessary to inform the reader of my sincerity at the beginning of each of my papers. If this were true, it is my privilege. The fact, however, is that this is not true. Because of the abusive language used by my opponent I have taken pains to show the needlessness of such and have pointed to the fact that I have not impugned his motives. In my first paper I called the attention of the reader to the real issue and to the importance of the question being discussed.

I have said that I am satisfied with my part in the discussion and I am. The only difference between my friend, Julian, and the turtle is that Julian is unable to walk. Let us now get to the arguments of his last paper.

"WHY THE MISREPRESENTATIONS"

Mr. Hunt claims that I failed to show where he misrepresented me. The reader may judge of the truthfulness of this statement. He not only misrepresented me, but now persists in the same misrepresentations. He has again misquoted my statement about "the other thing." He has by this misquotation given my statement a meaning which it does not convey when accurately stated. And not only did he misquote me, but he misquoted himself. He claims that he said, "This other thing will not work for him." If he had said this the sentence would

not have been changed in its meaning, but read paragraph four under the caption, "What Brother Inman Failed To Do!" of his second manuscript. He there said, "So this 'other thing' he thought of in addition to my principle will not work." He now maintains that he made this statement contending that my principle was not another principle but was identical with his. He never made any such claim. Read the above mentioned reference.

What of the statement that offering strange fire and offering strange incense refer to the same act? The prohibition of God in Ex. 30:9 was against the incense and not against the fire. The condemnation found in Lev. 10:1 was for the use of the wrong fire and not for the use of the wrong incense. There is no intimation that they did not have the proper incense. Any sophistry used to try to make the prohibition of Ex. 30:9 against the fire loses its force when these facts are understood.

Number 1

This statement is basicaly false. Offering the incense was the act of worship. The fire was an aid. It was the agency used to produce the incense. If it were an act of worship, the use of the instrument is also an act of worship by Julian's own reasoning. He claims that the instrument produces some of the prerequisites of singing. If it produces some of the prerequisites of singing, it is a prerequisite itself. Fire was a prerequisite to the offering of incense since it produced a prerequisite, heat. One is just as much a part of the worship as the other.

In his discussion with me at Pikeville, Mr. Hunt contended that strange fire and strange incense are

the same. He said that the bulls, lambs, etc., are fire when offered. He says that incense in Ex. 30:9 refers to fire. Things equal to the same things are equal to each other. He now in his last affirmative paper has given some passages of scripture which he claims show that animals when offered were called fire. Do you not wonder why he did not quote at least one of these. In each of the passages we find the statement that these are burnt offerings and offerings made by fire unto the LORD. In none of them are the animals called fire. This statement, "made by" is all the proof that I need to show that the fire was an aid to offer sacrifices and to offer incense also. The incense was also offered by fire; that is, by the instrumentality of fire or the aid of fire.

Under the heading "A RECAPITULATION," paragraph two, of my last paper I made the following statement: "All I tried to prove by the references (The references alluded to were the case of Saul and of Nadab and Abihu), was that his contention that God would accept anything as an aid which is not wrong within itself provided it really aids is not

true." In his reply he tried to quote me and this is the result: "My argument on Nadab and Abihu shows that there is a class of aids which can be used and a class which cannot be used. Then he says: (meaning me—R. C. I.) 'This is all I claim for it.' Hmmm. Read the two statements carefully and see if they correspond.

1 Corinthians 11

Adam Clarke wrote many good things. His commentaries, as a whole, are the finest extant. However, he wrote many things which are not worth the paper they are written on. There is probably not another thing that he is more wrong on than the Lord's supper unless it be baptism. Were he living I would ask him as I have Julian, "What verse shows that the Corinthians used other foods on the Lord's table than the bread and wine?" Because Adam Clarke made the statement quoted by my respondent, my friend asks me if I am going to walk over top and blindly ignore God's condemnation of the strawberries on the Lord's table. Julian, Are the words of Adam Clarke the words of Almighty God? Are they? Answer me. Answer me! Oh Julian!

Strange Fire Offered by Nadab and Abihu

vs.

Use of Instrumental Music

(A Review of Mr. Hunt's Chart)

1. "God added a not against it. Ex. 30:9"

This passage does not add a not against the fire but against the incense.

2. Strange fire a substitute

3. "Did not use strange fire as an aid but as an act of worship."

I have asked my opponent a question with regard to this argument and as yet he has made no effort to answer it. Any effort to do so in his three page rejoinder will be a violation of the rules of honorable controversy, since I will not have a chance to reply.

In his quotation from Jamieson, Fausset and Brown he removes their statement from its context and gives it a meaning which it does not have there. Just after the quotation cited they have this to say, It (The love feast—R. C. I.) was a club-feast, where each brought his portion and the rich, extra portions for the poor; from it the bread and wine were taken for the Eucharist; and it was at it that the excesses took place, which made a true celebration of the Lord's Supper during or after it, with true discernment of its solemnity, out of the question." Notice that according to this statement there were no extra foods taken at the time the bread and wine were taken. They, (the extra foods), were taken before (or before and after). They do not make any effort to show that the Corinthians should not engage in the love feasts. Jude sanctioned love feasts (Jude 12). The things which they say were condemned were the excesses during the love feast. The last statement quoted from this commentary does not contradict this reasoning. Their statement is a correct one. It doesn't mean what my opponent would like for it to mean though. We should distinguish in judgment between the elements of the Lord's supper and of common food as they say. They are sacramental pledges of the Lord's body. They are more than the bread and wine that is used in common feasts. Not in substance, but in significance. The statement quoted from Bengel is taken from Jamieson — Fausset & Brown. The way in which they used it shows that they did not interpret it as does my opponent. I am sorry that I do not have Adam Clarke's commentary handy at the present. We might be able to find that some more quotations have been taken out of their setting.

In speaking concerning strawberries in the Lord's supper Mr. Hunt contended that he had the following "principle" on a chart: "An individual has authority to use anything that aids him to do God's will, provid-

ed the aid he uses is not wrong within itself." This sentence was not on his chart. I hope for his own benefit that he has changed it to read thus. This "principle" leaves the idea that all singing is doing God's will. He has said that singing is doing God's will. (page two, paragraph 4, second affirmative paper). This statement has no qualification. This shows that he contradicts himself in saying this at at one time and saying at another that all singing is not doing God's will.

(1). I have not contended and do not contend that taking the Lord's supper (i. e. merely eating the loaf and drinking the wine) is always doing God's will as the statement of my opponent might imply. It may or may not, depending upon the manner of taking, the purpose of taking and the use of the elements commanded or whether there is an addition to these elements. This is where you have missed the point on singing. All singing is not doing God's will.

(2). He says that using strawberries in the Lord's supper would not aid it to taste better. It will nevertheless. It is not a question of whether the strawberries are placed immediately on the bread. They may be taken with the bread without being on it. The strawberries would then aid the individual because they would offset the repulsiveness of its taste. The contention that the strawberries would change the unleavened bread to leavened is a poor subterfuge. The term leavened has to do with the preparation of the bread and not with the other foods to be taken with it. It is mixed with other foods in the digestive system. If other foods would make leavened bread of it, the wine would do so also. The Jews were to eat a lamb at the same time that they ate unleavened bread. Certainly this did not make it leavened. (Compare Ex. 12:6; 12:18).

I like to quote my opponent. Let us observe another of his statements. He says, "Brother Inman, however,

argued that unless the instrument changed singing it could not aid, but the opposite is the truth. The instrument aids the individual to sing. In order for it to change singing — singing would have to be in existence and the instrument would have to change the words and tune of a song. The individual (not the instrument) changes singing for the better or worse." If the efforts made by singers were made more accurate certainly the singing would be changed. But if the instrument doesn't change the singing what does it change? My opponent has said, "So the instrument would not change either the song or the man." (Page seven of his third affirmative paper). Again I say that my opponent has contradicted himself, and has thereby given up his argument that the instrument aids. If it changes neither the instrument nor the individual, it simply has no effect upon the singing or the individual either, hence it makes neither better or worse.

My opponent used the illustration of the man's going to Cincinnati to prove that a thing could not aid one to obey God's command and prevent his obeying God's command at the same time. I showed that when one does something in excess to obeying God's command and which is not authorized, it will not be pleasing to Him just as the man's claiming that he goes to Cincinnati via Huntington in order to aid him to get there cheaper and faster. The man was not obeying his master's will by going by way of Huntington. He was imposing upon it. People are doing the same when they use the instrument.

He further contends that the use of strawberries upon the Lord's table is wrong within itself because Paul condemned it. If it were wrong within itself Paul would not have had to condemn it. He has not found and showed the passage where Paul said for us not to use other food on the Lord's table. The passage which he has named says nothing of the kind.

He claims that I admitted that the case of Saul and the cattle is not parallel with the use of the instrument. This leaves the impression that I have changed my position on this point. I have not done so. It is parallel with (or rather a refutation of) His argument that God will accept a thing as an aid provided that thing is not wrong within itself. He finishes this grand (?) argument with the statement that every thing else I have said is irrelevant to the issue. Why did he not show wherein they are irrelevant? Some people seem to think that if they claim that they are winning loud enough and long enough someone will believe them.

Julian, you say that I took back one misrepresentation regarding the Bible colleges being modernistic and then made another. I never made one. I never took back anything. I did correct your erroneous representation of what I said. You say now that the Cincinnati Bible Seminary is not backed by the church at all. Was this the only institution named? Were you afraid of your position on the others?

I offered to debate my opponent on the radio and communion set question because I knew that he was using his reasoning on these to poison the minds of the people against the church of Christ. He has now backed away from it just as I knew he would. We shall see more on this in our next proposition.

Rom. 14:23

I am accused of wresting the scriptures and of admittedly doing so because I used an argument based upon Rom. 14:23 against the instrument and do not contend that Paul used the reasoning there against it. If I have done so my opponent is more guilty than am I, for he will certainly not contend that Paul used Rom. 12:1; Ezekiel 28:15 or Moses Gen. 31:27 to justify the instrument, yet he uses them thus. He knows there is nothing to this argument. There is

a principle involved in the verse I referred to. Paul used that principle to condemn the eating of meats. This principle will also condemn the use of the instrument under the same circumstances. I have said that to take the most favorable attitude possible toward the use of the instrument it will fall in the same class as the eating of meats. There are many more scriptural attitudes to take of it which are not so favorable. The users of it contend that it is in the class of indifferent things. I took that for granted and used this passage to show that if this were true, it would not justify the use of the instrument. I would still like for my opponent to bring on some of his "strong" brethren.

"A FEW OTHER THINGS"

My argument from Nadab and Abihu shows that my opponent's argument from Rom. 12:1 is not true because it shows that there is a class of aids which can not be used. It also shows that the class named by my opponent; viz., things that are not wrong within themselves and things that really aid, are not always acceptable. Really the argument from Rom. 12 unaided by other passages does not get at the issue at all.

He says that I quoted an authority from Dresden, Germany to prove that the instrument creates a state of dependency. I did nothing of the kind. I knew the objection which he would give and therefore took pains to show that this "authority" did not only say that it creates a state of dependency, but said that, "in voice culture," it is always a detriment and creates a state of dependency. The creating a state of dependency was something in addition. Wagner's statement that the singer should also be an actor was not made in reference to religious music. Wagner was a composer of operas. He also wrote some theses on the theory of opera. It was in respect to the theory of opera that he made the statement to which Julian referred.

I am not accusing God of commanding a thing which hinders, when I argue that the less adept in music cannot follow the instrument and are therefore hindered by it, as my opponent claims. The singers which were commanded to use the instrument and to sing in the Old Testament were specially trained. 1 Chron. 25:7 says that all these were instructed and were "cunning." As for Ps. 108:1-3: I have showed that the argument made from it is irrelevant since there were many things which these Jews, mentioned in this passage, could do which would not debar their making melody in their hearts, but that we cannot use those same things today and make acceptable melody. My opponent ignored this argument.

I am glad to admit a mistake when I see that I make one. Two of Julian's brothers did not leave the Christian church. One of the men to which I referred is either an uncle or a first cousin and lives on Mudlick creek near Hardy, Kentucky. I was mistaken in the relationship. However, his brother, Homer, may have turned again, but he was not with Julian and his position at the time of our debate in Pikeville or else he was deceiving many. He came and talked to me. He bragged on Roy Hall and tried to help me by giving me some questions to ask Julian. I never asked these. He then has either left the Christian church and has later returned, has left and not returned or is a traitor and deceitful. You may take your choice. If he has left and returned, my statement that he came to the church of Christ after the Hall-Hunt debate is correct. I do not think that he is a traitor.

The proposition on the pastor system cannot well be stated in a positive form without my taking the affirmative. I shall gladly do this and state it in a positive form. However, Julian argued with me in his correspondence that he had rather have a position stated in a negative form. Nevertheless I give the following proposition: Resolved, that a preacher

may scripturally labor with a congregation regularly in any given locality over a space of months or years though that congregation has elders. His proposition leaves a false impression in the minds of the readers. It leaves the idea that the "One-man-preacher-pastor" has generally taken over the work of elders throughout the churches of Christ. This is not true. Personally I know of only one place where this has been done. They are getting rid of the preacher now. I doubt if my opponent knows a place. This is all beside the present issue and was given to muddy the water.

Mt. 13:41

My opponent contends that the kingdom is used in this passage to mean the world. If it is it is the only time that it is so used throughout the entire Bible. The Word was sown in the world (that is, in the hearts of the people in the world.) But the tares (false doctrine) were sown in the same soil as was the wheat (the Word). The tares were mixed with wheat and not the wheat with the tares. Had the kingdom here referred to the world, the wheat would have been scattered through the tares. None of God's people would want to send the unrighteous people out of the world. There was an effort made to root up the tares. We may withdraw our fellowship from an errant Christian but we can not pluck him out of the kingdom. That remains till the judgment. The death of one who is in the world is not likely to destroy the faith of a Christian, but in this parable the servants were told to leave the tares alone lest in pulling them up they pull up some wheat. The statement that "Every sin is without the body" found in 1 Cor. 6:18 refers to the physical body. That is the thing which Paul is discussing throughout the context. There is no sin inherent in the body or caused by the body alone. Before the body sins it must be influenced by something without the body. This is evidently the meaning of this pas-

sage. We are not to judge them that are without, but we are to judge the wicked or sinful in the church.

The first part of this chapter shows this to be true. If my opponent's interpretation of this passage is correct, we would never have any one to judge for all erring ones would be outside the church. There is simply no connection with what the Baptist teach and what I teach on this subject.

Your contention that there can be a body without a head, a kingdom without a king and a house without a foundation is indeed amusing. The only body without a head is a dead one; the only house without a foundation is a wrecked one and the only kingdom which has no king is one whose king has abdicated. None of these are true of the church of our Lord.

I have ever contended that the "four prongs" do not get at the real issue. I did not take either prong as it is worded. I had this to say concerning them at the outset: "All can readily see which of his prongs I took. Neither of them states the real issue. My position is that the instrument does not aid one to offer acceptable praise unto God." This is what I said in my second reply and is what I have ever said and what I still maintain. You can see then that I took none of his prongs as it reads. I stated a principle which gets at the real issue. My side of the issue has as much to do with the word acceptable as does his. Am I not negating what he affirms. He affirms that the use of the instrument is acceptable. I deny it. Both sides are concerned with this word. It is the whole issue.

"A REPLY TO INMAN'S SECOND COUNTER ARGUMENT"

My opponent says that he has proved that teaching is a specific commandment the same as singing. In the commandment to sing the means of accompaniment is specified as being the heart. The method of teach-

ing is not restricted. If the apostles are not our examples, whom are we to follow? There were many more of the early christians who taught by the written method also.

The instrument's being on an equality with the singing has nothing to do with my argument from Noah and the ark. The hickory pegs and oak beams mentioned are not on an equality with the gopher which comprises the rest of the ark. The instrument is certainly not used to "drag in and work up the singing," or is it? It would have to be before it could be a parallel to the work bench and hammer handle, etc. The fact is that it is in the very middle of the singing.

My opponent maintains that there are ten scholars to one against my contention that the instrument was not used in worship service until at least the seventh century A. D. Why did he not quote some of these? I can tell you the reason. He tried it at Pikeville and I took his own scholars away from him. They failed to say what he claimed for them. I have quoted several in the process of the discussion and have on file quotations from about a dozen or more others. It is too bad that he has not seen fit to turn loose his "flood." He has argued that Eph. 5:19 infers the use of the instrument since "psalms" (according to him) means songs sung to the accompaniment of the instrument. I showed that if his argument were true, we would then have a direct command instead of an inference. If we have a command neither Paul nor the early church ever obeyed it. In speaking of the boy and the candy, Mr. Hunt left the impression that the instrument is an essential aid. I replied that if the instrument is an essential, the apostles did without an essential. You can see that my argument on this point is not off the subject then as my opponent claimed, but it very amply answers my friend's argument.

He has contended that there are forty-four passages in the New Testa-

ment which mention the instrument and that therefore the apostles knew something of the instrument. No one said that the apostles knew nothing of the instrument. I said that they never used it in the christian worship service. None of the forty four passages cited mention it as being so used. He never quoted a one of these to make an argument from it. If he does so in his rejoinder, it will be a violation of the rules of debate.

He still contends that his first part of the discussion was to prove that the instrument aids. He says that this was a part of his duty because I kept saying that it does not aid. This is utter falsehood. I have asked my opponent to produce the statement which I have made that claims the instrument does not aid. He refused to do so because he knew that I had not made any such statement. He has taken statements of mine completely out of their setting and thrown them together with other statements upon an entirely different subject and has so tried to prove that I have contradicted myself. I have showed his error here. He is just like the boy he mentions. You remember the boy was fooled. The hog was a hog all the time and the pup was a pup all the time. Julian is in the same shape as this boy. I have been giving him the solid meat of the Word, but something or someone has fooled him into believing that it is only a pup. Some people are easily fooled.

"AIDS ARE JUSTIFIED OR AUTHORIZED BY THE LAW OF INCLUSION AND ARE REJECTED BY THE LAW OF EXCLUSION"

I have never questioned the truth of the above heading, though my opponent asserts that I have. His assertion is another needless misrepresentation. The thing which I did question both in the oral and in the written discussion was that my opponent's statement is this law. He says that I softly said that the principle which he advanced in his last paper

was not true. Well, I believe that Teddy Roosevelt's idea of speaking softly and carrying the big stick is a good one. I proved what I claimed. I contended that we need some other principle by which to determine whether using the instrument is doing God's will. He says, "I contend (1). a thing not wrong within itself; (2). a thing that aids us; and (3). to do God's will, is authorized by Almighty God." I have proved that the contention that God will accept a thing as an aid which is not wrong within itself is not true. I proved this mainly by the case of Nadab and Abihu. He has not successfully answered this argument yet. Until he finds something wrong with my argument upon Lev. 10 I have found an exception to his rule. If it has this one exception, it needs further qualifications. Therefore, I say that we need an additional principle to determine what is God's will. My opponent admits that all singing is not doing God's will. Then if the instrument aids one to sing, he is not necessarily doing God's will. His burden is to prove that under any given set of conditions one may sing praises to the instrument that will be acceptable to God. He has offered a set of conditions. I have showed that these are not sound. He must show that they are or else get another set. He has done neither.

His calling my reasoning idiotic only brings pity for him. It is a pitiable thing to see one so hard pressed for an argument that he has to cast aspersions upon the intellect of another.

THE SO CALLED "BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE ENTIRE DISCUSSION"

What he has written in his "summary" is supposed to answer my recapitulation. Let us see.

(1). He says that he proved that the instrument could aid an individual from 1 Cor. 14:7-8. The effort made by him upon this passage was not only to prove that the instrument

can aid but to leave the impression that Paul justifies the instrument's use in the worship service. I showed that his reasoning used upon this passage would justify the use of an old hen just as readily. The sound of the voice aids the chicks to know where to find food. The sound of the trumpet aids soldiers to know when to prepare to go into a physical combat. Neither are said or intimidated to be used in offering acceptable praise unto God. If one is, however, the other is. I exposed his argument about the song leader. This is the first time he has seen fit to notice it since.

(2). My opponent has waited till the very last to notice the argument which I made from whiskey and glasses. He now says, that he showed that by the testimony of millions the instrument aids. Did you notice a quotation from a million, reader? I never saw one. I did see a twisted statement from the census bureau. I asked him for the exact statement and he accused me of getting off the subject. The thing which I contended for is that human testimony alone is not sufficient. The case of the glasses and whiskey clearly show this. Glasses will aid some people, but they will hinder the seeing of others. All know this and any reputable doctor will confirm it. It would be uncharitable for one who uses glasses to force them upon others, or to use them at all if their use of them hindered some one else. I gave my friend every privilege which I kept for myself. Every time I offered testimony I gave the author of the testimony and showed whether he had made sufficient research to know whereof he spoke.

(3). Under the number three he says that he gave two arguments to prove that the instrument is acceptable which I never did meet. His first argument was that if the instrument is not acceptable it is the fault of the person or the song and not of the instrument. I showed that every argument which he made to try to prove that the use of the instrument is

authorized is not sound. For a person to use a thing which is not authorized certainly shows him to be at fault. I fully answered his argument upon Rom. 12:1 also; though it belongs entirely to our next proposition.

(4). Next he claimed that I had not successfully answered his principles which he has stated in two forms. He has not answered my arguments upon Nadab and Abihu and Saul. He has succeeded only in trying to make the reader think that I have said something other than what I have said. His calling the argument from Nadab and Abihu a substituting argument does him no good since he has continually ignored my question as to whether it would have been acceptable for them to have used both kinds of fire.

(5). He says that he has proven that his principle is sound from Cowan, Somner, Campbell and Briney. He says that Campbell condemned the instrument "IN" worship, but that he would have justified it as an aid had he been pressed to so do. In other words Campbell did not have the benefit of the superior reasoning of Julian and some of his present day cohorts. As a matter of fact it was as an aid that Campbell condemned its use. He said, "But I presume, to all spiritually minded Christians, such aids would be as a cow bell in a concert." (Mil. Harb., Series 4 V. 1, No. 10, page 581.) (The italics are mine).

He calls in question my statement that at the time of Bro. Calhoun's death he was in the church of Christ and did not believe in the use of the instrument. Remember folks that the statement quoted from Bro. Harde-man was not made at the time or near the time of Bro. Calhoun's decease. At the time this statement was made Calhoun was with the Christian church. He later left them. My opponent should be better informed on these matters.

(6). He says that I tried to ignore the "four prongs." This I did not do.

I have given them sufficient attention.

(7). I have answered his argument which he made from 1 Kings 10:12. He now calls attention to his making it but does not make any effort to answer my argument on it. I also answered his argument that the instrument did not prevent the Jew's making melody in their hearts.

His argument about the first and last time instruments are mentioned I have showed to have nothing to do with the subject. He now says that players and singers were always together. They are not so in the New Testament.

Ezekiel 28:13 certainly refers to the beginning of Tyrus and not to the beginning of time. The statement that this country had been in Eden the garden of God only shows the blessings which God had bestowed upon it. It is a figurative expression, as are many others in the Bible, to show that these people had been bountifully blessed. If the instruments named in this passage had been created in Adam, my opponent has failed to show that God authorizes us to use them today in the christian worship service. My opponent has implied that God had the instruments mentioned in Gen. 4:21 made. He asked me the purpose of their being made. He ridiculed me for saying that they were made to play and entertain listeners; thereby implying that their purpose was to aid individuals to sing. Yet he also says that singing was not in existence until after instruments. Can you figure this out reader? If this be true, they were made to aid something which did not exist.

He still contends that Haskin shows that one can not sing without an instrument near unless he has had previous instrumental training. Read again the statement of Haskin and you will see that it has no connection whatever with Julian's contention.

(8). He says that the instrument produces some prerequisites of sing-

ing because it puts into sound what the notes of the song book contain. Sound is a prerequisite to singing, but not the sound of an instrument. The sound of the voice is the prerequisite.

(9). His play upon the pup is only a space filler. He is better at chasing pups and pigs than at answering arguments.

(10). His contention that we are the causers of the division I have fully answered. He never noticed my argument.

(11). I have not begged to be received into the fold of the Christian church. I am very well satisfied in the fold of God, the church of Jesus, the Son of God. I have maintained my stand upon Rom. 14:23. He has never harmed it.

(12). He seems to think that my statement, that things do not have to be specifically mentioned in order to be authorized, and my challenge for him to show where I had ever denied that the instrument can aid, are contradictory. No one can get such an idea from the reading of these two statements. He usually leaves out the word "specifically" when quoting my statement. He seems to want to leave the impression that I oppose the instrument because it is not mentioned. I oppose it because it is not authorized. He has produced no sound principle which will authorize its use. I have showed two which will condemn it.

(13). In closing he says that there is a principle contained in Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; 1 Cor. 14:15; James 5:13 and other passages which involves all proper aids. He has not showed that they involve any such aid and that if they do that the instrument is included in the "proper aids." His

making this assertion in the last of his last paper does not help his cause.

CONCLUSION

There have been only two real arguments offered by my opponent to prove his proposition. These were his "principle" of the law of inclusion and exclusion and his argument that Eph. 5:19 infers the use of the instrument. I took the first away from him by showing that God may reject the use of a thing as an aid though that thing be not wrong within itself. The last I answered by showing that according to his argument there would be a command and not an inference and that if there were such a command the apostles never obeyed it. Since he has failed to establish his proposition we must conclude that he has no authority for the use of the instrument or that if such authority exists my opponent does not know it.

Since these things are true my plea is that he and all others who use the instrument depart from the practice of that for which they have no authority. Come to a solid position upon the foundation of those things authorized and set forth in God's eternal word. Contend for the faith which was once for all delivered for the saints. Abiding in its purity and know that by so doing you are upon safe and solid ground and shall be one day allowed to bask in the sunlight of God's love and presence and serve Him forever in that land where the body is not bowed down in fatigue, because the labor there is no burden, where tears shall never fall and sorrows shall never come. We can inherit that home if we will do that and only that which He authorizes us to do. Let us not then jeopardize our souls and take the chance of leading others astray. (I thank you).

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE PAPER

By CLIFTON INMAN

PROPOSITION

"RESOLVED, THAT I CAN CONSISTENTLY USE AIDS IN THE CATEGORY OF A SONG BOOK, TUNING FORK, RADIO, COMMUNION SET, AUTOMOBILE, CHART, CHURCH HOUSE AND COLLECTION BASKET IN OBEYING GOD'S COMMANDMENTS AND CONDEMN THE USE OF A MECHANICAL INSTRUMENT OF MUSIC AS AN AID DURING CHRISTIAN WORSHIP SERVICE."

After submitting a proposition to my opponent with the suggestion that we have a discussion upon the subject of mechanical instrumentation he suggested that we have both an oral and a written debate and that there be two propositions. He was to affirm one and I the other. This was perfectly satisfactory to me. After some discussion as to the wording of the propositions, therefore, he submitted the above quoted proposition and the proposition which appears in the first of this book, with the exception that the word "acceptable" was not included in the other proposition. It was added at my suggestion.

Much reference was made in the former discussion to those things which rightfully belong to this. I have purposely refused to have much to say regarding them, because, as you can readily see, they are the very basis for this proposition and should be discussed here. Let us now consider them.

In the beginning of any discussion the affirmative should define the terms used in the wording of the proposition so clearly that there can be no doubt as to their meaning and

as to the exact point as issue. If this is done much irrelevant discussion will be avoided. I shall therefore try to define the terms clearly and to point out the exact point at issue.

Definitions

"I"—Clifton Inman: This should not be so construed as to infer that others may not be able to do the same thing. If I can, certainly others may also.

"Can"—Am able; have the ability; it is possible.

"Consistently" — Harmoniously; without contradiction — This means that my use and contention for the authority for the use of the song book, the tuning fork, etc., is not contradictory to my opposition to the mechanical instrument.

"Use"—employ; put into practice.

"Aids"—those things which help or assist.

"In the category"—in the class of.

"Song book" — a book containing the words and notes of a song.

"tuning fork"—a device used for the purpose of aiding to get the pitch of a song.

"Radio"—there has not been a satisfactory definition given of this word that is not very technical but I will do my best. It is an invention which is used to transmit sounds from some centrally located sending stations to the homes of individuals who have an apparatus for the reception of such sounds or to other listening stations so equipped.

"Communion set"—A set composed of trays and glasses used to contain

and to aid in distributing the bread and wine used in the Lord's supper.

"Automobile"—The common car or any other self-propelled vehicle.

"Chart"—Any kind of diagram used for the purpose of illustrating a sermon or other lesson by one when teaching the Bible.

"Church house"—Any house used by any congregation as a place of gathering for public worship.

"Collection basket"—A basket or other container used for the purpose of gathering into one place (or into the treasury) the contribution of christians.

"Obeying"—complying with the orders or commands of.

"God's commandments"—Those orders or commands given to christians by Jehovah.

"Condemn" — Hold to be wrong. Though this word has other meanings, this is the one to be used in this discussion. I disavow any definition which would lead one to believe that I would of my own will pass sentence.

"Mechanical instrument of music"—an instrument made by the art of man for the purpose of making music.

"As an aid"—For the purpose of helping.

"During christian worship service"—At the same time and in the same place that christians are engaged in expressing genuinely their adoration and devotion to the heavenly Father.

From these definitions we can readily see the exact point at issue. The whole point is that of consistency. It is not primarily whether we have authority for the use of the first things named in the proposition, or whether the instrument is authorized, but whether the principles which I contend authorize the song book, etc., authorize also the use of the instrument or whether the principle (or

principles) which I contend condemns the mechanical instrument condemns also the use of these things.

WHAT I AM OBLIGATED TO PROVE

What I am obligated to do is clear from this. I am obligated to show scriptural principles which authorize the use of the song book, tuning fork, etc., that do not at the same time authorize the use of the mechanical instrument of music, or I must show a scriptural principle or scriptural principles which condemn the use of the mechanical instrument of music that do not condemn also the use of things in the category of the song book, tuning fork, etc.

THE OBLIGATIONS OF MY OPPONENT

In order to defeat me and my proposition in this discussion my opponent must prove (1) that the principle or principles which I use to justify the use of things in the category of the song book, tuning fork, etc., justify also the use of the mechanical instrument of music or (2) that the principle or principles which I show to condemn the use of the mechanical instrument of music, condemn also the use of the other things named. It would not be entirely fair, however, to hold him to these things alone. It is only right that there be some investigation as to the soundness of the principles which I use; though that does not enter into the proposition as it is worded. We want to be entirely fair, however, so I offer two other alternatives for him. He may show that (1) the principle or principles which I use to justify the use of the song book, chart, etc., are not sound or (2) that the principle or principles which I use to condemn the use of the mechanical instrument of music is unsound. These are the only alternatives as I see the case.

"THE INSTRUMENT"

This term has been used throughout our previous discussion without any qualifying descriptives. There-

fore, it seems only fitting that I say something in regard to it. This is not used to include every type of instrument, but only that which is immediately under discussion. In this discussion we shall have something to say regarding other types of instruments than the mechanical, however, unless the context shows otherwise, when the term "the instrument," is used it refers to the mechanical instrument. (This shall be true in my papers at least.) I mention this not for argument but to prevent needless discussion and misunderstanding.

AUTHORITY FOR SONG BOOKS, TUNING FORK, ETC.

It is conceded by most all scholars that there are only three ways in which a thing may be scripturally authorized. These are by direct command, by scriptural example and by necessary inference. By "necessary inference" is not meant that which is necessary to sustain a position but a conclusion which must necessarily be drawn from a passage. From this you may see that a thing does not have to be directly mentioned in order to be authorized—if there is a necessary inference, a specific mention is not necessary. The question now to be ascertained is whether the things in question are authorized by either of these principles. I maintain that those things mentioned in the above heading are:

1. The Song book—In Ephesians 5:19 we are told to sing. The instrument which is to accompany the singing is specified as being the heart. The means of acquiring the song is not specified. There is a necessary inference for the song book though. Since we are to sing, it must be necessarily inferred that we have some place from which to obtain the song. A song book is not the only place where this may be obtained, but no place is specified so it must be necessarily inferred that we may get it from any place which would not be in violation of some other scriptural principle. There must also be some

pitch upon which to sing a song. A necessary inference is pitch. Another necessary inference is some means of getting the pitch. Since no certain means is specified the necessary inference is that we may get it in any way that does not violate some other scriptural principle.

2. The communion set—In Mt. 26 we have the record of Jesus' instituting the Lord's supper. In Acts 20:7 we have an example of the disciples' observance of this feast. The articles of food specified to be used in this feast are the bread and the wine. (Mt. 26:26-28) It is necessarily to be inferred that there be some kind of container or containers for the bread and for the wine. It must also be necessarily inferred from the context that there were separate containers for the bread and the wine. These separate containers would constitute a set. The number of containers is not specified so we must conclude that we may use as many as advisable so long as the use of them does not violate some other principle of the New Testament.

3. The radio — In Mk. 16:15 the apostles were told to preach the Gospel to all the world. From New Testament example we see that others later were to do the same thing, such as Timothy, Titus, John Mark, et al. In the command to preach it is necessarily inferred that there must be hearers. It is also implied that in order for one to hear he must employ some form of acoustics (some device to enable him to hear). God has provided natural acoustics. Without these or some form of artificial acoustics we could hear nothing. In the command given the acoustics to be used are not specified. We must necessarily infer, therefore, that we may use any form of acoustics so long as the use of it does not violate some other principle of scripture. The radio is a form of acoustics.

4. The automobile—Mk. 16:15 also shows that the apostles were to go. By example we see that they went.

Rom. 10:14 reads, "How shall they preach except they be sent?" When preaching is done there is, in most cases, a going and a sending. Since there is a "going" and a "sending," it must be necessarily inferred that some means of going be employed. The method of going is no where specified so we must necessarily conclude that man is at liberty to use any means that does not violate some other Bible principle.

5. The chart—Christ told the apostles to teach all nations. (Mt. 28:19) Paul told Timothy to commit the Gospel to faithful men who should be able to teach others also. (2 Tim. 2:2) From the command to teach it is implied that there must be some means or method employed in the teaching. The method is not specified in the Bible so it is necessarily inferred that we are at liberty to use any means or any method that does not violate a clear principle of the Bible. This may include the chart, religious journals or any other form of teaching which is done in harmony with the teaching of the Bible.

6. The church house—In Acts 2:2 we read that the apostles were sitting in a house. Acts 20:28 mentions an upper chamber. A chamber, of course, is a room in a house. Here then we have not an inference but a direct New Testament example for the house. The person or persons who own the house are not specified, so we must infer that any one may own the house so long as the ownership comports with other scriptural teaching.

7. The collection basket—Paul told the church at Corinth to lay by them in store upon the first day of the week as God had prospered them. (1 Cor. 16:2) He had previously given this instruction to the churches of Galatia, so we see that it pertains to all. They were to do this laying by in store that no collections be made when Paul came. It must be necessarily inferred from this command that some method of collecting the

contribution into one place is to be used. This method was not specified. We must necessarily conclude therefore, that we may use any method which is in keeping with other New Testament teaching.

This covers all those things specified directly in the proposition. All those things which come in the class with these things, such as eye-glasses, baptistries, etc., may be justified in the same manner. The principle employed here may be stated in another way (using the words quoted by my opponent from Briney): "When a thing is commanded to be done, and the method of doing it is not prescribed, those commanded are at liberty to use their best judgment in devising ways and means to carry out the command, and they are to act under the principle laid down by Paul in 1 Corinthians 14:40, "Let all things be done decently and in order." That they have such liberty must be necessarily inferred. The question to be determined then is whether there are any specifications as to the method to be used in singing.

IS THE METHOD OF SINGING SPECIFIED?

The answer to this question must be in the affirmative. Someone may object that I have previously stated that the method of obtaining the pitch of the song is not specified. That is true. Some things concerning the singing are not specified — others are. Eph. 5:19 reads thus: "Speaking to yourselves in Psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord . . ." The revised version reads, "making melody with your heart." The phrase, "make melody," is translated from the Greek word, *psallontes*. The original or root meaning of this word to touch, to pluck, to pull or to play. The thing specified to be touched, pulled, plucked or played is to be specified by the context. The context here specifies it as being the heart. The means of singing and of accompanying such singing then

is specified as being the heart. This removes our liberty. We have no liberty to use that which we please when God has specified that which is to be used.

Sometimes God will specify one thing in one place and another thing in another. When this is done we must use one, both, or all those specified. In 1 Cor. 14:15 we find other specifications. Paul there says, "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." The word here translated sing is "psallo" of which the word used in Eph. 5:19 is the participle. The word translated "spirit" is "pneumati" and the word translated "understanding" is "noi." "Noi" is sometimes translated "mind." Both these words are in what is known as the instrumental case. The instrumental case is a case in Greek which shows the instrument or agency by which a thing is done. This shows that the instruments or agencies by which the "psallo-ing" is to be done are the spirit and the mind, the understanding. We see then that the means to be used to accompany our singing is specified in the Bible. We have no liberty to add to these specifications. To show that we have no liberty to add to these specifications let us consider some examples.

EXAMPLES OF THE TRUTH OF THESE PRINCIPLES

1. Noah and the Ark—God told Noah to build an ark. If this had been all that God had told Noah, Noah may have made it of any material, any size and any shape. God specified certain things, however. These specifications limited Noah's liberty. God said you build it of Gopher wood. If God had not specified this material Noah may have been at liberty to have used any kind. He would have necessarily inferred that he had such liberty. God said Gopher wood, however, and

Noah's liberty ended there. Any other kind of wood would not have been satisfactory.

2. Nadab and Abihu—God had commanded the priests to offer incense before Him. For the purpose of offering this incense, he had erected in the Holy place in the tabernacle just in front of the veil leading to the Most Holy place an altar of burnt incense. God specified that they place in (or on) this altar a mixture composed of spices, stacte, onycha, and galbanum with pure frankincense. Had God not specified the spices to be used they would have been at liberty to use any. This must then have been inferred. He made specifications though. They were also to get the fire to put under this altar, to heat the spices so that they would give off a perfume, (incense), from off the altar of burnt offering. Had not God specified the fire they were to use they might have used any fire. God had made specifications though, so when they essayed to offer some other fire they were condemned. (Lev. 10:1)

3. The Lord's supper—Christ instituted the Lord's supper. By example he specified certain elements to be used in the taking of that supper. These elements are the bread and the wine. Had he not made any specifications, we would have been at liberty to have used as many elements and whatever elements we pleased. This would have been necessarily inferred. Since he specified certain elements we are not at liberty to use any others no matter what the pretext — whether it be for aiding or what.

I have now done all that I am obligated to do. I have showed a principle which authorizes the use of the song book, the tuning fork the collection basket, the automobile, the radio, the chart, the communion set, and the collection basket, etc. I have showed that this principle does not authorize the use of the mechanical instrument of music. I have also

showed the principle which condemns the use of the mechanical instrument of music. I have further showed that this principle does not condemn the use of the other things named.

Though I have used but six of the ten pages allotted me by our agreement, I feel that I have proved my proposition and have no need of writing more. My opponent is now

obligated to prove (1) that the principle which I used to justify the use of the song book, tuning fork, etc., is unsound, (2) that the principle which I used to condemn the mechanical instrument is unsound or (3) that this principle also condemns the use of the song book, the tuning fork, etc. So I await with eager anticipation his reply. I thank you.

FIRST NEGATIVE PAPER

By JULIAN OLYN HUNT

"RESOLVED, THAT I CAN CONSISTENTLY USE AIDS IN THE CATEGORY OF A SONG BOOK, TUNING FORK, RADIO, COMMUNION SET, AUTOMOBILE, CHART, CHURCH HOUSE AND COLLECTION BASKET IN OBEYING GOD'S COMMANDMENTS AND CONDEMN THE USE OF A MECHANICAL INSTRUMENT OF MUSIC AS AN AID DURING CHRISTIAN WORSHIP SERVICE."

There is not a person living who can prove the above proposition. I mean establish it! Confirm it! Develop it until all can see any difference in using the instrument as an aid and these other things mentioned in his proposition! We care not for his "wild-guesses" nor "sly-perversions" in trying to prove it, but we want absolute, concrete authority if there is any. It is wresting the Scripture to contend that they "necessarily infer" dozens of things which are not even hinted at, nor insinuated nor implied by them. Does our brother know what the word "inferred" means? He says the radio, tuning fork, automobile and so on are necessarily inferred by the Scriptures, but instrumental music is not? ISN'T THAT SOME "WILD GUESS!"

The song book, tuning fork, radio, communion set, automobile and collection basket were not in existence when the New Testament was written. **NOT ONE OF THEM!** But instruments of music are mentioned forty-four times in the New Testament. The reader can read for himself: Matt. 9:23; 24:31, Lk. 15:25; 1 Cor. 14:7, 8; 15:52; 1 Thess. 4:16; Rev. 1:10; 4:1, 5:8; 8:1-2; 8:6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13; 9:1, 13, 14; 11:15; 14:2; 15:1-7; 18:22.

Who told Clifton Inman, who is living nearly two thousands years on this side of the writing of the Scriptures, that the radio, automobile, tuning fork and so on were inferred, when they were not even in existence? On the other hand, who told him that instrumental music was "NOT" inferred, when the instrument is mentioned forty-four times by the writers of the New Testament? I suppose the Scriptures **PROPHESIED** of the radio, automobile, etc., did they? Our brother has pursued the wrong course; he should have undertaken to have proven his proposition by prophecy and not by necessary inference.

WHAT BROTHER INMAN IS OBLIGATED TO DO!

He outlined his duties. He made them two-fold:

First—He says he is to submit a Scriptural principle which authorizes the radio, automobile, tuning fork and so on which does not authorize the instrument of music. We might call this, "**HIS POSITIVE DUTY!**" In discharging this duty he offered the principle of necessary inference.

Second—He says he is to submit a Scriptural principle which condemns the instrument of music as an aid, which does not condemn the radio, automobile, song book, collection basket and so on as aids. We might call this "**HIS NEGATIVE DUTY!**" In discharging this duty he offered the principle involved in a specific commandment—contending that the commandment to sing in Eph. 5:19, is specific—therefore, excludes and condemns the instrument as an aid but does not exclude and condemn the tuning fork and song book as aids.

So we have his duties and principles before us. These duties are a positive or authorizing duty and a negative or condemning duty; a positive principle and a negative principle. His positive or authorizing principle of necessary inference and his negative or condemning principle of a specific commandment. Around these two principles his whole speech was centered and built. And I presume that his three future speeches are in contemplation of being erected upon these principles. Therefore, since our opponent has thoroughly outlined before our eyes what he is obligated to do and after setting forth a positive and negative principle which shall perhaps govern his procedure throughout the entire debate — we shall next find out what my duty is.

WHAT I AM OBLIGATED TO DO!

Brother Inman outlined for me a four-fold duty, and I gladly accept it.

First—I am going to thoroughly test his positive principle; that is, the principle of necessary inference which he claims authorizes the use of all proper aids. (I contemplate on using the rest of my space in this speech in testing this principle in order to completely knock the props from under his whole theory and hobby riding scheme. When his theory of necessary inference is taken from him then the authority for aids naturally appeals to the law of expediency—where they belong. When this is done Brother Inman and his brethren have no grounds for being against instrumental music).

Second—Even though I show that the law of necessary inference is not the proper authority for the use of all proper aids I will nevertheless show as my second duty that if the radio, automobile, etc., can be authorized by this law then the instrument can.

Third—I am going to thoroughly test his negative principle; that is, the principle of a specific commandment which he claims condemns and

excludes the instrument and upholds and includes the song book and tuning fork.

Fourth—Even though I show that the law of a specific commandment does not exclude the use of any proper aid I will nevertheless show that if this law excludes the instrument it also excludes the song book and tuning fork. (I will probably not get to these last three duties until my next paper as the major error, of the anti-instrument position lies in a false conception of necessary inference and I need the space in this paper to offset this).

Fifth—After discharging my four-fold duty as the negative in refuting the arguments of the affirmative I propose a fifth duty—that of making affirmative arguments. I am going to take a text found in Romans 2:1, which reads: "Therefore, thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things."

In developing this text I will make my affirmative arguments and I mean to "turn the tables" on our anti-instrument brethren. They have had us on the defensive in times past. But now the tide has turned; Brother Inman is on the defensive. We now have the pleasure of seeing him "try" to produce authority for numerous unscriptural things that he and his brethren use in obeying the commandments of God. They have mounted the pulpits and employed the religious journals and made every effort available to condemn the instrument which they claim is an addition to God's word. But now Brother Inman must take all the condemnation of Rom. 2:1, "for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things;" for wherein he has judged us, in accusing us of adding the instrument to God's word, he stands judged and condemned with the same condemnation because he has added

the radio, tuning fork, song book, automobile, etc., which are not in God's word. If we have added, he has! My affirmative arguments will show this.

TESTING THE PRINCIPLE OF NECESSARY INFERENCE AS THE AUTHORITY FOR THE USE OF ALL PROPER AIDS!

A consideration of the following six items proves that the law of necessary inference does not authorize the use of all proper aids in obeying God's commandments:

1. A correct definition of necessary inference proves it an improper law for authorizing the use of all proper aids.

2. Three principles which the law of necessary inference involve prove it does not authorize the use of all proper aids.

3. The fact that the task of selecting aids is not the responsibility of God, but of man proves that the law of necessary inference does not authorize the use of all proper aids.

5. The fact that there is a "law of Christian liberty" or "law of expediency" proves that the law of necessary inference does not authorize the use of all proper aids.

6. The testimony of scholars prove that the law of necessary inference does not authorize the use of all proper aids.

While many other reasons could be given, perhaps, these six, with a brief discussion, will thoroughly off-set the theory that the law of necessary inference authorizes the use of all proper aids. It is now in order to discuss these six items:

1. A CORRECT DEFINITION OF NECESSARY INFERENCE PROVES IT AN IMPROPER LAW FOR AUTHORIZING THE USE OF ALL PROPER AIDS:

I have no objections to Brother Inman's definition of necessary inference other than it is incomplete. He

says it means, "A conclusion which must necessarily be drawn from a passage." I accept this as a part of the correct definition. The use of the aids mentioned in his proposition violates this definition, however! Inman says the commandment to preach necessarily infers a radio as a form of acoustics. If so he says: "It is a conclusion which must necessarily be drawn from this passage, viz. Mk. 16:15." Did the apostles "necessarily draw the conclusion" that they were to use a radio? When Peter explained the commission on Pentecost did the three thousand who were cut to the heart "necessarily draw the conclusion" that they were to hear sermons over the radio? If the commandment to preach necessarily infers a radio, as you contend, and necessary inference is a conclusion necessarily drawn from a passage, then the Apostles and every person since the day of Pentecost have necessarily drawn the conclusion that they must use a radio in obeying Mk. 16:15.

Now, for Webster's definition: the word necessary means: "that cannot be otherwise; essential, indispensable; a thing that cannot be done without." The word infer means: "to derive by deduction or induction; accept as a fact or consequence; imply; conclude." Inference means: "the act of inferring; the conclusion; deduction; induction."

Therefore, "necessary inference" means: "A consequence, implication or conclusion derived either by deduction or induction which cannot be otherwise, is essential, indispensable and a thing that cannot be without."

This is Mr. Webster's definition and it ought to stand. Now, lets try the use of the radio, automobile, song book and so on by this definition and see if they can be properly authorized by necessary inference. In doing this I shall follow the order as given in Brother Inman's paper:

1. The song book—He said the commandment to sing in Eph. 5:19, nec-

essarily inferred a song book. Well then, if this be so, "it is a consequence implication or conclusion derived either by deduction or induction which cannot be otherwise, is essential, indispensable and a thing that cannot be done without." Will my respondent claim all this for the song book? If not, then his use of necessary inference is erroneous. If so, then the song book is indispensable and cannot be done without. Did the apostles use the song book? No!

2. The communion set—From Matt. 26: and Acts 20:7 (The teaching on the Lord's Supper) he says the communion set is inferred. If so, "it is a consequence, implication or conclusion derived either by deduction or induction which cannot be otherwise, is essential, indispensable and a thing that cannot be done without." Did the apostles do without a communion set? If so, it is not necessarily inferred!

3. The radio—He says in Mk. 16:15 the apostles are told to preach and that the radio is necessarily inferred as a form of acoustics. If so, "it is a consequence, implication or conclusion derived either by deduction or induction which cannot be otherwise, is essential, indispensable and a thing that cannot be done without." Did the Apostles, who obeyed this commandment directly, use a radio, a thing not invented until approximately nineteen hundred years after their deaths? If it is necessarily inferred as you claim, then it is essentially drawn from this passage, indispensable to it, and cannot be done without when this passage is obeyed; yet you believe the apostles died and went to Heaven without an essential and something that cannot be done without. Such an argument is nonsense!

To boot! After saying the radio was a form of acoustics necessarily inferred from the commandment to preach, he said: "God has provided natural acoustics." Since God has provided natural acoustics, none other is inferred. Why would God pro-

vide one kind of acoustics, in hearing the word preached, and infer another?

4. The automobile — He says the commandment to go, found in Mk. 16:15, necessarily infers the automobile. If this is true "it is a consequence implication or conclusion derived either by deduction or induction which cannot be otherwise, is essential, indispensable and a thing that cannot be done without." An automobile had never been dreamed of when Christ gave the commission; besides God provided a way for the Apostles to go by giving them legs with which to walk. Would the commandment to go infer one way to go when God had provided another? This provision which God has provided for man does not debar man from improving it. He has the liberty granted to him by the law of expediency, if he is wise enough in judgment to decide the best methods to accomplish the thing God commanded. That which man may use to improve himself is not inferred by the Scripture, but through man's discretion he may see an expedient whereby he can attain the improvement necessary.

5. The chart and church house—He uses Matt. 28:19; Acts 2:2 to prove these are necessarily inferred. Campbell says: "There is neither precept nor precedent in the New Testament for building, hiring, buying or possessing a meeting-house." (Christian System, p. 95). Yet Inman says there is. Great men differ sometimes, you know! The chart nor church house is a conclusion drawn from a passage, hence not necessarily inferred.

6. The collection basket—Brother Inman thinks because I Cor. 16:1-2 says: "Now concerning the collection of the saints," that this necessarily infers a collection basket. Does this refer to passing a collection basket around the congregation for them to drop in a few nickels during an assembly today, which is then placed in a Sunday School treasury? Or does it refer to collecting relief goods for

the poor saints at Jerusalem? Suppose we let Paul answer this: "And when I come, whomsoever ye shall approve by your letters, them will I send to bring your liberality unto Jerusalem." (I. Cor. 16:3) Our Brother should have read the next verse and he would have known the "collection for the saints" refers to the poor at Jerusalem and not to using collection baskets in gathering the pennies during an assembled congregation today. Don't forget, however, if his collection baskets are necessarily inferred they are, "a consequence, implication or conclusion derived either by deduction or induction which cannot be otherwise, are essential, indispensable and things that cannot be done without."

Before leaving this discussion on the definition of necessary inference, it is proper, I think, to select a clear-cut case of necessary inference from the New Testament and put Mr. Webster's definition to the test by it. In Acts 2:2 it says: "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as a rushing mighty wind and filled all the house where they were sitting." The Scripture says: "They were sitting." But it says nothing about sitting in seats. But who will deny that seats are necessarily inferred? The phrase, "They were sitting," necessarily infers seats. So Mr. Webster would say, seats are a consequence drawn from "they were sitting." "Were sitting" is an implication of seats. It is a conclusion that they were sitting in seats drawn from "they were sitting," because it could not be otherwise. Seats are essential to sitting. Seats are indispensable to sitting, and are things that cannot be done without in sitting. This clear cut case of necessary inference works one hundred per cent with Mr. Webster's definition.

Now lets try further one of Brother Inman's "wild-guesses" which he claims is necessarily inferred and see how it works. "Preach the Gospel" (Mark 16:15) necessarily infers a radio, says Mr. Inman! To agree with

Mr. Webster, then, a radio is a consequence drawn from "preach the gospel." A radio is a conclusion drawn from the commandment to "preach the Gospel." It is an implication of "Preach the Gospel," which cannot be otherwise. It is essential to "preaching the Gospel." It is indispensable to "preaching the Gospel," and a thing that cannot be done without in preaching the Gospel. Is this true or false? Seats were inferred from a passage that all agree is a clear-cut case of necessary inference. And this case of necessary inference agrees with Mr. Webster's definition. The radio is not inferred from the commandment to preach; therefore does not agree with the definition of necessary inference, but is ridiculous in the extreme. Hence, we must conclude that the theory Mr. Inman has imposed on the principle of necessary inference is wrong, **PROVEN BY THE VERY DEFINITION OF NECESSARY INFERENCE, ITSELF!**

II. THREE PRINCIPLES WHICH THE LAW OF NECESSARY INFERENCE ENVOLVE PROVE IT DOES NOT AUTHORIZE THE USE OF ALL PROPER AIDS:

The Three Principles are these:

(a). "Anything that was not in existence—such as the radio, automobile, tuning fork and so on, at the time of the writing of the Scriptures was not, and could not be necessarily inferred by any verse or verses of the Scripture unless that portion of Scripture was prophetic."

(b). "Everything necessarily inferred by a Scripture must be done before that Scripture is obeyed."

(c). "Christians in all places and all ages would have to use the same aids in obeying a commandment if aids are necessarily inferred or else the Scriptures would infer one thing in one place and age and something else in another place and age—the Bible does not change to suit men!"

A brief discussion upon each of these principles will establish them. I follow the order above:

Scripture other than prophecy could not infer anything which was to be invented in the future. Peter on Pentecost used necessary inference as a method of proof from the prophecy found in Psalms 16:8-10. He reasoned that David was both dead and buried and his sepulchre was with them until that day. Therefore, David's body saw corruption and his soul was left in Hades, hence David, in Psalms 16:8-10 was necessarily inferring someone else. But when David uttered this prophecy which necessarily inferred the resurrection and crowning of Christ—the resurrection and crowning of Christ had not taken place, hence were not in existence. I do not deny that the prophecies of the Scripture may necessarily infer many things, but not something which is and was, but something which shall be. But Scriptures other than prophecies do not infer future things, unless all Scriptures carry a prophetic necessary inference. This, of course, is not true.

Now the question to be decided is whether the Scriptures used by Brother Inman, to necessarily infer those aids mentioned in his proposition, are prophetic or not? If they are, we might grant him the right to say these aids are inferred. But if they are not prophetic then he must remove this difficulty before we can agree that such aids as the radio, automobile, etc., are inferred. What Scriptures did he use? Why they were Eph. 5:19; Mk. 16:15; Matt. 28:19; Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:1-2, etc. Is there anything prophetic in these Scriptures? Can Scriptures be prophecies and commandments at the same time? Should he decide these Scriptures were prophetic, however, he could not use them because his proposition limits him to "obeying God's commandments"—not obeying prophecies. (Note the proposition!) I think Brother Inman will agree to the following: (1) That Scriptures

must be prophetic in some sense to infer future things. (2) That Scriptures are not both prophecies and commandments; and (3) That Mk. 16:15; Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:1-2, etc., are not prophecies, but commandments or examples. Will you agree? If you do, then you are forced to say that the Scriptures you used do not necessarily infer the radio, automobile, tuning fork, etc.

Now to the second principle: "Everything necessarily inferred by a Scripture must be done before that Scripture is obeyed." Because the inference of a Scripture is the teaching of that Scripture. My opponent says necessary inference is one way to teach; if so, then to obey the teaching is to obey that which is inferred. He said the radio is necessarily inferred in the commandment to preach (Mk. 16:15). If so, the radio must be used before that commandment is obeyed. Did the apostles use the radio? They obeyed this commandment didn't they? Can one commandment have two teachings? If not, then aids are not inferred. Because more than one aid may be used in obeying a commandment. The law of necessary inference would force some Scriptures to have a double meaning or else demand the Scripture to infer one aid only to each commandment. How would one decide whether he was using the aid necessarily inferred? I tell you, to say aids are authorized by necessary inference is a terrible wresting of that law—as the above principle shows.

Now to the third principle: "Christians in all places and all ages would have to use the same aids in obeying a commandment if aids are necessarily inferred or else the Scriptures would infer one thing in one place and age and something else in another place and age—the Bible does not change to suit men!" If such is the case the Bible is a changing Book. It means one thing in one age and place and something else in another. According to Inman the commandment to preach would teach us to use a

radio, because it inferred one, but did not reveal the same meaning to the apostles since they did not use one. Does the Bible change its inferences; its meanings, with the inventions and progress of men? If so, the modernists are right in saying, "we need a new Gospel for a new age." Brother Inman's theory of necessary inference is extremely modernistic!

III. THE FACT THAT THE TASK OF SELECTING AIDS IS NOT THE RESPONSIBILITY OF GOD, BUT OF MAN PROVES THAT THE LAW OF NECESSARY INFERENCE DOES NOT AUTHORIZE THE USE OF ALL PROPER AIDS:

Another error of Brother Inman's reasoning lies in trying to put the responsibility of selecting aids upon God when God has placed that responsibility upon man. Had God taken the responsibility of selecting each and every aid for each and every commandment in the Scripture—then all aids would have been mentioned by name in connection with the commandments in a clear cut form until there could not have been any mistake about them. Had God done this, at least, three disadvantages would have been the result; (1) The Bible would have been so large one could not lift it. It could be said of aids as it was of the miracles of Jesus: "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written everyone, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." (John 21:25). (2) Had every aid been written which is profitable to us today they would have covered up and engulfed the commandments until it would have been difficult to have grasped the thought God wanted to convey. (3) It would have stunted or prohibited civilization. Because all modern inventions such as the radio, automobile, air-plane, printing press, etc., had not been dreamed about at the time of the writing of the Scriptures. Unless these had been included in the prophecies of the Scripture. Then it would not have

worked, because the early Christians could not use aids known to them only by prophecy—and for us to use them today would not be obeying the Scriptures alike. So it would have been a disadvantage to God's program had each aid been written in the Scriptures.

Had God taken the responsibility of selecting aids to be used in obeying His commandments He would have perhaps done one of two things: (1) He would have selected aids which were in existence during the time the New Testament was being written and commanded all Christians of all ages to have used the same aids. This would have forced us to have mounted the backs of camels instead of riding automobiles in going to preach. (2) He would not have sealed the New Testament but would have kept inspiring and revealing things to his followers which could be used as aids. This way, God could have added the radio, automobile, etc., to His written word as they came into existence by the instrumentality of man.

God did not take the responsibility of selecting aids, however, but left that up to man. God does his work through the instrumentality of man. Had God done it all, including the selecting of aids, man would have not been much of an instrument. Man is free moral agent and therefore has been allowed the privilege of using his judgment in matters of "expediency" wherein the authority for aids is found. The above reasons should be abundant proof that God does not take the responsibility of selecting every aid which man uses in obeying his commandments. Will you agree to this Brother Inman? Surely you will not disagree! If you do agree you are forced to give up your theory on necessary inference. **BECAUSE IF GOD DID NOT TAKE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF SELECTING AIDS HE DID NOT NECESSARILY INFER THEM BY HIS WORD!**

Since God is the Author and Giver of the Scriptures and since God did

not take the responsibility of selecting every aid profitable in obeying the Scriptures (evidenced by the fact aids are not mentioned in the Scriptures). THEN WE ARE FORCED TO CONCLUDE THAT GOD DID NOT NECESSARILY INFER ALL AIDS BY THE SCRIPTURES!

IV. THE PROPER DISTINCTION BETWEEN FAITH AND OPINION PROVES THAT THE LAW OF NECESSARY INFERENCE DOES NOT AUTHORIZE THE USE OF ALL PROPER AIDS:

All the restoration fathers such as Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell, Pendleton, Scott, Stone, Smith, Johnson, Sweeney, Franklin and their contemporaries of the movement classified all matters of Christianity under two great, general headings. These were: first, matters of faith; and second, matters of opinion.

All matters of faith were authorized by three (and only three) ways: By direct commandment, scriptural example and necessary inference. All matters of opinion were decided by what is known as Christian liberty or the law of expediency.

The restoration fathers never once contended that matters of opinion were decided by a direct commandment, scriptural example or necessary inference. They recognized the difference between faith and opinion—the very thing Brother Inman is failing to do—the lack of which has him in a mess of confusion. I suggest that you secure a set of the Millennial Harbinger's and re-read what our early fathers had to say on faith and opinion. Alexander Campbell was too wise to try to justify the use of aids by necessary inference so he wrote an article on "The Law of Expediency." If he believed aids could be justified by necessary inference, why did he justify them by "The Law of Expediency?" He no where calls the law of expediency, the law of necessary inference. While some aids can be authorized by a direct com-

mandment; all cannot. Others are authorized by a Scriptural example; all cannot. Some are authorized by necessary inference; all are not! But all aids can and are authorized by the law of expediency. Christ commanded two disciples to bring him an ass upon which he rode into Jerusalem. (Matt. 21:1-10). The ass was a commanded aid. (verse 6). It aided Christ in making His Triumphant entry into Jerusalem. Paul rode a ship Acts 28:11. Therefore, an aid authorized by apostolic example. "A sound from heaven filled all the house where they were sitting." Acts 2:2. The word "sitting" infers seats, hence an example of authorizing an aid by necessary inference. While all aids cannot be authorized by these three methods, all matters pertaining to faith can. While the matters pertaining to faith are not justified by the law of expediency all proper aids are. Even aids mentioned in the Scriptures may be included in the commands of other Scriptures where they are not mentioned, hence authorized by the law of expediency from these other Scriptures. So a proper distinction between faith and opinion proves that the law of necessary inference is mainly used to authorize matters of faith and not matters of opinion—to which the use of aids belong!

V. THE FACT THAT THERE IS A "LAW OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY" OR "LAW OF EXPEDIENCY" PROVES THAT THE LAW OF NECESSARY INFERENCE DOES NOT AUTHORIZE THE USE OF ALL PROPER AIDS:

It is not necessary that I quote a host of human authorities to prove that there is a recognized "law of expediency," or "law of Christian Liberty" for hundreds of scholars have written on this subject and Brother Inman will concede the reality of such a law. So I introduce the Apostle Paul, a Divine authority, to establish this fact. He says: "All things are lawful unto me but all things are not expedient." (I Cor. 6:12 and 10:23). This shows the Scrip-

tures give recognition to that which is expedient. While the Scripture here states it negatively; there is nevertheless, positive authority herein contained. There is a principle of expediency recognized in this Scripture which is something different from what Paul terms "as lawful." He probably means by "lawful" that which is from God in stated precepts; while he probably means by "expedient" that which is left to the judgment and discretion of the mind of a Christian as he obeys "all things that are lawful."

For a thing to be lawful there must either be a direct commandment, scriptural example or necessary inference. But for a thing to be expedient this is unnecessary for Paul makes a distinction between "that which is lawful" and "that which is expedient." We might say then that there are four things to justify the actions of a Christian:

- (1). A direct commandment.
- (2). A Scriptural example.
- (3). A necessary inference.
- (4). A law of expediency.

Campbell says: "Now the law of expediency is the law of adopting the best present means of attaining any given end." What might be expedient in one nation might not be expedient in another. What might be expedient in one age might not be expedient in another. It was expedient in the days of the apostles to ride a camel in going to preach the Gospel, but it is expedient to ride an automobile today. Expedients (Aids) for one in obeying the commandments of God might not be expedients (Aids) for another, therefore, aids (Expedients) are to be justified as "expedients" and authorized by the law of expediency.

Mr. Webster defines the word "expedient" — fit; convenient; suitable; proper; that which aids as a means to an end; device." To adopt this definition and think of it in harmony with the Scriptures, will do for a definition of the law of expediency. I

believe all aids can be justified Scripturally by this definition and are therefore authorized by it. Lets put it to the test:

1. **The Song Book**—In Eph. 5:19 we are commanded to sing. The methods of carrying out this commandment are not mentioned but we must use that (only) which is expedient. "All things are lawful, but all things are not expedient." It is expedient that we use a song book, because "it is fit, convenient, suitable, proper: that which aids as a means to an end, a device." This being true it is authorized by the law of expediency recognized from the passages found in I Cor. 6:12 and 10:23.

2. **The Communion Set**—The example of taking the Lord's Supper recording in Acts 20:7 failed to specify the details; so we are at liberty to use those things (only) which are expedient. "It is fit, convenient, suitable, proper:" to use a communion set as an aid in obeying this precept and a communion set "aids as a means to an end, is a device," therefore, authorized by the law of expediency.

3. **The Radio**—We are commanded to preach Mk. 16:15. While God has provided natural acoustics, I believe man has the liberty to improve himself along any line. Therefore, if circumstances make it "fit, convenient, suitable, proper, a means to an end, a device" in having the radio as a form of acoustics, it is authorized by the law of expediency. This authority is recognized from I Cor. 6:12.

4. **The Church House**— We are commanded to assemble Heb. 10:25. Nothing is said about "where" the assembling is to take place. The church house "is a fit place, is convenient, is suitable, is proper; is that which aids as a means to an end," therefore, authorized by the Scripture as an expedient.

5. **Instrumental Music** — We are commanded to sing Col. 3:16. The pitch, the tune, and various methods of obeying this commandment are not

mentioned. We must do that which is expedient according to I Cor. 6:12. The instrument of music gives the pitch, the tune and so on which makes it "fit, convenient, suitable, proper; that which aids as a means to an end" therefore, it is expedient that we use one in singing. Hence, the instrument is authorized by the law of expediency. If not, why not? Remember "consistency is a jewel."

6. We could use the saloon, theater, pool room and so on as aids in making money in order to obey God's commandment "to give" found in I Cor. 16:1-2. But these things are not, "fit, convenient, suitable, proper: that which aids as a means to an end," therefore, are not expedients, hence not authorized by the law of expediency drawn from I Cor. 6:12. So we see that all things proper for using in obeying God's commandments can be authorized by the law of expediency and their use agrees with Mr. Webster's definition of "expedient." But all improper things are excluded by the law of expediency and do not harmonize with Mr. Webster's definition. Just here I will say a word on the side to the reader and put,

"A BUG IN YOUR EAR!"

The bug I want to put in your ear is this. "All things authorized by the law of expediency are matters of opinion and not matters of faith." "All things are lawful, but all things are not expedient," says Paul. In other words, all things were lawful, but he had to use his opinion as to when it was expedient to do them. The expediency in doing a thing was decided by the opinion of the individual. It might be expedient for you to use eye-glasses in reading God's Word, but would not be expedient for me to do so. Therefore, you must use "your opinion" as to what is expedient for you and I must use "my opinion" as to what is expedient for me. These opinions of ours, of course, must not change any law of God, nor usurp authority over one; nor must our opinions involve something wrong

within itself. We might say then, that the law of expediency is a Scriptural authority granted to the liberty of an individual in exercising his opinion in obeying all things that are lawful. Now, here is a bug for Brother Inman's ear! (1) All aids cannot be justified by necessary inference. (2) All aids can be justified by the law of expediency that are profitable. (3) But the law of expediency is a Scriptural authority governing matters of opinion. (4) Instrumental music is governed or authorized by the law of expediency, hence is a matter of opinion. No individual has the right to condemn the opinion of another—that is, condemn those opinions that are authorized by the law of expediency, which is a Scriptural authority. I Cor. 6:12.

THEREFORE, SINCE I HAVE PROVED THAT ALL AIDS CANNOT BE JUSTIFIED BY THE LAW OF NECESSARY INFERENCE AND SINCE I HAVE PROVED THAT ALL PROPER AIDS CAN BE JUSTIFIED BY THE LAW OF EXPEDIENCY AND SINCE I HAVE PROVED THAT ALL THINGS AUTHORIZED BY THE LAW OF EXPEDIENCY ARE MATTERS OF OPINION—THEN THERE IS NO GROUNDS WHATSOEVER TO REJECT AND CONDEMN INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC—WHEN YOU DO, IT IS YOUR OPINION CONDEMNING MY OPINION! This bug will continue to live as a plague to my opponent's position.

VI. THE TESTIMONY OF SCHOLARS PROVE THAT THE LAW OF NECESSARY INFERENCE DOES NOT AUTHORIZE THE USE OF ALL PROPER AIDS:

I challenge Brother Inman to find one scholar of any note or reputation who used the law of necessary inference to authorize the use of aids. No scholar ever did. No not one!

1. Alexander Campbell: "Still there are many things left to the law of expediency, concerning which no pre-

cepts are found in the apostolic writings. Many things, indeed, that are of vital importance to the well-being and prosperity of the kingdom of Christ. This is not, this cannot be a matter of standing revelation. They are, then, in one sentence, those things, or forms of action, which it was impossible or unnecessary to reduce to special precepts, consequently they are not faith, piety, nor morality; because whatever is of faith, or the worship or of the morality of Christianity, was both possible and necessary to be promulgated; and is expressly and fully propounded in the sacred Scriptures. The law of expediency, then, has no place in the determining the articles of faith, acts of worship, nor principles of morality." (For this article on expediency in its entirety, see my third speech of our first proposition).

Does this article on expediency by Campbell anywhere resemble Inman's theory on necessary inference? A thousand times no! It forever settles the matter. It shows that Campbell did not consider the use of aids authorized by necessary inference but by "the law of expediency," which is as much different from the law of necessary inference as opinion is from faith.

2. J. H. Garrison: "Instruments are used under the law of Christian liberty, just exactly as hymn books, notes and different parts of music, and as a hundred other expedients are used." (Otey-Briney Debate, p. 125).

3. J. B. Briney: "When that principle was enunciated, after having matured, the idea was that in matters of faith, things that must be believed, and matters of ordinance, things that must be done, where the Bible speaks on those subjects, we speak; and where the Bible is silent, we are silent. That great principle was never intended to be applied to matters of mere opinion or philosophical or theological speculations, but to matters of

faith and ordinance. Why, my dear friends, if you were to undertake to load upon that principle the philosophies and opinions and speculations of men, you would soon sink it far beyond recovery beneath the rubbish of the traditions—it does not pertain to church architecture. It does not mean to regulate church furnishings. It does not mean to decide what kind of windows shall be in a church house. These are matters that pertain to human taste, and one man may have one opinion in regard to Church architecture and another man another, but whether the one or the other, it is a question that does not fall under this principle." (Otey-Briney Debate, P. 33).

Briney said the above in discussing the principle: "Where the Bible speaks, we speak, etc.," but does not this principle involve the principle of necessary inference? To speak where the Bible speaks is to do nothing except by direct commandment, scriptural example or necessary inference—that is, in matters of faith. So when Briney objected to putting aids under the principle "Where the Bible speaks, etc.," he objected to putting them under necessary inference.

4. M. D. Clubb: "That there is a large class of things which come within the sphere of expediency in the work and worship of Christians is so clearly taught in the New Testament that it needs no special emphasis. The tuning fork is justified by the opposers of instrumental music on the ground that its use is necessary to get the correct pitch in singing. The only real authority for its use is the law of expediency." (Clubb-Boles Debate, P. 139, 140).

5. Daniel A. Sommer and J. N. Cowan, who are anti-instrumental music, both wrote principles to authorize aids other than the law of necessary inference. The Scholars are against my opponent.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE PAPER

By CLIFTON INMAN

It is always easier to answer what an opponent has not said than to answer what he has said. It is also easier to cast reflections upon the character and motives of another. This seems to be the style of debate used by my opponent. He full well knows and all others can see that he did not touch the arguments made by me in my first affirmative, but he set up a straw man and tried to fight it instead.

Concerning the radio, communion set, automobile, collection basket, tuning fork, etc.—I showed passages which commanded the things to be done which these aid. I further showed that, since there was no specification made as to the means of carrying out these commands, it must be necessarily inferred that we may use any means which does not violate some other scriptural principle. Julian has made this same argument in his affirmative papers. He quoted Cowan and Briney to prove it. I used his quotation from Briney in my last paper. Is he now going back on his own authors and own argument? The Bible does not infer that we are to use no other method of travel than the automobile. The thing that it infers is that we may use any method, since no particular method is specified. If it infers that we can use any method, can we not use the automobile? Certainly so if it be a method—and it is. This can be said of all the other things named.

The definition of "necessary inference" given by him is virtually the same as that which I gave. There is no use in spending needless effort in arguing about it. I might say this; a word sometimes has more than one meaning. All the definitions of the word, "necessary," can not be well

applied to an inference. Let us take my opponents definition though and notice how he misapplied it. The conclusion that we may use the song book is the thing which cannot be otherwise, not the song book itself. I think that a child can see this. The conclusion that we may use a communion set is the thing that cannot be otherwise, not the communion set itself. The conclusion that we may use the radio is the thing that can not be otherwise—not the radio itself. The conclusion that we may use a collection basket is the thing which cannot be otherwise—not the collection basket itself. I never once said neither did I intimate nor can anything I said be led to mean that other things could not be used in the place of these things. The thing which I said and taught is that each of these things is permissible. This is true of his "clear-cut" case also. In Acts 2:2 we are told, that the apostles were sitting. Seats are not indispensable to sitting, but the conclusion that we may use them is, since the Bible does not specify the place where we are to sit. We could sit on the ground or on the floor, but the Bible does not specify these places as being the ones to be used so we may use any place which does not violate some other principle.

Let me say this concerning his assertion that the instrument is mentioned forty-four times in the New Testament—I challenge him to name one of these passages which mentions these instruments as being used during christian worship service. We are not debating whether it can be used at other times nor whether it will be in heaven. The question is whether or not it can be used during christian worship service. I will give him one bright silver dollar if he can show

that even one of these passages mentions the mechanical instrument as being used in the christian worship service. The instrument to be used in the christian worship is designated as being the heart, the understanding (mind) and the spirit. Since God has designated these instruments we cannot infer that we are at liberty to use what we please. Let us notice a close parallel from the Old Testament. God told the Israelites to teach the law. (Deut. 6:7; 11:19). He did not specify any method of teaching. We find that later (likely in the days of Ezra) the synagogue form of teaching was adapted. This was not wrong, for Christ placed his stamp of approval upon it by teaching there. God had not specified the manner of their teaching so they were at liberty to use any method which was in keeping with all other divine principles. For this reason they could use the synagogue. There is another case where God gave a command and specified the manner of carrying it out. When Nadab and Abihu failed to carry it out as He commanded, they were killed. (Lev. 10:1)

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF SELECTING AIDS

I have said heretofore that every aid is not specifically mentioned in the Bible. This I have abundantly proved. This does not lead one to conclude that he may use any aid which may suit his fancy. God has by certain principles limited the aids which man may use. Whenever he designates any certain procedure or any certain aids, that limits us to those things designated. Certainly when He designates certain things and certain procedures, we cannot use others at our fancy's demand. If we could, we could justify many of the unscriptural practices of sectarianism. We could use statues as do the Catholics, maintaining that they aid us to better comprehend God and to feel more clearly his reality. We could burn incense claiming that it aids us through the medium of the mind, by putting us in a more pleasant frame of mind

and by helping us to have a more solemn attitude. We could have picture shows, maintaining that they help us to draw a crowd. We could have games upon the same excuse. We could sprinkle infants, claiming that it aids us to reach the children and to hold them closer to the church. Yes, if the Bible specifically mentioned every aid to be used it would be a book so large that we could not lift it, but if it told us everything that we are not to use in specific terms, it would be even larger size. God therefore has chosen to set forth certain clear principles which govern the use of aids. We may use any which comply with these principles.

FAITH AND OPINION

I had meant to cover the subject of faith and opinion later, but since my respondent has already introduced it, I am more than glad to take it up here. An appeal has been made to the pioneers of the restoration and I have been requested to read the Millennial Harbinger. Thanks, I have already done that and I take great pleasure in quoting it here. Julian says that the mechanical instrument is authorized by the law of expediency. He then says that "All things authorized by the law of expediency are matters of opinion and not matters of faith." Since he has accepted the pioneers as authority upon this score, I shall use them to test his contention. Remember that he says that the right to use the instrument is a matter of opinion and not a matter of faith. Let's now see what the pioneers say: "As it respects opinions, these can never, with us become legitimate matters of discussion. They are divested of importance, when it is known that they are incapable of proof, doubtful and variable products of the human brain." (R. Richardson, Millennial Harbinger Abridged, V. 2, p. 49). This pioneer said that opinions should not be discussed. Julian says, "I will challenge you to discuss them till the last one of you is out of Sandy Valley." Bro. Richardson said that they could never be proved, that they

are doubtful and changeable. Julian says they are certain and tries to prove them. Again Richardson said, "If it can not be produced as expressed or directly implied, in terms of Scripture, it is at once evident that it is not a matter of faith, but that it belongs to the chapter of untaught questions which occupies so large a space in all the editions of Popular Theology. We should, therefore, have nothing to do with it, as Christians and reformers." (Ibid, pp. 48, 49) Richardson says that we should have nothing to do with opinions. Julian says, "I will put a bug in your ears." Another time Richardson said, "An opinion is, at least, a mere intellectual conception. It is not a fact. It is not a truth. It can not be legitimately a matter of faith. It is something that is incapable of verification, something that is merely plausible; and, though it may sometimes be probable, it is always apocryphal." (Ibid, p. 48)

In an extra published by Alexander Campbell in 1832 he had the following questions and answers:

"Q. 129. Are not the opinions of men placed upon the same footing with the commandments of God in all the creeds in the Christian world?

A. They are very generally, if not universally so.

Q. 130. Can you give us a very clear instance of this?

A. I think we have one in the institution of infant sprinkling and in every speculative dogma found in the creeds of Christendom." (Mil. Har. Abridged, pp. 39, 40, V. 2)

Campbell said that infant sprinkling was (and is) a matter of opinion. Hunt says that the mechanical instrument is a matter of opinion. This being true, according to Campbell, infant sprinkling and the mechanical instrument are upon the same plain.

In speaking of a certain man who had been converted from the univer-

salist's and who still held some of his former opinions, Campbell had this to say: "Some of us made a proposition that if these peculiar opinions were held as PRIVATE opinions, and not taught by this brother, he might be, and constitutionally ought to be, retained; but if he should teach or inculcate such private opinions, or seek to make disciples to them, he would become a factionist, and as such could not be fellowshipped." (p. 38 of the Millennial Harbinger Abridged, V. 2; also page 146 of the 1830 Harbinger) Brother Campbell says that one who teaches private opinions is a factionist (one who causes division) and that he should not be fellowshipped. Julian says that the right to use the mechanical instrument is a matter of opinion. Since he teaches this opinion and says that he will run all those who do not accept it out of Sandy Valley, he voluntarily admits that he is a factionist and ought not to be fellowshipped, for he has gone on record as accepting the teaching of Campbell and the other pioneers on the question of opinion. Do you have another bug to put in our ears, Julian? Do you still want us to read the Harbinger?

Let me repeat that the law of expediency given by Campbell does not authorize the use of the mechanical instrument of music. Campbell was better able to interpret his own law than my opponent. He said that to spiritually minded Christians, such aids as the mechanical instrument are as a cowbell in a concert. This was in the Harbinger, too.

THE SCHOLARS AND NECESSARY INFERENCE

My respondent says that there is not one scholar who will accept this law. He has quoted several principles which he seems to think contradict the principle of necessary inference. None of them do, however. Briney stated the principle of necessary inference in his discussion with Bro. Otey on the Mechanical Instrument question. Somner and Cowan both

accept the truthfulness of it. When Briney quoted the statement given by Julian in his last paper, he was not referring to the principle of necessary inference.

Campbell's statement that "There is neither precept nor precedent in the New Testament for building, hiring, buying or possessing a meeting house" is certainly true. A precept is a command; a precedent is an example. All that Campbell says, therefore, is that we do not have a command or example for the use of a meeting house. He does not say one thing about not having a necessary inference.

N. B. Hardeman in his discussion with Boswell had this to say concerning Boswell's right to use the instrument: "You have no right to do that. Why? Because not one single word have you read from the Bible as direct authority, apostolic example, or necessary inference." Julian says that Hardeman is the greatest debater among us. Boswell accepted Hardeman's contention that we should have a direct command, apostolic example or necessary inference for our practices in the following words: "Everything that I have brought to this discussion has been predicated upon all three elements of his definition — terms found in the Scriptures, apostolic precedent, and necessary inference."

Not only do these men all accept these rules of interpretation, but so has every scholar of any note who has been connected with the restoration movement. These principles hold true also in civil law.

1 CORINTHIANS 6:12

This passage has been very much overworked by the users of the mechanical instrument. They have failed to notice anything much in it, however, but the word, "expedient." Notice what Paul said: "All things are not expedient . . ." Julian says, that "He probably means by 'lawful' that which is from God in stated pre-

cepts; while he probably means by 'expedient' that which is left to the judgment and discretion of the mind of a Christian as he obeys 'all things that are lawful.'" Let's just take his own definition. Notice that only those things which are lawful are expedient. Some of those things which are lawful are not expedient. All are lawful; all are not expedient. The law permits me to do many things which are not expedient for me to do at all times and under every circumstance. Before one can, according to this passage, say that the instrument is expedient, he must prove it to be lawful and also that it is fit and proper. My opponent says, "For a thing to be 'lawful' there must either be a direct commandment, scriptural example or necessary inference." Taking his own reasoning in harmony with the passage under consideration, we must conclude that before a thing is expedient it must be either a direct commandment, we must have scriptural example for it or a necessary inference and we are then not to use it unless it is fitting and proper under the circumstances in which it is to be used. This conclusion my friend virtually admits in the following statement from his paper: "All things were lawful, but he had to use his opinion as to when it was expedient to do them." Do them what? Evidently those things which were lawful. But he says for a thing to be lawful we must have a direct command, scriptural example or necessary inference. Let us then substitute the meaning of the words for the words themselves and see how the sentence reads: "All things were approved by direct commandment, scriptural example or necessary inference, but he had to use his opinion as to when to use these things which were so approved." Thanks for the argument.

A SUMMARY

I have now answered all that he had to say in his paper. I wish, therefore, to review what has been said and especially the argument of my first paper. I told you in the begin-

ning that I was obligated to show a scriptural principle which authorizes the use of the song book, the tuning fork, etc., which does not at the same time authorize the use of the mechanical instrument of music, or show a principle which condemns the use of the mechanical instrument of music which does not condemn the use of the other things named. In order to defeat me and my proposition, he is obligated to (1) show that the principle which I use to authorize the use of the song book, tuning fork, etc., is not sound, (2) show that the principle which I use to authorize these authorizes the instrument also, (3) show that the principle which I use to condemn the use of the mechanical instrument is unsound or (4) show that this principle condemns also the use of the song book, tuning fork, etc. He has accepted this as a proper analysis of our duties.

After I had thus shown our respective obligations I offered the principle which authorizes the use of the song book, tuning fork, etc. This principle is the principle that things are authorized by direct command, by New Testament example or by necessary inference. I also gave this principle in another form as taken from Briney; viz., "When a thing is commanded to be done, and the method of doing it is not prescribed, those commanded are at liberty to use their best judgment in devising ways and means to carry out the command, and they are to act under the principle laid down by Paul in 1 Corinthians 14:40, 'Let all things be done decently and in order.'" I said and maintain that this statement of his to be necessarily inferred. It is a conclusion which is inescapable. It is the only logical conclusion which one may draw. I then applied this principle to each of the things named in our proposition. I shall do the same again.

1. The song book—God has told us to sing. It is necessary that we have a song before we can sing. It is necessary that this song be obtained

from some place. God has not prescribed any certain place from which to obtain the song. It must be necessarily inferred that we may obtain it from any source which does not violate some other clear principle of scripture. Since a song book is some place, it must be necessarily inferred that we may use it.

2. The tuning fork—In the command to sing there is implied some pitch upon which to sing. It is necessarily implied that we use some means of obtaining the pitch. This means is not prescribed. We must necessarily infer that we are at liberty to use any means which does not violate some other clear New Testament principle. We may then use the tuning fork unless it can be shown that it violates some other principle of scripture.

3. The church house—We find that the apostles used a house. We may then use one also. The person or persons who must own the house is not prescribed. It must be necessarily inferred, therefore, that the ownership is immaterial. We may use any house regardless of its ownership unless that ownership is in violation of some other principle of scripture.

4. The radio—We are told to hear. In order to hear there must be some means of carrying the sound of the voice to the one who is to hear—There must be some form of acoustics. The Bible does not prescribe any form of acoustics. Therefore we must necessarily infer that we may use any form of acoustics which does not violate some other clear principle of the New Testament.

5. The collection basket—We are told to lay by in store (at least this was a command given by the apostle Paul to all the churches of his day. We certainly should follow their example. If one will look closely he will find that the First Corinthian letter, in which this command was given was written, was addressed to "all those who in every place call upon the name of the Lord." (1 Cor. 1:2)

This contribution was to be collected into one place. It must be necessarily inferred that some means of collecting be used. The Bible does not prescribe any means. Therefore, it is to be necessarily inferred that we may use any means which does not violate some other scriptural principle. Any effort to get around this reasoning by pointing to the fact that the collection mentioned in 1 Cor. 16:2 was for the poor saints at Jerusalem is to be pitied. The purpose for which it was to be collected has nothing to do with the case unless my opponent wishes to infer that we are not to lay by in store today because there are no poor saints at Jerusalem. Is that your idea, Julian? The contention that this contribution was merchandise and not money has no foundation in fact. It would have been impossible for the apostle Paul to have carried merchandise from all the churches of Achaia and Macedonia to the church at Jerusalem under the conditions by which he had to travel. It would have nothing to do with the case if it had been merchandise.

6. Communion set—We are taught to commune. In communing we are to have bread and wine. We must have some form of containers for these items. This is necessarily inferred. If we have a container for each this would be a set. The Bible places no limit upon the number of containers to be used, so we must infer that we may use as many containers as are advisable as long as we do not violate some other principle of the scripture.

7. The automobile — We are told that preachers are to be sent and that they must go. The method of their going is not specified in the command. It must be necessarily inferred that we may use any method which is not in violation of some other principle of the New Testament. Since the automobile is some method, we may use it.

(Just here I want to put in a little something for our anti-Bible class

friends. We are commanded to teach. The method of teaching is not prescribed. We may therefore use any method which does not violate some other principle of the New Testament. We may do this just as the Jews were allowed to have the synagogue).

My opponent did not attack this argument at all. He merely tried to make believe that I had taught that each item named above is indispensable in its self. This I never argued, nor can that conclusion be logically or lawfully drawn from what I said. He used the very same argument in his reply, for he said: "In Eph. 5:19 we are commanded to sing. The methods of carrying out this commandment are not mentioned but we must use that which is expedient. 'All things are lawful, but all things are not expedient.' It is expedient that we use a song book, because it is fit, convenient, suitable, proper . . ." Why does he say that we may use the song book?—Because it is fit, convenient, etc., and because the methods of singing are not mentioned. Is not this the same reasoning which I used? Certainly so. He is wrong in only one particular. The method of singing is given: the place from which to obtain the song is not.

Now we must ask the question, can the instrument be authorized by the above reasoning? The answer is no. Why not? Because the instruments to be used to accompany the singing are specified as being the heart, the understanding and the spirit. God's specification is our limitation. When he specified the instruments to be used we are limited to those instruments. I demonstrated the truth of this principle by the case of Nadab and Abihu and by the Lord's supper.

My opponent tried to offset my principle by adding another one, opinion. He has appealed to the pioneers in support of his principle. They taught that we are to hold our opinions as private property. They said that if we did not so do we should be disfellowshipped. All the users of the

mechanical instrument teach and advocate its use. Julian says that he will run the non-users out of Sandy Valley. J. C. Stark, another mechanical instrumental music advocate, said concerning Bro. Joe. S. Warlick, "Another draft on his imagination is the statement that 'Brother McGarvey besought them [the little church at Lexington] with tears not to put it in.' This is all for effect. There is not a particle of truth in it. Brother McGarvey never came up sniffing and bawling like a whipped school boy because he could not have his way. He could leave like a man and go where there was no organ, which he did." (Stark-Warlick Debate, p. 38) We now see who are the causers of division. Evidently those are who possess such an attitude. Their opinion is worth more to them than the fellowship of good, conscientious people.

CAUSERS OF DIVISION

While upon the subject of division, I wish to make another argument. I have shown that the use of the mechanical instrument of music is not authorized. It is no part of the doctrine of Christ. Paul said for us to mark those who cause division and occasions of stumbling among us contrary to the doctrine which we have received. (Rom. 16:17) There is a division over the use of mechanical instruments. My opponent virtually admits that the right to use it is not a part of the doctrine of Christ when he tries to justify it by opinion. One of his brethren, J. S. Lamar, said this concerning its use: "All parties search the Scriptures for authority, pro and con, and finding none, as, of course, they do not, the matter not being the subject of Scripture teaching at all, they strain and force different texts into a sort of simulated support of their respective positions . . ." (New Testament Christianity, p. 25) If this be true, I charge that those who use the instrument are causing division contrary to the doctrine of Christ. When I had Julian in my home recently, I told him that if he would come with us and hold his opinion

that we have a right to use the mechanical instrument as a private opinion and not teach it, that I thought the brotherhood would accept him. (I told him this because I had heard that he had said that he would do this). He immediately told me that we wanted to get him because we thought that his influence would draw others. I said nothing further, for I knew that it was useless until he took a more humble attitude.

Someone may object to this reasoning that it will cause us to give up individual communion cups, Bible classes, etc., because there are those who oppose them also. This would be a valid objection if these are proved to be contrary to the teaching of Christ. I have showed that the New Testament authorizes them though. Until a flaw is found in my reasoning this objection can not be urged. Julian has found no flaw.

NEW TESTAMENT USAGE

There are two good ways of testing the soundness of any practice. These two ways are to note New Testament usage and teaching and to find the attitude and usage of those who lived at the same time as the apostles and shortly thereafter. Let us now consider New Testament usage. There are some seven times that the music in which Christians are to engage in praising God is mentioned in the New Testament. None of the forty-four times mentioned by my opponent have reference to a christian worship or praise service here upon earth). In Acts 16:25 we are told that ". . . At midnight Paul and Silas prayed, and sang praises unto God: and the prisoners heard them." Paul says in 1 Cor. 14:15, "What is it then? I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also." In 1 Cor. 14:26, "How is it then, brethren? When ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm. . ." In Col. 3:16: "Let the Word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns

and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your heart to the Lord."

In Eph. 5:18, 19: "And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit; speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord . . ." In Heb. 2:12: "Saying I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church I will sing praise unto thee." In James 5:13: "Is any among you afflicted? Let him pray. Is any merry? Let him sing psalms." These passages all give the type of music which christians should use as being vocal and a particular kind of vocal music—singing. There are two major families of music: vocal and instrumental. There is another hybrid family, vocal music accompanied by a mechanical instrument. God had these from which to choose. He chose vocal. There are three branches of vocal music: singing, whistling and humming. He chose singing. We cannot, therefore, say that God has not specified. To show that I am correct in my interpretation of these scriptures, let us notice how the

EARLY CHRISTIANS

interpreted them and the attitude which they had toward the use of mechanical instruments. Clement of Elaxandria, "one of the greatest and noblest of early Christian writers . . . born in the middle of the second century," (Sanford's Cyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, p. 195), said, "Let the pipe be resigned to the shepherds, and the flute to the superstitious who are engrossed in idolatry. For, in truth, such instruments are to be banished from a temperate banquet, being more suitable to beasts than men, and the irrational portion of mankind." (Works of Clement of Elaxandria, translated by Roberts and Donaldson, Bk. 2, ch. 4, p. 215) Again he said, "For man is truly a pacific instrument; while other instruments, if you investigate, you will find to be warlike, inflaming of the lusts, or kindling up amours or arousing wrath."

Prof. John Girardeau, Presbyterian, of Columbia Theological Seminary said, "The church, although lapsing more and more into defection from the truth and into corruption of apostolic practice, had no instrumental music for 1200 years (that is, it was not in general use before this time)." (Instrumental Music, p. 179)

Lyman Coleman, another Presbyterian: "The tendency of this (instrumental music) was to secularize the music of the church and to encourage singing by a choir. Such musical instruments 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 centuries. Previous to this they had their place in the theatre, 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, 37)

Joseph Bingham: "Music in churches is as ancient as the apostles but instrumental music not so." (Antiquities of Christian Church)

Fessenden's Encyclopedia: "1. Vocal music. This species, which is 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. 1, 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 instruments. 2. Instrumental music is also of very ancient date, its invention being ascribed to Tubal, the sixth descendant of Cain. That instrumental music was not practiced by primitive Christians but was an aid to devotion of later times, is evi-

dent from church history." ("Art Music," p. 852)

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." (V. 2, p. 1,702)

The New Learned History: "Ancient Art Music," V. III, p. 5,956): "Both sexes joined in singing; but instruments of every kind were prohibited for a long time."

How Music Grew, Bauer and Feyer, p. 73: "Books were written by hand and were hard to get. The teacher had a monochord, the instrument invented by Pythagoras, to give the pitch, for all singing was done without accompaniment." "At first the songs were sung unaccompanied, but later as in the time of David, the church allowed instruments." (p. 76)

Each of these men tell us that the early church did not use the mechanical instrument. They tell us also that its use was opposed by the early christians. It was not because of a lack of substance with which to purchase the instruments that they left them out; they lived near the times of the apostles; they understood the apostles teaching and attitude, therefore, they opposed them.

Someone is ready to say, "Yes, but the early church did not use the tuning fork, the song book and the automobile." This is true, but you can not show that they ever very generally opposed them. You can not show a principle of their teaching which condemns them. Furthermore, none of these things were ever opposed by the church in general at their introduction. There were a few isolated cases of opposition—no general opposition. The opposition to the mechanical instrument was general. It was omitted by the common consent of the early christians. Remember that it was in existence in their time and they would have used it had it not been thought to be contrary to the principles of christianity.

Who now can use the mechanical instrument of music in their worship services? The Bible does not authorize it. The early church opposed it: My opponent, himself, says it is a matter of opinion. The pioneers opposed the instrument and said that we should not teach our opinions. All then must surely agree that we as christians and lovers of unity and of God's Word must lay aside the mechanical instrument. Accept those things for which we can find authority in the Bible by either direct command, New Testament example, or necessary inference. God will then accept us. We can go forth hand in hand, a united force, battling Satan and all his forces of darkness. We can then have a hope of a glorious resurrection in which we will hear the Lord proclaim, "Well done thou good and faithful servant." I thank you.

SECOND NEGATIVE PAPER

By JULIAN OLYN HUNT

First, I wish to call the reader's attention to my duties as set-forth in my first speech. Remember I said I had five duties. First, I was to test the law of necessary inference. This I did and proved beyond a doubt that aids cannot be authorized by this law. I am through with this duty as I have fulfilled it. Second, I will cite Scriptures and show the possibility of instrumental music being inferred. At least, I can show that the same reasoning Bro. Inman uses to necessarily infer the radio, tuning fork and all those things in his proposition will also necessarily infer the instrument. Therefore, he cannot consistently use these things by necessary inference without using the instrument. Third, I will test his principle involved in a specific commandment and show that because a commandment is specific does not debar the use of aids. I will show that Brother Inman has the principle of a specific commandment excluding the wrong thing. It excludes substitutes, not aids. Fourth, I will show, however, that if the specific commandment to sing excludes the instrument it also excludes the song book, tuning fork and so on. Fifth, I will make some affirmative arguments.

The reader is asked to please keep my duties in mind. Before going further with them I will notice a few things argued by my opponent. I wish to ask - -

WHY WASTE YOUR TIME?

You wasted nearly six type-written pages out of ten allotted you in discussing things not concerning your proposition. You wrote on, "Who Caused the Division?" "What Early Christians Say!" "The New Testament Usage of the Word Sing!" And

so on! These things do not help establish your proposition. What is your logic, Inman? Should I grant that my brethren caused the division would this prove you can consistently use the radio, tuning fork, and so on and condemn the instrument? Even though early Christians (?) say the word sing is in the New Testament seven times, and say too, that the early Church sang, does this prove your proposition? If you have no better proof than that, your proposition stands hopeless, helpless and hapless!

By the way, the reader is asked to turn back and read his article on the "Early Christians." It is amusing! He used eight persons and only one could possibly be called an early Christian. He calls three of them Presbyterians (Girardeau, Lyman and Coleman). Great guns! Are these Presbyterians early Christians? Was Joseph Bingham an early Christian? Was Fessenden's Encyclopedia written by an early Christian? Was Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia written by early Christians? You have them classified as "Early Christians." Fine authority you have for establishing your proposition!

Plus this, these eight authorities did not supply any proof for the confirmation of your proposition. Did these men contend that they could consistently use a radio, song book, collection basket, and so forth and condemn instrumental music? Did they? A thousand times no! Therefore, you are off the subject, Mr. Inman! You used these men for one thing when your proposition needed something else.

What little you said on the proposition were arguments copied (nearly word for word) from your first pa-

per. You must fill up your space with something, you know! But why waste your time?

WHO CAUSED THE DIVISION

Since Brother Inman desires to discuss this instead of affirming his proposition I stand ready to "discern the evil spirit," "to stick closer to him than a brother," and "follow whithersoever he goeth!" I will give six valid arguments why Brother Inman and his brethren caused the division in the Church of Christ over the instrument:

Argument one: They caused the division because they make the use of the instrument a test of fellowship while my brethren and I do not. Now to prove this, let me ask my opponent this question: "Will you come to one of our congregations and worship with us and permit us to use the instrument?" Of course, your answer is no! But we will go to your congregations and permit you not to use it and worship with you. Now notice reader, it is Brother Inman's opinion that it is wrong to use the instrument. It is my opinion that it is all right to use it. Well, I respect, his opinion and go preach with him and not say a word about not using the instrument. But Brother Inman will not come over and preach with me and permit me to use it. He lets the instrument divide the fellowship of him and me, therefore, he causes division over the instrument. Since I will preach with him and permit him to do without it and he will not preach with me and permit me to use it, then he is guilty of forcing his opinion and making the instrument a test of fellowship. There are only two ways that there could possibly be division over the instrument. These are, to either make "the use" or "non-use" of it a test of fellowship. We do not make the non-use of it a test of fellowship because we sing "with" or "without" it. But the opposers make the use of it a test of fellowship because they will not sing with it.

Therefore, they (not us) are responsible for the division over the "use" of it.

Argument Two: The anti-instrument brethren were not registered at Washington, D. C. until 1906, while the Church of Christ, restored by Campbell, was registered in eighteen hundred and something. This shows that they "split off" from those of the restoration movement and started another group. Therefore, they are merely a chip "slabbed off" from the old mother block. Hence, a prong of division!

Argument Three: The fact that Brother Inman makes the use of the instrument a matter of faith while I make it a matter of opinion proves that he is the offender. While in his home I made the statement: "Well, Brother Inman, I believe one can go to heaven and hold the view you do, or the position I do, regarding the instrument." He said: "I don't think so." So he thinks I am going to Hell for using an instrument. With such an attitude as this, you know he is going to separate himself from my fellowship, hence will divide from me and therefore, will cause division between him and me. Since, I believe he can go to Heaven and be against the instrument I have no reason for dividing and parting fellowship with him. The reader can see this, surely! How can my brethren be the cause of division when we do not have one solitary reason for separating ourselves from the opposers of the instrument? We believe they can go to heaven and be anti-instrumental music; so we consider them our brethren and desire to go to heaven with them. But no! They contend we are going to Hell for using it and therefore divide with us, and parting themselves asunder, they pierce the sword in the side of the spiritual body of our Saviour.

Argument Four: The fact that we call our opposers "BROTHER" and they refuse to return the same courtesy proves they cause the division.

Roy Hall said he had as soon call the Pope of Rome, Brother as one of us. No wonder I said I would run the last one of them out of the Sandy Valley. They were unknown in that section until about five years ago, but when they came; they came challenging, debating; challenging, debating—desiring to win a point rather than to win a soul; came dividing Churches, taking over Church property erected and paid for by us. Saying that the line must be drawn between the Church of Christ and the Christian Church. We tried to reason with them, but to no avail. So when every other way for peace had been tried and failed, I decided to explode their hobbies. I skinned, their bully (Hall) six nights so badly that their heads drooped in sorrow. Desiring to get revenge they challenged me for the second debate with their bully. He got such a dose that he walked out on them and quit the second night. Your friend, Garland Corns gave up the fight and admitted he was unable to meet my arguments in a written debate. A. E. Harper was skinned so he left the country. Henry Parson refused to debate—scared to try it! So my prophecy has nearly come true because hardly an anti-preacher can be found in the Sandy Valley. The reader can use his judgment whether Inman ought to leave or not by reading this debate. I feel safe in saying he will not do much in the Sandy Valley, so he might as well leave. **THE CHALLENGE IS HANGING STILL OVER THE HEADS OF THE ANTI-INSTRUMENT BROTHERS TO DEBATE THE INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC QUESTION** and I now have it in capital letters before your very eyes.

Argument Five: You fellows caused the division because you preach on the subject nearly every where you go, while our brethren never preach on it unless it is when some of you come challenging and over riding your hobby in a form of tactics too disgraceful to mention. Then we might take the pleasure in exposing your inconsistencies. My brethren

consider the question a dead issue and hence have no reasons for preaching on the subject, but your brethren take delight in it and thereby cause division by it.

Argument Six: The anti-instrument position is divisive. They endorse and up-hold some aids and agencies and reject and condemn others. Any inconsistent position is divisive and for this reason they are responsible for the division over the instrument.

The reader will notice that I have given six clear-cut, convincing arguments which prove that Inman and his brethren are the causers of the division among the Churches of Christ—but what did Mr. Inman give? Nothing, unless it was a narrow assumption. I could give much more on this issue but should my opponent bring it up again, it will be ignored because it supplies no proof in establishing his proposition.

WHY CRAWFISH?

My respondent argued in his first speech that the commandments of God as found in Mk. 16:15; I Cor. 16:1, 2; Acts 20:7; Eph. 5:19; and others necessarily inferred the radio, collection basket, communion set, tuning fork and so on. But I quoted Webster's definition of necessary inference and showed the ridiculousness of such a contention and now he has "crawfished" and is trying to change his contention in his second paper. He says the aids, themselves are not necessarily inferred, but the **CONCLUSION** is inferred. All can see that he has crawfished! Because his first paper plainly says the aids, themselves are inferred. He has now gone back on that, given it up, and says, **NO! IT IS THE CONCLUSION THAT IS INFERRED!** Not the radio, but the conclusion! Not the song book, but the conclusion! Not the communion set, but the conclusion! Not the automobile, but the conclusion—which is inferred!

Holy Horrors! Do you think this effort to smuggle your defeat helped you any? A thousand times no!

You only laid down the bars for a worse predicament! Now notice: If the conclusion that we may use the radio is the thing that cannot be otherwise, as you say — then we ask: "Did the Apostles draw that conclusion?" When they read: "Go into all the world and preach the Gospel," did they draw the conclusion that they could use and must use the radio? Did they? A conclusion which could not have been otherwise? If the conclusion could not be otherwise, as you said, then the apostles would have drawn that conclusion because, as you said, it could not have been otherwise. If they did not draw that conclusion, then "the conclusion is not the thing which could not have been otherwise" hence you are forced to say the radio, automobile, tuning fork, and so on are the things which could not have been otherwise—that is, if you, Mr. Inman, are correct in saying the authority for the use of aids is found in the law of necessary inference. A contention which no scholar will contend. Not even N. B. Hardeman nor Ira M. Boswell, even though you say they do. You misapplied their statements. The Hardeman-Boswell Debate on instrumental music dealt with the question, whether the music was "IN" worship or not. Therefore, if "IN" worship it is a matter of faith, and being thus, demands either a commandment, example or inference. They were not discussing instrumental music as an aid (as we are) but whether "IN" worship. Therefore they did not say aids are authorized by the law of necessary inference as you accused. No scholar does or ever did! Please fine one before you undertake it!

Who ever heard of "A CONCLUSION," apart from something, being inferred? That certainly is a new one! If the commandment to preach infers a conclusion to use a radio; it infers the radio, itself. You made a distinction where there is not any difference. You cannot split hairs, when there are no hairs to split. If it only infers a conclusion without in-

ferring a radio—then why do you use the radio? Surely not by necessary inference! If the commandment to sing infers a conclusion without inferring a song book—then why do you use the song book? By what authority? It could not be by necessary inference. If the commandment to "go preach" infers a conclusion without inferring an automobile — then by what authority do you use an automobile? Not by necessary inference! Get this please! **IF THE RADIO, SONG BOOK, AUTOMOBILE, COLECTION BASKET AND ALL OTHER AIDS IN THE SAME CATEGORY ARE NOT NECESSARILY INFERRED BY THE SCRIPTURES, AS YOU NOW SAY, THEN THEY ARE NOT AUTHORIZED BY THE LAW OF NECESSARY INFERENCE.** Therefore, all can see that my opponent has simply "crawfished" in order to "try" to escape a total defeat. I tell you, Brother, the use of aids cannot be justified by the law of necessary inference, so why try any longer? They are authorized by the law of expediency! **LET ME REPEAT AGAIN AND AGAIN: THE MAIN ERROR OF THE ANTI INSTRUMENT POSITION LIES IN A FALSE CONCEPTION OF THE LAW OF NECESSARY INFERENCE.** When their theory of necessary inference has been taken away from them, then the authority for aids naturally appeals to the law of expediency where it belongs. When this is done they have no grounds for being against instrumental music—because "that which is expedient" is left to the judgment, liberty and opinion of each individual or congregation.

Next, he says: "Seats are not indispensable to sitting, but the conclusion to use them taken from Acts 2:2 is." But seats, themselves are indispensable to sitting. How in the world can one sit without seats sir? you answer, on the ground, floor, and so on, but everybody else knows that such places are seats: You cannot squirm around the fact that seats, themselves, are necessarily inferred

in Acts 2:2 (a clear-cut case of necessary inference) but the radio, song book, etc., are not inferred—either "themselves" or "a conclusion" to use them, from the scriptures you introduced.

Next, he challenged me to mention one passage which shows the instrument in connection with the worship service from the forty four references I gave. First, let me say that I did not give these passages to prove they were used in the worship service but to offset the false idea of him contending that the Church knew nothing about the use of the instrument until the eighth century. However, I can cite one of the forty-four passages which mentions the instrument in connection with a worship service. In Rev. 5:8, 9 and 14 verses, it is mentioned thus: In verse eight it says they played harps. In verse nine it says they sang. In verse fourteen it says they worshipped. Here we have playing harps, singing and worshipping mentioned together. Verse nine shows it was after the Cross and that it was those who had been redeemed by the blood of Christ who played on harps. Were angels and elders in heaven redeemed by the blood of Christ? (See Heb. 1:14). These who played the harps were redeemed: "for thou was slain and hath redeemed us." (Rev. 5:9). Plus this, John wrote: "to the seven Churches which are in Asia." (Rev. 1:14). The things in the book of Revelation were written to the Churches. "I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the Churches" (Rev. 22:16). Mr. Inman thinks this worship service took place in Heaven. While I do not believe it did, since John "wrote to the seven Churches" and "testified these things in the Churches," but if it did—what of it? It was a Christian worship service. All in heaven are Christians according to the Apostle, Paul. He says: "The whole family in Heaven and earth is named after Christ." (Eph. 3:14, 15).

Should our friend bring up the issue that they have things in Heaven

which cannot be used in the Church service on earth, I answer in advance by stating this principle: "Anything in Heaven can be used in the church today if it aids in obeying a commandment of God and does not violate the scriptural principle which I laid down in our first proposition. I challenge him to mention one single thing!

BROTHER INMAN ON FAITH AND OPINION

He criticized my statement: "All things authorized by the law of expedience are matters of opinion and not matters of faith." However this statement is as sound as Gospel! I think I can establish the truthfulness of it until all can see it. Brother Inman will have to concede it. And when he does he has completely lost this debate and logically given up his contention against the use of the instrument. I am giving him fair warning in advance! It is nothing but fair since he is in the affirmative that he answer my questions which are directly on the issue—the answer to which will throw a thorough light on the subject under discussion. So I offer the following:

IMPORTANT QUESTIONS FOR BROTHER INMAN

1. Is anything authorized by the law of expedience?
2. Is any matter of faith authorized only by the law of expedience?
3. Are matters of opinion authorized by the law of expedience?
4. Are the law of expediency and necessary inference the same law?
5. If not, what use is the law of expediency if aids are authorized by necessary inference?
6. If they are the same laws, why did you say, in our oral debate, they were different laws?
7. If the law of necessary inference and the law of expediency are not the same laws why did Alexander Campbell contend that aids were authorized by the law of expediency instead of necessary inference?

8. If they are the same laws—then did not Campbell contend that all matters of necessary inference are matters of opinion in his article on the law of expediency?

9. Does the law of necessary inference have any place in determining the articles of faith, acts of worship, or principles of morality? (Campbell said: "The law of expediency has no place in determining the articles of faith, acts of worship, or principles of morality." Christian System p. 94).

10. Are the things authorized by necessary inference matters of faith?

11. Are the things authorized by the law of expediency matters of faith?

12. Is the radio, automobile, song book, collection basket, communion set, tuning fork, chart, church house, and aids in the same category matters of faith or opinion?

13. Is instrumental music a matter of faith or opinion?

14. Was I correct in my statement: "All things authorized by the law of expediency are matters of opinion and not matters of faith?"

I feel safe in saying that Brother Inman will not attempt to answer the above questions. He might merely mention them in order to claim he answered them, but the reader is asked to pay particular attention to what he says and decide yourself whether he answers them or not. The correct answer to these questions completely overthrows and defeats his theory based on necessary inference.

He claims he has been reading the Millennial Harbinger but we notice that he quotes Richardson's Memoirs of Campbell instead. He thinks he has the pioneers against me, but all can see that he is living in a glass house and trying to throw stones. He quotes Richardson: "As it respects opinions, these can never, with us become legitimate matters of discussion, etc." Now he says the pioneers said "opinions" should not be discussed. Since I make instrumental music

a matter of opinion, Brother Inman says I should not discuss it. Are you begging for mercy? You were the challenger for this debate! You challenged me to discuss this "matter of opinion" with you. I can do it and still fellowship you, but you are now wanting to disfellowship me. Why did you challenge me to debate the question if you are against discussing opinions? You asked me to do it and now harping because I agreed to. Is instrumental music a matter of faith or opinion with you? If faith, you ought to use it! If opinion, aren't you discussing opinions? Or do you have a part in this debate? Is the radio, song book, tuning fork, and all those items in your proposition matters of faith? You know they are not! Then aren't you discussing your opinions? The pioneers are against you, sir! Why throw stones at me while living in a glass house yourself? I suppose it is all right for you to discuss opinions but all wrong for me?

The fact is, Brother Inman misuses the statements of Mr. Richardson. The only thing Mr. Richardson (and Campbell, too) argued is that matters of opinion should not be made matters of faith. This is exactly what I have contended for throughout this entire debate. I have argued that instrumental music was merely a matter of opinion while on the other hand Brother Inman has held that it is a matter of salvation. For he says: "It is vitally connected with the salvation of souls." So he makes it a matter of faith—the very thing that the writers of the Harbingers objected to. You, Mr. Inman, stand in direct opposition to the pioneers for you have taken your private opinions and attacked me with them; contending that they dealt with matters of faith—hence I use your quotation from Richardson to condemn you: "Some of us made a proposition that if these peculiar opinions were held as PRIVATE opinion, and not taught by this brother, he might be, and constitutionally ought to be, retained; but if he should teach or inculcate such pri-

mate opinions, or seek to make disciples to them, he would become a factionist, and as such could not be fellowshipped." (Taken from Millennial Harbinger Abridged V. 2, P. 38). This statement which was originally taken from Campbell condemns Brother Inman and his brethren. For all who know them, know that they seek to make disciples to their opinions (their hobby). They do not hold their opinions as PRIVATE either, but echo them from the pulpits and religious journals. The pioneers say you are factionists and should be disfellowshipped. The Harbingers are against you! Not against us!

Certainly we want our opponent to read the Harbingers because he surely did not read them correctly, if he read them at all. The bug is still in your ear, for your interpretation of the pioneers is surely "buggy!"

I have answered all of his material in his speech so now I proceed to fulfill my other duties. Since I have shown that the law of necessary inference is not the proper source to find authority for the use of all proper aids—it leaves FOUR duties to perform! So next we will show,

IF THE SCRIPTURES NECESSARILY INFER THE RADIO, TUNING FORK, COLLECTION BASKET, AUTOMOBILE AND SO ON THEY ALSO NECESSARILY INFER INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC

Argument One: The only reason Brother Inman has given for the use of the song book and tuning fork is that they are necessarily inferred by the commandment to sing found in Eph. 5:19. Bear in mind that this, however, is only a "wild guess" entirely without one iota of proof. The verse reads: "Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord." Now my opponent says since no place is specified from which to obtain the song and the pitch, it is necessarily inferred that we may use a song book and tuning fork for these purposes. Why

not say an instrument of music is necessarily inferred from which to get the pitch? Since the pitch can be gotten from an instrument of music as easily as from a tuning fork and neither the tuning fork nor the instrument is mentioned? Not only does it take a song and the proper pitch in order to sing but it takes a tune also. We can get the words of a song from a song book. We can get the pitch from a tuning fork. We can get the tune from the sound of a musical instrument. Therefore, if the song book is inferred, from the commandment to sing (to give the words) and the tuning fork is inferred from the commandment to sing (to give the pitch) then the instrument of music is inferred from the commandment to sing (to give the tune). (Remember I proved that if the notes of a song contained the proper tune, that the sound of an instrument did also, because the instrument transforms the notes into sound understandable to the ears, therefore, causes the proper tune to be recorded on the mind which enables one to sing!) **IMAGINE OUR OPPONENT SAYING THAT THE COMMANDMENT TO SING INFERS A PLACE TO GET THE PITCH (A TUNING FORK) AND DOES NOT INFER A PLACE TO GET THE TUNE (THE INSTRUMENT).** Isn't that something for you? Great consistency, that is!

Argument Two: Eph. 5:19 contains five different things and surely all of them do not refer to singing: (1) Speaking to yourselves in Psalms. (2) Hymns. (3) Spiritual songs. (4) Singing. (5) Making melody. Does all this refer to singing? Does all this necessarily infer **ONLY** the song book and tuning fork? If it all refers to singing then it must read: "Speaking to yourselves in singing, singing, and singing, singing and singing in your heart unto the Lord." Some interpretation on Eph. 5:19 isn't it? Brother! I contend that something else is included in this passage besides singing. What does all these five terms mean? Surely since in-

strumental music always accompanied singing throughout the Old Testament—the instrument is necessarily inferred in this verse. For the converted Jews had always accompanied singing with an instrument, therefore, it would have been absolutely essential for the apostle Paul to have given them a commandment "NOT" to use an instrument, at the same time and place he gave them a commandment to sing, had he not wanted them to use one. Since no such commandment is given, it is inferred that they used the instrument.

Argument Three: Scholars innumerable say that the Greek word, "psallo" found in Eph. 5:19 contains authority for instrumental music in connection with singing. I refer the reader to the Clubb-Boles Debate for an innumerable host of witnesses. Scholars say the command to "Speak to yourselves in Psalms" means to sing and play an instrument. Note the proof: Psalms: "A song sung to the sound of the lyre to be sung in honor of God" (Zorell). "A Psalm is a song sung to the accompaniment of music" (Younge). "Psalms, a song that is sung, that is, a song of praise to God with an accompaniment on the harp" (Souter). "Psalms, properly a song to the accompaniment of a stringed instrument" (Hastings Bible Dictionary).

Not only are scholars agreed that the instrument is necessarily inferred in this verse, but they say it is commanded—the commandment, of course, being generic and not essential to salvation, just as singing is not essential.

Argument Four: The translations show the possibility of the instrument being necessarily inferred in Eph. 5:19. I will list fourteen translations that so translate "psallo" in Eph. 5:19 to mean instrumental music accompaniment.

1. Montgomery (1924) translates it "Make music."
2. Twentieth Cen. (1902) translates it "Make music."

3. Emphatic Diaglott (1864) translates it "Make music."

4. Rotherham (1872) translates it "Make music."

5. Hayman translates it "Make music."

6. Doddridge (1821) translates it "Sing and Chant."

7. Rotherham (1897) translates it "Strike strings."

8. Coptic gives it "Chanting."

9. Ballantine (1923) translates it "Playing harp."

10. Luther translates it "Playing."

11. Coptic Version (1905) "Playing."

12. Alford translates it "Playing."

13. Weizsaker "Sing and Play."

14. Mofatt translates it "Praise the Lord heartily with words and music."

This array of scholars are against our opponent. They say that Eph. 5:19 contains authority for the use of instrumental music. I have made four arguments based on Eph. 5:19, the very verse, Brother Inman used to infer the song book and tuning fork, and have shown that the instrument is inferred also. He cannot give four good reasonable arguments backed up by scholars that the song book and tuning fork are inferred in Eph. 5:19 as I have done in favor of the instrument. **The instrument not only has as good, but a far better chance to be inferred than does the song book and tuning fork.** So how can our brother consistently use the tuning fork and song book (from Eph. 5:19) and condemn the instrument?

Argument Five: Jesus mentioned music in connection with the most beautiful and pathetic story of the Bible: the story of the Prodigal son. See Luke 15:25. Will Brother Inman deny that Christ was teaching something in connection with the Church in the story of the Prodigal son? What was He teaching if not something in connection with the Church, which was in preparation of being established? Is not the fact that

Jesus mentioned music in this story, in teaching of His Church, a necessary inference for instrumental music?

Argument Six: The fifth chapter of Revelation—the eighth, ninth and fourteenth verses say they played harps, sang and worshipped. "I, Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the Churches." (Rev. 22:16). Is not this a necessary inference?

Now, I have given six arguments which prove beyond a doubt that the instrument of music has a much better chance to be necessarily inferred by the Scriptures than do the song book and tuning fork. This also goes with all those other things mentioned in his proposition. But suppose we try another one—the communion set!

Now notice: "This cup is the New Testament in my blood; this do as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me" (I Cor. 11:25). The Bible mentions "cup" in the singular. Brother Inman says this infers a communion set—that is, a set of several or many cups—that is, "cups" in the plural. If this reasoning will work in regard to a communion set it will work in regard to instrumental music. Now notice: Brother Inman says there are two kinds of music—singing and instrumental music. Then he says that the Bible specifies one kind of music (which is not so) that is, singing. Well, why cannot this one kind of music infer another kind just as the one cup infers more cups—a communion set? Surely the Bible is specific, more so, in the "one cup" than it is in the "one kind of music." Therefore, if his argument on a specific commandment is true the specification of "one cup" excluded a communion set. Hence, he cannot consistently use a communion set and condemn the instrument and once more his proposition falls to the ground.

This finishes my second duty, that of showing that "IF" the Bible necessarily infers the radio, tuning fork,

song book, communion set and so on, it infers instrumental music also. So I come next to my third duty:

TESTING BROTHER INMAN'S NEGATIVE PRINCIPLE, THAT IS, THE PRINCIPLE INVOLVED IN A SPECIFIC COMMANDMENT:

Brother Inman thinks that a specific commandment involves a principle which excludes the use of aids. This of course, is not true! But there is a principle involved in a specific commandment, which excludes "SUBSTITUTES" for that commandment. Let's illustrate: God told Noah to build the ark out of gopher wood. That commandment was specific. If Noah had used oak instead of gopher wood he would have substituted and hence overthrown God's commandment. But the commandment to use gopher wood was specific and therefore excluded oak wood and every other kind of wood as substitutes. So a specific commandment excludes substitutes but does not exclude aids. Inman has it excluding the wrong thing. Noah could have used a "hickory axe-handle" or an "oak log-cart" or a "beech hammer handle" in erecting and constructing the ark out of gopher wood without violating the principle of a specific commandment. That is, used these as aids!

This is true with the use of instrumental music. Should we grant that God specified singing as the kind of music he wanted this would not exclude instrumental music from being used as an aid in assisting the individual to make the kind of music God wants.

This same reasoning can be applied to my opponent's examples of Nadab and Abihu and the Lord's Supper used in his first affirmative paper. I agree with him that other fire could not be used than that specified by the Lord, for the substitution of "strange fire" caused Nadab and Abihu to lose their lives. (Lev. 10:1) Neither could other emblems be substituted for the bread and wine because the Lord has specified these

emblems. Adam Clark, Jamieson-Fausset-Brown, Bengel and others say the Corinthian Church was having an ordinary meal as a substitute for the simple supper of the Lord, hence the reason for Paul saying: "When ye come together this is not to eat the Lord's Supper" (I Cor. 11: 20). The bread trays and communion cups are not substitutes for the bread and wine, therefore are not excluded in the specific commandment to use bread and wine. Neither are song books, tuning forks nor instrumental music substitutes for singing, therefore are not excluded even though the commandment to sing is specific.

Before Brother Inman can prove that the principle involved in a specific commandment excludes and condemns the instrument he must first prove that instrumental music is used as a substitute for singing. **FOR BE IT REMEMBERED THAT THE PRINCIPLE IN A SPECIFIC COMMANDMENT CONDEMNS AND EXCLUDES SUBSTITUTES ONLY FOR THAT COMMANDMENT, BUT DOES NOT CONDEMN AND EXCLUDE AIDS USED IN CARRYING OUT AND OBEYING THAT COMMANDMENT.**

Before leaving this thought, I wish to entirely defeat Brother Inman on this argument by asking him two questions, the last of which places him in a dilemma: (1) Does a specific commandment exclude and condemn substitutes? If so, is instrumental music when used as an aid a substitute? Prove it! (2) Does a specific commandment exclude and condemn the use of aids? If so, does it not exclude and condemn the song book and tuning fork since you say they are aids? If not, how does it exclude and condemn instrumental music since you admit it is an aid?

MY FOURTH DUTY IS TO SHOW THAT IF THE PRINCIPLE INVOLVED IN A SPECIFIC COMMANDMENT EXCLUDES THE INSTRUMENT IT ALSO EXCLUDES

THE SONG BOOK, TUNING FORK, AND ALL AIDS IN THE SAME CATEGORY:

I previously showed that the scripture specifies "one cup" in the Lord's Supper and Inman's communion set is excluded by this specification if his theory of a specific commandment is true. At least, if the principle of specification excludes the instrument it also excludes the communion set. Hence, he cannot consistently use the communion set and condemn the instrument. Thus his proposition falls.

Our opponent says the place from which to get the song books and tuning fork are not specified. Since the musical instrument gives the tune—we are bound to ask. "Does the Scripture specify the place to get the tune?" If not, then we contend the instrument is the place to get it. If the song book is the place to get the words and the tuning fork is the place to get the pitch then the instrument is the place to get the tune. Really it takes three things in order to sing: namely: words, pitch and a tune. Now since you say the place to get the words and pitch is not specified, hence the song book and tuning fork cannot be excluded by the principle of specification, then you are forced to say the place to get the tune is not specified, hence, the instrument cannot be excluded by the principle of specification. Therefore, according to your reasoning, instrumental music is not excluded by a specific commandment to sing. If it is, then the tuning fork and song book are excluded too! Hence, you cannot consistently use one and reject the other—so your proposition falls again!

He also says: "The instruments to be used to accompany the singing are specified as being the heart, the understanding and the spirit." Great guns! Does this exclude instrumental music from being used as an aid in giving the tune. Lucky am I, for now having the privilege of cut-

ting the whole body, soul and spirit out of the whole system of the anti-instrument position. Let me say in capital letters **THAT ANOTHER FALLACY OF THEIR POSITION LIES IN THE FACT THAT THEY DO NOT KNOW WHAT THE "HEART" "UNDERSTANDING" AND "SPIRIT" MEANS IN CONNECTION WITH SINGING!** Our anti-instrument brethren have the idea that the heart is some kind of an instrument that can be tuned up and plucked, twitched and played to accompany the singing. **DID YOU KNOW THAT THE HEART IS NOT AN INSTRUMENT? DID YOU KNOW THAT THE UNDERSTANDING IS NOT AN INSTRUMENT? DID YOU KNOW THAT THE SPIRIT IS NOT AN INSTRUMENT?** Who ever heard of the heart, understanding and spirit being instruments? Yet Bro. Inman says: "The instruments to be used to accompany the singing are specified as being the heart, understanding and the spirit."

The physical heart is an instrument but the Bible heart is not. The Bible heart is the mind, the affections, the desire, etc. Jesus said: "Lay up treasures in heaven for where your treasures are there will your heart be also." According to this, one can live on earth and his heart be in heaven where his treasures are. The heart of the Bible does not mean the physical heart or any thing that can be construed to mean an instrument! The "heart" in Eph. 5:19, is the mind or affections just as the heart is elsewhere in the Bible. So after all is done and said, the thing Bro. Inman and his co-workers contend for, is for the mind to accompany the singing. Since the heart is the mind, and the heart is specified to accompany the singing, then the mind is specified to accompany the singing. But who denies that the mind must accompany the singing? I am sure that my brethren and I do not.

Are you trying to leave the impression, Brother Inman, that I am against one using his mind, his spirit,

his understanding when he sings? Great heavens! He would have you believe that I am in favor of idiots, imbeciles and morons only doing the singing!

Now hear the conclusion to the whole matter. Since the heart is the mind, and the mind is not and cannot be termed as an instrument, then no instrument is specified to accompany the singing. Search Eph. 5:19 and see! Since no instrument is specified then instrumental music is not excluded by the principle of specification. Therefore, my point is proved that there is nothing in connection with the commandment to sing that excludes the instrument any more than there is to exclude the song book and tuning fork—hence his proposition has fallen and left bleeding at every vein!

When Brother Inman insists that the heart must accompany the singing he is doing nothing more than saying that one must use his mind and understanding when he sings. So his contention is, that because one is commanded to use his mind and understanding, that the use of the mind and understanding excludes and condemns the use of the instrument. Isn't that some reason for intelligent people to be against the instrument? The fact is, one would have to use his mind (his heart) if he played an instrument.

The opposers of the instrument seem to be laboring under the impression that the heart accompanies only when we sing. Do they not know that our hearts accompany when we preach? When we pray? When we give? Or when we do any act of worship or work? One makes melody in his heart when he sings; one makes melody in his heart when he preaches; when he prays; gives; takes the Lord's supper; etc. Any acceptable act of worship or work must be accompanied with melody in the heart. But this melody does not exclude the use of any proper aid in exercising any act of worship. Be-

cause the "heart" is mentioned in Eph. 5:19 and not mentioned when Christ said, "Go preach" as found in Mk. 16:15 does not mean that the heart is not to be used when we preach. Now note another argument: We sing and use our hearts! We preach and use our hearts! If the heart excludes the instrument of music when we sing, it excludes the radio when we preach. This conclusion is unanswerable! Therefore, he cannot consistently use the radio and condemn the instrument, hence his proposition falls again!

THE BIBLE TEACHES THAT THE USE OF THE HEART DOES NOT EXCLUDE THE USE OF THE INSTRUMENT OF MUSIC. Note the proof: "O God, my heart is fixed; I will sing and give praise, even with my glory. Awake, psaltery and harp: I myself will awake early." (Psalms 108:1-2). I want the reader to notice three things in this verse: (1) "My heart is fixed." (2) "I will sing and give praise." (3) "Awake psaltery and harp." David's heart was fixed; yet he sang praises and used the psaltery and harp all at the same time. This proves that the psaltery and harp did not keep his heart from accompanying the singing. Even though this verse is found in the book of Psalms, it nevertheless proves that the use of the instrument does not prohibit the heart from being fixed on God. If there is something about instrumental music that keeps the heart from being fixed on God "now" there was "then;" but since there was not "then" there is not "now." Therefore, the specification of the heart (mind) in Eph. 5:19 does not exclude the use of instrumental music. So his proposition falls again!

One more thought: Brother Inman defined the Greek word, "psallontes" to mean: "to touch, to pluck, to pull or to play." Then he says: "The thing to be touched, pulled, plucked, or played is to be specified by the context. The context here specifies it as being the heart." Now the heart is the mind. He says the heart is to be touched, pulled, plucked, played, twitched, etc. If this is the case, then the mind must be touched, pulled, plucked, played, twitched, etc. when we sing. Think of touching the mind; pulling the mind; playing the mind; twitching the mind when we sing. Some people's mind might be touched, pulled or twitched, but not so with my brethren!

The word "psallo" has more meanings than those given by Brother Inman. I tell you, the definition of the word "psallo" cannot be intelligently applied to the mind of a person. Therefore, the scholars are right in saying that the word "psallo" contains authority for touching, plucking, playing, twitching the strings of mechanical musical instruments. So our brother's proposition falls again!

I have one duty left for my next paper, that of making affirmative arguments. Four duties have been fulfilled. Next, I will take a text in Rom. 2:1 and show that our anti-instrument brethren condemn themselves in condemning us, "for he that judgest doeth the same things." I will show that every argument my opponent can make in favor of other aids and against the instrument I can make the same arguments in favor of the instrument and against all other aids in the same category. My next paper will show this!

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE PAPER

By CLIFTON INMAN

It has been the conviction of all who have spoken upon the subject that disputants in honorable controversy should refrain from all remarks concerning the person of another and of those who hold the opposition. This rule my opponent has violated form time to time by references concerning both me and Roy Hall. His reference to Roy as a "bully" is below the level of dignified discussion and I am sorry that it even appears in a discussion that bears my name in any way. It was because of such impeachable behavior on the part of Julian that Roy quit the discussion at Belfry and not because of any defeat at the hand of our friend.

Telling how many men have been run out of Big Sandy Valley will not and does not help the helpless plight of my opponent, even were his assertions true. Personally I know of none that he has run out. All of the men mentioned, with the exception of Harper, visit Sandy Valley more than does he. If I ever leave, it will not be because of any defeat suffered at the hands of Julian Hunt unless he does much better than he has done so far. If I ever leave for any reason and my opponent wants me to come back for a discussion, he may name the time and place. I will be there if he will get the backing of his people.

THAT WASTE OF TIME

Paul said that we should mark those who cause division contrary to the doctrine which we have received. (Rom. 16:17) My opponent has failed to show that the doctrine of Christ supports the use of mechanical instrumentation. I have showed that its use is contrary to it. The only conclusion to be reached then is that the users of the mechanical instru-

ments are causing division contrary to the doctrine of Christ. Paul tells us to avoid them. I further showed that if the other things named in our proposition cause division it is not because they are contrary to the doctrine of Christ. Division contrary to the doctrine is the kind of division that is condemned. Since the use of the instrument is contrary to that doctrine it is thus condemned, but since the use of the other things are not contrary to the doctrine of Christ they are not thus condemned. I am then being consistent when I refuse to use the instrument because it causes division and use the other things which do not and can not cause division contrary to the doctrine of Christ. This is directly on the subject and the only time wasted was that wasted by my opponent in trying to find an answer to this argument. He certainly did not answer it.

I showed that the New Testament usage, as regards music, to be singing and only singing. They had instruments of music in their day. If they had thought them right they would have used them. Their failure to use them shows that they did not feel that they were authorized. This argument cannot be urged against any of the other things in question, therefore, I am consistent again, and still on the subject. Whenever anyone tried to introduce the mechanical instruments into the christian worship service, it was ably and strongly opposed. This is clearly proved by the writings of the early christians and also by the voice of all reputable historians. When the song book, tuning fork, etc., was introduced there was no such opposition. This again shows me to be consistent and shows

the position of my opponent to be untenable. It is directly on the subject.

He made a pitiable effort to do away with the evidence I presented upon this score by pointing out that only one of the men that I quoted was an early christian. Did any one read that I claimed they were. Of whom did these men testify? They testified of the early christians. They said that the early christians refused to use and opposed the use of mechanical instruments of music. They are reputable historians who have studied the writings of the early christians. The fact that some of them were Presbyterians only adds to the value of the testimony since Presbyterians use the mechanical instruments and would present testimony for its use in the early church if there were any forthcoming. We can see again that if there has been any time wasted it was wasted by my opponent in trying to find an answer to my reasoning.

WHO CAUSED THE DIVISION?

1. Julian says that we cause the division because we will not worship with them while they use the mechanical instrument. Julian will not worship with pedobaptists or other denominationalist. So by his own reasoning he is responsible for the division between himself and those people. They claim that they will worship with him.

2. The second reason cited for our being the causers of division is that we were not registered in Washington until after the Methodists and argument at face value. Neither the church of Christ nor the Christian church were registered in Washington until after the Methodists and Baptists. If the one who was registered in Washington first is the one who is right, Julian had better start meeting with the Methodists and Baptists, for according to his reasoning he is responsible for the division between them. The church of Christ was registered in heaven about thirty or thirty-three A.D. (Acts 2:47) I will honor that registration.

3. The third reason given is that I make the instrument a matter of faith and he makes it a matter of opinion. I have nowhere said that the use of the instrument is a matter of faith. It is my opponent's effort to exalt it to a place on an equality with matters of faith to which I object. Infant sprinkling is a matter of opinion. It is the effort to exalt it to an equality with matters of faith that cause both me and my opponent to object it.

4. The fourth reason given to prove that we are the cause of division is that we will not "brother" the users of the mechanical instruments. In the first place, most of my brethren call the users of the mechanical instruments "brother." I called my opponent brother until he insinuated that I was dishonest, idiotic and a few other similar things. I presumed that he would not want to own a dishonest idiot as a brother so I refrained from calling him brother. Julian, do you call the Methodists, Baptists, Catholics, Mormons and Mohammedians brother? If you do not, according to your own logic, you are responsible for the division which exists between them and you.

5. The fifth reason presented is that we preach on the subject but they do not and that they consider it a dead issue. The people who practice infant sprinkling do not often preach on it and consider it to be a dead issue. My opponent preaches on it and does not consider it a dead issue. According to his own logic we must again conclude that he is responsible for the division which is between them.

6. The sixth reason is the claim that we are inconsistent. My opponent has been unable to prove this. I showed in my last paper that he is inconsistent in contending for the use of the mechanical instrument and then condemning the use of infant sprinkling, picture shows in the church and burning of incense as aids. Again we must conclude by his own reason-

ing that he is a causer of division. Every argument which he presented to prove that we cause division proves that he causes division between himself and all other denominations. He will not accept his own logic.

THE CRAWFISHING

My opponent has backed into something and thinks that he can wiggle out by crying out "crawfish." If he had paid close attention to the meaning of the word "inference," he would not have got himself into such an amusing circumstance. The word, "inference" means a Conclusion. The word, "necessary" means that which cannot be otherwise. My respondent took the definition of the word, "necessary," and tried to apply it to the whole phrase, "necessary inference." He said that "necessary inference" means that which cannot be otherwise. But the phrase, "necessary inference," means a conclusion which is necessarily deduced from given facts or a conclusion which cannot be otherwise in the face of these facts. The conclusion that we may use the song book, tuning fork, collection basket, etc., is the thing which is necessary or which cannot be otherwise. My opponent has never attacked this conclusion but has been "crawfishing" away from it and around it all this time. He claimed that the scholars would not accept my claim that there are only three ways by which things may be authorized, viz., apostolic example, direct command and necessary inference. I cited Boswell and Hardeman. He seems to think that they were only joking and did not mean what they said. Then he tries to dodge it by saying they were discussing another subject. Regardless of what they were discussing, they said that things were authorized by direct command, apostolic example and necessary inference. I am persuaded that they meant what they said.

ACTS 2:2

Julian has informed us that the floor is seats and that the ground is seats. Thanks for the information.

Is the ground and floor the seats inferred in Acts 2:2? If so, by what form of reasoning do you conclude that we may use chairs and benches? You must say that we must necessarily infer that we have the right to use them since no particular style of seating is specified. The floor nor the ground are seats in the strict sense of the word though each may be utilized for that purpose. One may use a table for a seat, but it is not a seat in its regular use. We still see that Acts 2:2 presents a perfect parallel to my arguments for the use of the song book, tuning fork, etc.

THE FORTY-FOUR PASSAGES WHICH MENTION THE INSTRUMENT

My opponent has been parading these passages all this time as if they gave authority for the use of the mechanical instrument in the christian worship service. He now tells us that he used them to disprove my claim that the early christians knew nothing of the use of the mechanical instrument. That is strange — a man's trying to disprove a claim which has never been made. I claimed that they knew nothing of their use in the christian worship service. We are not debating their secular use. Now my opponent has given up all these passages with the exception of two (if we count the narrative of the return of the prodigal). Rev. 5 is the only one of the forty-four that he cites as evidence that the mechanical instrument was used in the christian worship service. We are told in this passage that those who had the harps were the "four beasts and four and twenty elders" (v. 8) and that these "four beasts and four and twenty elders surrounded the throne of God. (v. 6) "And I beheld, and, lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth. And he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon

the throne. And when he had taken the book, the four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints." Julian do you have four beasts and twenty four elders to do your playing for you? Notice that every one in the vision except God and Christ had a harp. Does every one present at one of your worship services have a harp? Was John seeing a vision of a worship service somewhere on earth or was he not seeing a vision of heaven? Evidently of heaven. They had vials full of odours. These were figurative. How do we know that "harps" were literal? Evidently the early christians did not think that this authorized the use of the instrument since they opposed its use. It is testified in the churches many times today that there was something like a big sheet let down from heaven containing all manner of four footed beasts before the apostle Peter. (Acts 10:12) Does this mean that we are to have beasts in our worship service? The effort made to bend Eph. 3:14, 15 to aid him in his argument here is without avail. Suppose that the four beasts and other heavenly beings are called christians. Does that mean that we may use any thing in the worship service on earth that they use in heaven? The holy place of the tabernacle represents the church and the most holy place represents heaven. (Heb. 9:6, 7, 24). The most holy place contained the ark of the covenant, the mercy seat, etc. Could they have taken the mercy seat out of the most holy place and have put it in the holy place? Could they have made another mercy seat to place in the holy place? If you say no, by what manner of reasoning do you conclude that we are to use things in the church (the true holy place) that are in heaven, (the true holiest of all or most holy place)? The excuse used to justify this practice has nothing to do with the case.

FAITH AND OPINION

Under this heading my opponent has some questions. Let us consider them:

1. "Is anything authorized by the law of expediency?"

You have said yourself that it is used to decide the fitness or suitability of doing things which are authorized by direct command, apostolic example or necessary inference, for you said that Paul probably meant by "lawful" those things which were authorized by direct command, apostolic example or necessary inference. You then said that all things were lawful but that he had to use his opinion (exercise the law of expediency) as to when to do those things which were lawful. Stick to your own decision.

2. "Is any matter of faith authorized only by the law of expediency?"

You admit yourself that according to 1 Cor. 6:12 that the law of expediency is to be exercised only after a thing is proved to be authorized. Do you want to "crawfish"?

3. "Are matters of opinion authorized by the law of expediency?"

You have said that the law of expediency is the exercise of our opinion to determine the fitness of using things which are authorized by direct command, apostolic example, or necessary inference. I'll just take your decision.

4. Is the law of expediency and necessary inference the same thing?"

According to both Paul and my opponent we are first of all to determine whether a thing is authorized (whether it is lawful). We are then to determine whether it is expedient; i. e. whether it is fit and proper under the circumstances. My opponent has agreed that a thing is lawful when it is authorized by direct command, apostolic example or necessary inference. He then has answered his own question again. The law of expediency and necessary inference are not the same.

5. Number five is answered in number four.

6. This is also answered in number four.

7. "If the law of necessary inference and the law of expediency are not the same laws why did Alexander Campbell contend that aids were authorized by the law of expediency instead of necessary inference?"

I don't know why Campbell did and said many of the things which he did. Suppose my opponent tells us why Campbell said that such aids as the mechanical instrument of music are like a cowbell in a concert.

8. "If they are the same laws — then did not Campbell contend that all matters of necessary inference are matters of opinion in his article on the law of expediency?"

They are not the same. When the Bible tells us to sing and does not specify the source from which to obtain the song. We may necessarily infer that we may use the law of expediency in determining the source. If the song book is a suitable and fit source we may use it provided it does not violate some other New Testament principle. This is practically the same idea as advanced by Campbell. He certainly does not mean to imply that where the Bible has made specifications we are at liberty to ignore them.

9. The answer to nine is yes. It is too long to waste my space quoting it.

10. "Are the things authorized by necessary inference matters of faith?"

We may do them believing that they are right.

11. "Are the things authorized by the law of expediency matters of faith?"

We may believe (have faith) that we may use them when fitting or proper and that we must not use them if they are not fitting or proper. Expediency does not determine whether things are matters of faith but what we can use within the limits of "the faith."

12. We have faith that we may use the radio, automobile, song book, etc. We should use discretionary judgment to determine when it is expedient to use them. "The faith," (the system of faith), authorizes them by necessary inference. It does not bind their use as absolutely essential, however.

13. "Is instrumental music a matter of faith or opinion?"

You said it is opinion and not faith. Since the Bible does not authorize us to use it under any condition, we can not say that we may use it when suitable. If the Bible does not give us liberty to use it, it is never expedient.

14. "Was I correct in my statement: 'All things authorized by the law of expediency are matters of opinion and not matters of faith?'"

Only half right. It must be a matter of faith before we have the liberty to exercise our opinion. If we have a direct specification concerning the type of music to be used in "the faith" (the New Testament), we are not at liberty to use any other. If the manner of doing a thing is specified, the law of expediency can not justify us in using something else.

THE HARBINGER

He claims that I have quoted the *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell* instead of the *Harbinger*. Were this true it would not offset the forcefulness of what was quoted. But the truth of the matter is that his claim is false. He is the one who needs to read the *Harbinger*. He claims that I missused their statements. How does he know. I am persuaded he has not read the context from which they were taken, for he does not know that they were quoted from the *Harbinger*. Who ever heard of a man's claiming that someone missused another's statement when he has not read that man's statement?

Yes, I challenged Julian for this discussion, or at least for an oral one and he suggested the written one. The users of the mechanical instruments were the ones who first intro-

duced the subject though. We may oppose the teaching of an opinion and challenge the teachers of it to prove its soundness. Campbell showed this by telling us to withdraw from those who teach opinions. Paul opposed and disputed with those who taught their opinions. (Acts 15) The man who teaches the opinion is the guilty party. Julian claims that he never teaches on instrumental music. He does in action if not in word, for he uses it. Someone taught on the subject somewhere or else it would never have been introduced.

NECESSARY INFERENCE FOR THE INSTRUMENT?

Argument one: My opponent claims that if Eph. 5:19 infers that we may use the song book to get the song and the tuning fork to get the pitch, it infers that we may use the mechanical instrument to get the tune. The difference lies in the fact that the mechanical instrument produces another type of music than that here specified. It is also another type of accompaniment than the one specified. This cannot be said of either the song book or the tuning fork. Try it. Many people could listen to the mechanical instrument and never learn the tune from it. This is especially true when the song is "seconded" as they generally are.

Argument two: My friend contends that psalms, hymns and spiritual songs are different types of songs and that therefore the instrument is inferred. Preaching and teaching are not altogether synonymous. Does this show that we must accompany them with an instrument? Most scholars admit that there can be no clear-cut distinction made between psalms and hymns, but that the word psalm was probably used because it was understood by the Jews and the word hymn because it was understood by the Greeks. The fact that the Jews had been accustomed to singing to the accompaniment of a mechanical instrument adds to the forcefulness of the conclusion that we are not now to use them, for the early

church did not use the instruments as I have previously showed. Had it been right for them to use them, they surely would have done so, since they were accustomed to do so before. There must have been a reason for their ceasing to use them. The reason is that they realized that they were not authorized to use them. Julian says that since there was no command given for the christians not to use the mechanical instruments, they must have used them—strange logic this. They were not told not to make wave and heave offerings. The Jews were accustomed to do these things. Does this prove that the early christians offered them?

Argument three: In his argument numbered three he tells us that the use of the instrument is commanded, but that the commandment is generic and not therefore essential to salvation. I am wondering where my opponent learned this type of reasoning. Certainly not from the Bible. I will present a round silver dollar to the man who can show me one command of God to the christian that he can leave off and be eternally saved unless it be physically impossible for him to obey it. If the command be generic, it is still essential to salvation. The word music is generic. When God says for us to make music and does not specify the kind we are at liberty to use any kind. When he specifies singing, singing is specific as to the type of music. We are not at liberty to leave it off. We may sing in bass, tenor or alto, but we must sing. If the word psalm means a song sung to the accompaniment of a musical instrument we can not please God without singing to the accompaniment of a mechanical instrument. Since the apostles and early christians never used the mechanical instrument, they never pleased God, if the word psalms includes the instrument. Many of the Lexicographers when giving the definition of "psalms" give the classical meaning and not the New Testament meaning. In the classical meaning

the instrument was included, but even then the instrument was to be named in the context. When we find the New Testament usage directly referred to, we most generally find no reference to a mechanical instrument. Green's Lexicon defines "psalms" as "A sacred song, psalm." Bagster's Lexicon says, "In the New Testament, a sacred song, psalm." E. A. Sophocles who examined every instance of the use of the word psalms during New Testament days, defined it to mean to chant to sing religious songs." The Pulpit Commentary on Galatians and Ephesians says on page 271, "Some have argued that while *adontes* denotes singing, *psallontes* means striking the musical instrument. But psalms is so frequently used in a more general sense, that it can hardly be restricted to this meaning here. The great thought is that this musical service must not be musical only, but a service of the heart, in rendering which the heart must be in a state of worship."

Argument four: The translations are appealed to in support of my opponent's contention that psalms means to sing to the accompaniment of a musical instrument. Let us examine the ones given by my opponent and a few others:

1. Montgomery — "Make music." Paul says in the heart.
2. Twentieth century — "make music." Paul says in the heart.
3. Emphatic Diaglott — "make music." Paul says in the heart.
4. Rotherham — "make music." Paul says in the heart.
5. Hayman — "make music." Paul says in the heart.
6. Doddridge — "sing and chant." Paul says in the heart.
7. Rotherham — "strike strings" Paul says in the heart.
8. Coptic — "Chanting." Paul says in the heart.
9. Ballantine — "playing harp." Paul says in the heart.
10. Luther — "playing." Paul says in the heart.

11. Coptic Version (1905) — "playing." Paul says in the heart.
12. Alford — "playing." Paul says in the heart.
13. Weizaker — "sing and play." Paul says in the heart.
14. Moffat — "Praise the Lord heartily with words and music." He does not say mechanical music.
15. Wyclif — "seyng salme." (sing psalms). Paul says in the heart.
16. Tyndale — "makinge melodie." Paul says in the heart.
17. Cranmer — "making melodie." Paul says in the heart.
18. Geneva Bible — "making melodie." Paul says in the heart.
19. Rheims (Catholic Bible) — "chaunting and singing." Paul says in the heart.
20. King James — "making melody." Paul says in the heart.
21. English Revised — "making melody." Paul says in the heart.
22. American Revised — "making melody." Paul says in the heart.
23. Goodspeed — "sing praise." Paul says in the heart.
24. De Valera, (Spanish Bible) — "alabando" (praising). Paul says in the heart.

Out of these twenty-four translations there is only one which includes any certain instrument—Ballantine. Though some of them translate it playing none of them other than Ballantine designate the instrument to be played. Paul tells us that the instrument to be played is the heart. In these twenty-four translations about two hundred of the world's ripest scholars are represented. My opponent makes the claim that the heart has nothing about it to be touched or plucked—that it has no strings. Every one, however, has heard the expression, "heart strings," "cords of the Heart," etc. Paul evidently knew something of this figure of speech when he told us to pluck the heart. Julian says that his heart cannot be touched. He would become angry if I said the same thing. He pointed out that the heart and the

mind are the same thing and then said that the minds of his brethren could not be touched. What did Luke mean when he said that the people on the day of Pentacost were "pricked in their hearts"? He evidently knew something of this figure of speech. Neither Paul nor the scholars give support to my opponent's position.

Argument five: The story of the prodigal son recorded in Lk. 15 is used by my friend to support his position. It fails to help him though. There was a fatted calf killed and eaten in this story. Can we kill and eat a fatted calf in the worship service? There was a ring placed upon the finger of the returning son. Are we to place a ring upon the finger of the erring child of God who returns to the fold? There was dancing as well as music. Are we to have dancing in the worship service? We do violence to any parable when we try to find a similarity in every point. There is always one main lesson to be taught in a parable. In this lesson it is that God is pleased and rejoices at the return of an erring child and that we should also rejoice. We are not even told that there were mechanical instruments present. The context says "music." It does not say what kind.

I have already answered his argument number six.

THE COMMUNION SET

I believe that we are to use only one cup. The Bible teaches this. I do not believe that the word, "cup" refers to the container. Neither does my opponent. 1 Corinthians 10:16 reads, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" This tells us plainly what the cup is. It is the communion of the blood of Christ. Paul tells us to drink the cup in 1 Corinthians 11:27. If the cup means the container, we are commanded to drink the container. The cup is the fruit of the vine—the communion of the blood of Christ. We are not told how many containers to use, but we are told what substance to use. My opponent

seems to think that the cup refers to the container. Does he use more than one container? If he does, while thinking that "cup" refers to the container, he can give no logical reason for his practice. He is then "anti-communion set" or else his argument is meaningless.

TESTING (?) MY NEGATIVE PRINCIPLE

Julian says that the principle of a specific command condemns only substitutes. He then repeats his worn out assertion that the "strange fire" used by Nadab and Abihu was a case of substitution. If I had dodged and refused to answer a simple, plain, straightforward question upon this subject as long as has he, I would not have the heart to mention it again. I have asked him from the beginning even until now if it would have been all right for Nadab and Abihu to have used the fire from the altar and also used some other fire to aid them to have built a larger fire and a quicker fire.

Silence is the only answer that I have received.

He introduced the statement again that Noah could have used a "hickory axe handle," an "oak log cart," etc. These things are not parallel to the use of the mechanical instruments, however, as has been showed. He himself said that these things were used to "drag in and work up" the Gopher wood. Is the instrument used to "drag in and work up" the singing? If it is not, there is not a parallel. Had Noah used Oak bracing in the ark to have aided him to make it stronger, we would have had a parallel, but Noah would have been condemned for such action.

He now says that Adam Clark, Jamieson, Fausset and Brown, Bengel and others say that the Corinthian church was having an ordinary meal as a substitute for the simple supper of the Lord. This is not true. Has he already forgot his contention that they were only using other foods with the bread and the wine, and that it was for this that Paul condemned them? He should have a better

memory so that he would not cross himself so often. The authorities quoted tell us that they were having a love feast before or after the Lord's supper and that it was at it that the excesses mentioned by Paul took place. They say nothing of substitution. They do not even suggest that the Corinthians failed to have the bread and the wine.

THE QUESTIONS

1. "Does a specific commandment exclude and condemn substitutes? If so, is instrumental music when used as an aid a substitute? Prove it!" You have already answered this question. You admit that it does. It also condemns other things.

2. "Does a specific commandment exclude and condemn the use of aids?" If so, does it not exclude and condemn the song book and tuning fork since you say they are aids? If not, how does it exclude and condemn instrumental music since you admit that it can aid?" A specific commandment condemns the use of some aids; namely those aids which are in the same family and on an equality in that family with the species chosen from that family. When God told Noah to use Gopher wood, all woods in the wood family were excluded except Gopher, regardless for the excuse for their use. If God had told us to walk and preach the Gospel, all other means of going would have been excluded regardless of our excuse for using them. When he tells us to sing all forms of music other than singing is excluded regardless of the excuse for our singing them. Asking questions does not offset this fact. The horns of my opponent's dilemma are easy to handle.

I have now answered all that my opponent has had to say. I shall call to the reader's attention some of the things which have gone before:

1. I took my opponent's quotation from Briney which says that when God commands a thing to be done and does not tell us the manner of carrying out that command we

are at liberty to use any means in harmony with Paul's admonition to let all things be done in decency and in order. I showed that this is a conclusion which must be necessarily inferred. I produced commands which have been given us the manner of the carrying out of which is not specified. I showed that the things named in our proposition could aid us in the carrying out of these commands. I then showed that we must necessarily infer that we may use these things unless there is some other principle of the New Testament which their use violates. My opponent never answered this argument, but tried to dodge its force by giving a false definition to the phrase, "necessary inference." He has been duly exposed in that effort.

He tried to justify the use of the instrument by what Paul had to say about expediency in 1 Cor. 6:12. I took his own definition and showed that if he were right, it got him nothing.

He said that aids are justified by opinion and asked me to read the *Millennial Harbinger*. This I did to his chagrin. He tried to escape the force of his defeat here by asking me several questions. I have answered his questions with his own contentions. I await his reply.

2. I showed that the use of the mechanical instrument could not be justified in the same way as the song book, the tuning fork, etc., because the kind of music to be used in the worship service is specified and the means of accompanying that music is specified. He appealed to the translations on this score. None of them, with the possible exception of one, support his contention. He tried to get the public to believe that I had a misconception of the meaning of "heart" as used in the Bible. I showed him to be wrong on that score. We are not to reach in and pull out understanding. Our hearts should be touched.

He appealed to the case of David's saying that he had a fixed heart and

calling upon the harp to awake. David could do many things with a fixed heart (a heart fixed upon God) that we cannot so do today. He could offer animal sacrifices and have his heart fixed upon God at the same time, but we cannot. He could offer animal sacrifices and make an acceptable melody in his heart unto God, but we can not do that today. Will my opponent say that we can?

3. I showed that New Testament usage forbade the use of the mechanical instrument. He claimed that this was off the subject but I have showed otherwise.

4. I showed that since the use of the instrument is contrary to the doctrine of Christ, those who use it are causing division. He claimed that this was off the subject and then got completely off the subject himself and said some mean things about my brethren. I showed it to be very much on the subject.

5. I showed that the early christians did not use the mechanical instrument and not only did not use it but opposed its use. I showed there was no general opposition to the other things considered in our proposi-

tion. He claimed this was off the subject, but I have showed it to be very much on the subject. He said the witnesses which I introduced were not early christians, but I had not claimed them to be such. They tell us the reaction of the early christians.

CONCLUSION

There are several things that I would like to summarize here, but my space is about used up. I shall review them in my next paper.

I have only one more paper. My opponent has two. I cannot make any new arguments in my next paper. I will not need to, for I have made enough. My opponent has not answered those which have been made. His next paper is the last in which he can make any new arguments. I shall be on hand to answer any new ones that he makes in it. I rejoice in the knowledge that at least a few may be able to see this discussion and in the quietness of their homes study what has been written. I know that with prayerful study and meditation, at least some will be led to see the truth. My prayer is that all may see it and unite upon it. I thank you.

THIRD NEGATIVE PAPER

By JULIAN OLYN HUNT

In the closing remarks of my last speech I promised the reader that I would make affirmative arguments in fulfilling my fifth duty and show that every argument my opponent can make in favor of the radio, song book, tuning fork, automobile and all other aids in the same category can be made in favor of the instrument. On the other hand, every argument he can make against the instrument can be made against these other aids. They all stand or all fall together.

It is unnecessary for me to spend time in hashing and rehashing minor points not concerning the question under discussion. This seems, however, to be what my opponent would like for me to do, for he knows when he comes to the subject he loses. So I will fill most of this paper with affirmative arguments and if space permits will close by replying to some things he has said, even though they are not concerning the issue. In my final paper I will give a recapitulation of the entire debate and in this recapitulation will refute everything he has said with one great sweep. He tried to dodge the question and spend time harping about personal matters; so it makes it necessary that I give these affirmative arguments and completely destroy his inconsistencies.

His proposition demands him to prove that he can "CONSISTENTLY" use aids in the category of a radio, tuning fork, song book, automobile, and so on and condemn the instrument as an aid. The question is not, whether I think song books, tuning forks, radios, etc., can be used (because I believe they can) but the question is can Mr. Inman and his brethren "CONSISTENTLY" use these aids and condemn the instrument of music, which is also used

as an aid. In the words of the wise man Solomon, I shall show that, "the legs of the lame are not equal." (Prov. 26:7). For all consistent minded folk can see that Brother Inman's reasoning is short on one side and long on the other. He is not consistent! To show this I now take a text found in Rom. 2:1 "Therefore, thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things." The thought of this text is, the anti-instrument brethren condemn themselves because they do the "SAME THINGS" they accuse us of doing. They accuse us of adding the instrument to God's word while at the same time they are "inexcusable for judging," for **WHEREIN** they judge us for saying we add the instrument, they add the radio, tuning fork, song book, and so forth to the Word of the Lord. David said: "In the net which they hid is their own foot taken" (Ps. 9:15). Jesus said: "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again" (Matt. 7:1-2) So now I am ready to "measure to them the very measurement they have given us."

ARGUMENT NUMBER ONE: "The same logic, argument or principle by which the anti-instrument brethren authorize the use of the radio in obeying God's commandment to preach authorizes the use of instrumental music in obeying God's commandment to sing."

Notice there are two commandments under consideration in this argument: the commandment to preach (Mk. 16:15) and the com-

mandment to sing (Eph. 5:19). Notice also there are two aids under consideration: the radio and the instrument. God gave the commandment to preach and God gave the commandment to sing. My opponent uses a radio as an aid in obeying God's commandment to preach and I use the piano as an aid in obeying God's commandment to sing. He says I sin when I use the piano as an aid, but he commits no sin in using the radio. But surely the reader can see that "the legs of the lame are not equal."

Now watch: Our respondent condemns the instrument because it is used in the worship service. But is not the radio in the worship service, too? If not, pray tell us, where it is when you use it? It is either in the worship service or on the outside. Let's locate it! If you take the stand that the radio is on the outside of the worship service, then you go on outside of the worship service to do your preaching—therefore, such service is not of God. If you say it is "IN" the worship service then you have a radio in the worship service, and I do not claim any more for the instrument. Tell us the difference in having a radio and having a piano in the worship service? If one is a sin, the other is! Hence, you cannot CONSISTENTLY use one without using the other.

Another argument: Our opposers make a big ado about the instrument being "in the church." They say it is all right in the homes but not in the church. But isn't the radio "in the church" when you preach a Gospel sermon over it? It is, if the instrument is "in the church" when we use it in aiding us to sing a Gospel Song. The radio (when used in preaching) is either in the church or on the outside. Let's locate it again! If you say it is on the outside of the church, then you have to go on the outside of the church to preach over it; this makes your preaching on the outside of the church, hence not of God. If you say the radio is on the inside of the church you have a radio inside of

the church. Thus the radio can be condemned by the same argument you use to condemn the instrument. "Therefore, thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself: for thou that judgest doest the same things" (Rom. 2:1).

Another argument: He says God said to preach and did not say how to do it, hence it may be done over the radio. Well, God said to sing and did not say how to do it, so it may be done with musical instruments. It is true, preaching may be done "with the radio." Likewise, singing may be done "with a musical instrument." Psalms 95:5 says: "Sing unto the Lord with the harp." (Also see Ps. 71:22) So singing may be done "with" the harp, just as preaching is done "with" the radio. The only difference, the Scripture said singing can be done "with" the harp and did not say preaching can be done "with" the radio. So again we have proved you cannot CONSISTENTLY use one without using the other and "the legs of the lame are not found equal."

Another argument: They say there are two kinds of music (vocal and instrumental) and God commanded "one kind of music" to be used. Well, what of it? There are at least three ways to preach. (1) Preaching by mouth, in building, over the radio or on the street. (2) Preaching by written word as through a religious journal, and (3) Preaching by a phonograph record. There is no command to preach by religious journals or by phonograph records, yet Brother Inman and his brethren do both. Of course, the New Testament is written, but it was written by inspired men and it is foolish to undertake to make religious journals parallel to the writing of the New Testament. Now since they use "one way to preach" to aid them to do another, why cannot they use "one way to make music" to aid them to make another? We know why! Because "the legs of the lame are not equal." Noah

was commanded to make the ark out of Gopher wood (one kind of wood) but this did not debar him from using other kinds of wood as aids. Brother Inman said that Noah would have had to use other wood in the ark, itself, for it to be parallel to using the instrument in the worship service. But this is not true! The instrument is not used "IN" worship, which is the very praise offered to God, but the instrument is used in the service as an aid to assist the person who sings. If Noah had put other wood besides gopher "IN" the ark it would not be parallel to using the instrument, since the instrument is not "IN" worship, but only an aid in the service. But since Noah could have used a "hickory-axe handle", "an oak log cart" and so on as aids in constructing the ark — other kinds of wood are not prohibited by the specification "gopher wood" and are therefore, parallel to using the instrument, even though the Lord specified singing. Likewise, one kind of preaching can aid one to do another kind which was specified. Suppose a minister knew of a congregation which was not very well informed and before he had an opportunity to visit it in person, he writes a sermon and sends to them. The congregation reads the sermon, studies and meditates upon it, until the arrival of the minister. The minister stands and preaches the exact words that he had previously written to them. Could the congregation understand his oral sermon better by him previously sending it to them in a written form? Of course, they could. Hence, we see how preaching by written word (one kind of preaching) can aid preaching by mouth (another kind of preaching) even though there is no command or example for preaching by written word. So our opposers are INCONSISTENT in using the religious journals and condemning instrumental music, for religious journals bear the same relation to oral preaching that instrumental music does to singing.

Before leaving their argument on "ONE KIND OF MUSIC" I want to

give other arguments against this theory. Inman claims that the five expressions in Eph. 5:19 "psalms, hymns, spiritual songs, singing, making melody" all refer to singing. For, says he, there is "ONE KIND OF MUSIC" specified. If so, we must read Eph. 5:19 as "Speaking unto yourselves in singing, singing, spiritual singing, singing and singing in your heart unto the Lord." Isn't that something to ask someone to believe? Any learned person can look at this and tell that, this verse refers to something else besides singing. Now, I am going to give five arguments against their theory of "ONE KIND OF MUSIC SPECIFIED" and refute that "bare assumption" for ever more. When that "one kind of music theory" is refuted, every little straw they have will be taken from them.

First. THAT WHOLE ARGUMENT BASED ON "ONE KIND OF MUSIC SPECIFIED" IS BARE ASSUMPTION! I want the reader to notice that God never said nor even hinted anything about "one kind of music" in Eph. 5:19. He said: "psalms, hymns, spiritual songs, singing, making melody." For our opposers to substitute the phrase "one kind of music" for "psalms, hymns, spiritual songs, singing and making melody" is vile wresting of the Scripture. And this they **MUST DO** and **DO** before they have one iota excuse for an argument. That whole argument of "one kind of music specified" is bare assumption. Because "one kind of music" is not specified. They try to put words in God's mouth and make Him say, "one kind of music" when He did not say it. He did not specify, "one kind of music." He specified, "psalms, hymns, spiritual songs, singing and making melody," but all can see that there is "too much" of this to be "one kind" of anything. When you add, "one kind of music" you add to God's book and this you are forced to do in order to retain your hobby!

Second. The fact that the Bible specifies five things in Eph. 5:19,

proves that your argument on "one kind of music specified" is bare assumption.

Third. Here is something I want you to get! When the instrument is used as an aid to the individual in singing it is not "another kind of music" offered as praise to God, but simply a means involved in making music by singing. Note the proof:

(1) The design of the instrument proves this. The instrument plays the same part that the notes of a song play; or the pitch of a song plays. Do notes of a song produce another kind of music? If not, the instrument doesn't, because the instrument "plays the notes," "puts the notes into music," and so on. Since the instrument "puts the notes into sound" or "into music" and since the notes do not contain "another kind of music" different from singing, how then does the instrument make "another kind of music when it is used to transform the notes into sound so as to aid in singing? Now, if you say the notes contain another kind of music different from singing then you cannot use the notes to assist in singing lest you use "another kind of music" other than singing. On the other hand, if you say the notes do not contain another kind of music different from singing, how then do you contend that the instrument produces another kind of music when it plays the notes? The fact is, the notes are simply a means in helping to sing; the instrument is simply a means in helping with the notes, so as to enable us to sing. Therefore, the instrument bears the same relationship to singing as do the notes.

(2) Since the instrument is designed to be used as an aid and not as an act of worship it cannot be "another kind of music." You make much ado about "melody in the heart" so stick to it! If you do, you are forced to say that when my heart is designed to use the instrument merely as an aid in order to sing, and then make melody in my heart by singing—that I do not make another kind of

music on the instrument—for God knows my heart. He knows the design for which I use the instrument, hence he knows I am not making another kind of music as praise to him, but only as an aid to assist me in singing! Get around it, if you can!

Fourth. Brother Inman, himself, has argued for "TWO KINDS OF MUSIC" mentioned or specified in Eph. 5:19 without noticing what he was doing. However, we are used to him contradicting himself in every other paragraph. First, he says singing is specified as the one kind of music. Second, he says the heart is an instrument and its strings must be touched, plucked, pulled and twitched. So he has music by singing and music by striking the strings of the heart, therefore, two kinds of music (according to Inman) is specified. One done by the throat and one made by the heart. So he defeats his argument on "one kind of music" being specified. Now, since he has "two kinds" of music specified in Eph. 5:19, how does he know that another kind is not specified in the expressions "psalms, hymns, spiritual songs," when neither of these three expressions are used by him to specify the two kinds of music he claims are specified?

Fifth. He claims the tuning fork is necessarily inferred in this verse. If so, another kind of music is inferred. Because the tuning fork produces music. Of course, he will deny this, but he may have it out with the following eight scholars, plus meeting my argument that it is. I have before me a song book compiled by S. J. Oslin; G. L. Young; J. T. Lane; J. M. Aslin, W. F. Harrison; S. B. Claiborne; John H. Smith and Hiel A. Key. This book gives ten lessons in the rudiments of music. Each lesson has a number of questions. I now refer to the questions on LESSON I, Page 1.

1. Question: What is sound?

Answer: "Anything we hear."

2. Question: There are how many classes of sound and what are they?

Answer: "Two: Musical and unmusical."

3. What is a musical sound called?

Answer: "A tone."

4. What is an unmusical sound called?

Answer: "A noise."

Now these EIGHT SCHOLARS IN MUSIC say there are two kinds of sounds: musical and unmusical. They say a musical sound is a tone and an unmusical sound is a noise. I ask, can anybody deny these scholars? Common sense shows that they are right. Even my opponent is forced to admit that there are two (and only two) kinds of sound: musical and unmusical. You cannot deny it, Brother! Now the question to be decided is: "Does the tuning fork make a musical sound?" You are forced to say it does, or else you have a noise giving the correct pitch of a song. Since it gives a "sound of music" it is a musical instrument. Therefore, if the tuning fork is necessarily inferred in Eph. 5:19, then our opponent's argument on "one kind of music specified" is contradictory and therefore erroneous!

Quite often the anti-instrument brethren reply to the above argument by saying that the horn of a car gives a sound and according to my argument it is a musical instrument. This will not stand the test. First, because I prefer calling the sound of a car horn, "a noise", hence, unmusical. They can call it what they please. Second, if they could prove the sound of a car horn is musical, then they prove an automobile can be brought into the worship service and used on the same ground they can bring in the tuning fork. A dilemma awaits then on this! I have now given five arguments to off-set their theory on "one kind of music specified" so I now get back to another argument in comparing the radio and the instrument.

Another argument: Our opposers say the instrument is used to "draw crowds and to entertain the world." The same argument can be made against the radio. In tuning for your sermon we hear every worldly program imaginable coming over the radio. We hear worldly songs, jokes and even beer advertisements. You have some right to talk about somebody bringing the world into the worship service. James 3:10-11 says: "Out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and cursing. My brethren, these things ought not to be. Doth a fountain send at the same place sweet water and bitter?" We might apply this to his radio preaching and ask: "Doth a radio send at the same place sermons and beer advertisements?" We have a better "necessary inference" against the radio than Inman has for it.

Another argument: They often argue that God commanded us to sing and therefore when we play the instrument we change God's commandment from "SING" to "PLAY." (This, of course, is not true. For we sing and play both at the same time. Singing is used to praise God while playing is used to aid the person). But this very argument can be made against using the radio. Now watch: Christ said, "GO" into all the world and preach the Gospel." He did not say "SEND" the Gospel over the radio. Therefore, when our opposers preach over the radio they change God's commandment from "GO" to "SEND"! They may argue that Christ said to sing and we change the command when we play the instrument, well let them argue it, if they like! We have them on their own logic when they use the radio in preaching. Christ said, "GO" and when they "SEND" the gospel over the radio they are guilty of changing the commandment of Christ, if their logic is true! So we don't mind feeding them out of their own spoon! Another thing: Christ said to "GO INTO ALL OF THE WORLD" but our opponent does not go into all of the world when he preaches over the

radio but he "GOES INTO A BROADCASTING STATION" hence changes the commandment of Christ again, if his reasoning be true concerning the instrument. Then too, Christ said to preach the Gospel "TO EVERY CREATURE," but our friend does not preach to every creature when he uses the radio, but he preaches "TO THE MICROPHONE." Therefore, he changes the commandment of Christ again, according to his own line of argument that he uses against the instrument.

What is more, Christ said, "TEACH AND BAPTIZE." Our respondent may teach to a certain degree, over the radio, but he cannot baptize. Hence, the radio prohibits our opponent from obeying the Great Commission and is therefore a stumbling block in his way. In the days of the Apostles, just as soon as one of them preached and convicted a sinner they took him immediately and baptized him. They never waited until "next Sunday" or "next year" to do their baptizing but did it "the same day or the same hour of the night" (Acts 2:41—Acts 16:30-34.) But our friend is unlike the Apostles when he uses the radio, because he cannot baptize immediately, those whom he convicts over the radio, but like Felix, of old, he must ask "for a more convenient season" (Acts 24:25).

Again, Christ promised to be with the apostles "ALWAY, EVEN UNTO THE END OF THE WORLD," but our respondent has "NO SUCH PROMISE" as he preaches over the radio! Also we read in I Cor. 16:1-2, that we are "TO MEET UPON THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK AND LAY IN STORE" but our opponent changes this commandment and "BEGS FOR MONEY OVER THE RADIO."

Why friends, we can find more wrong with his radio preaching than he will be able to patch up in a life time, and mark you, we are using his style (not mine) of reasoning. The kind of reasoning he uses against the

instrument. I will admit that this argument is very technical, but the line of argument that I have used against the radio is the very line of argument he uses against the instrument. So if it works for him, it should work for me. The radio and the instrument stand or fall together. I have not stated my position on the radio, I have merely stated the position that the anti-instrument brethren are forced to accept by reason of their own logic. That's it!

My position, however, is that the radio aids the individual to obey God's commandment to preach just as the instrument of music aids the individual to obey God's commandment to sing. I want to say, dear reader, that according to my position, according to my belief, according to my line of reasoning and argument we may use both the radio and the musical instrument as aids to the individual in carrying out God's commandments to preach and sing. But according to my respondent's position, according to my respondent's belief, according to my respondent's line of reasoning and argument, HE CANNOT CONSISTENTLY use either the radio or the instrument. Because the same line of argument that he uses to do away with the instrument will also do away with the radio. I challenge him to show the difference! BEAR IN MIND THAT ANYTHING INCONSISTENT IS NOT AND CANNOT BE THE TRUTH!

I have been showing (by anti-instrument logic) that the radio "butchers" the Great Commission as found in Mk. 16:15 more than the instrument could possibly "butcher" Eph. 5:19 (even by anti-instrument logic). The following chart will well set forth the truthfulness of this:

THE GREAT COMMISSION

As Given By Christ	As Obeyed By Radio Preaching
1. Christ said "GO"	1. Radio "SENDS"
2. Into all the World.	2. Into broadcasting station.

3. To every creature.	3. To microphone.
4. Teach and baptize.	4. Teaches, cannot baptize.
5. Be with you always.	5. No promise of Christ.
6. We are to meet on first day of week lay by in store, I Cor.16:1-2.	6. Begs for money over the radio. Is such the Lord's plan?

Ladies and gentlemen, I challenge my respondent to draw a similar chart and show that using the instrument "butchers" Eph. 5:19, as much as using a radio "butchers" Mk. 16:15. He cannot do it!

Friends, we could go over the country and use the above chart and show where the radio changes God's commandment and therefore, could start a division over the radio, just as the anti-instrument believers have done over instrumental music. Oh yes, we could get a following! And I want to say, the very day we become "anti-instrumental music" we will be forced to become "anti-radio." Because the same reasoning that will make one anti-instrument will make him anti-radio. Without a doubt this is true!

Another argument: They say that we care more for the instrument than we do for the fellowship of many good honest souls. For, say they, when we use the instrument many good, Christ-spirited people are forced to leave the church. This same argument can be used against the radio. Without a doubt the radio is doing more damage to church attendance than instrumental music can ever do in any way. The opposers have some grounds to talk about driving people away and keeping them from going to church. When they preach over the radio they cause many souls to never go to the church but they (the people) stay at home and listen to sermons over the radio, hence, depend upon radio preaching altogether. So "the legs of the lame

are not equal" in the argument on "driving souls away from church." And "Therefore, thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself. For thou that judgest does the same things" (Rom. 2:1).

Yes, we could start a division over the radio much easier than you have done over the instrumental music question if the issue should be pushed. But let me tell you, it is high time, that we in the Churches of Christ heed Titus 3:9, "But avoid foolish questions and genealogies and contentions and strivings about the law for they are unprofitable and vain."

Now to introduce another argument, I will say that the anti-instrument brethren are guilty (by their own logic and practice) of introducing instrumental music into the worship service. You are the ones! Because "LOGIC" and "COMMON SENSE" rolls the piano into the church building every time you preach over the radio. You cannot keep the piano out of the church building when you preach over the radio. Yes! "logic" brings it in! Now, just wait and see! The following argument will prove this to be a fact:

ARGUMENT NUMBER TWO: I am calling this my phonograph or talking machine argument. The arguments is this: "The person who preaches over the radio, is guilty of placing a piano in the church building by logic of his own practice."

Now notice: The man who preaches over the radio will have to permit us to bring a radio into the church building, in order to listen to him preach. All right, say a group of Christians gather around the radio in the church building and listen to his sermon. Will he reject this? Of course, he will not! He admits that a group of Christians could meet and gather around a radio inside the Church building and at the same time worship God acceptably as they listen

to his sermon. This could be done, says he! Now then, suppose this group of Christians decide to place a "recording machine" beside the radio and reproduce the voice of our speaker on a record so as to retain his excellent sermon. I ask, would this be wrong? Of course, he will say no! Well, after he closes his sermon on the radio, we still have his voice and sermon on a record. So we now send one of the group out of the church building and he brings in a phonograph or talking machine. We wind up the "ole talking machine" and listen to his sermon again from a record. Would this be a sin, brother? By "LOGIC" of your radio preaching you are forced to take the stand that it is perfectly all right! Well, we now have a radio and a phonograph both inside the church building and in use during the worship service. We have singing and preaching both done in the worship service by a phonograph and a radio just as sure as you are born! You cannot prevent it. It is your logic and your work. Thou art the man who brings the radio and phonograph into the worship service because you surely do request us to gather around the radio and listen to you preach. You want us to listen to you, don't you? Well, suppose we like your sermon enough, until we decide to reproduce it on a record; you surely cannot object. You are forced to permit it to be done. Will you please tell us how it is that you are permitted by the Scripture to bring a radio and a phonograph into the worship service and deny us the right to bring a piano in? Is God partial to radios and phonographs?

Is it not a fact that a phonograph is a musical instrument? The radio is not far from one, is it? The radio is an "electrical instrument"; the phonograph is a "spring instrument" (the old fashion ones were) and the piano is a "stringed instrument". Will Brother Inman please tell us: If God will recognize an electrical instrument (a radio) to be used in the worship service; will also

permit a spring instrument (a phonograph) to be used; why then does he refuse and reject the use of a stringed instrument (a piano) during the worship service? Does God have a special liking for "electrical wires" and "springs" more than he has for "strings"? Pray tell us the difference!

We are now ready to conclude this argument by saying, that by "logic" and "common sense" the man who preaches over the radio is guilty of introducing instrumental music into the worship service, himself. The fact of his radio preaching brings "TWO" instruments into the worship service, namely: a radio and a phonograph. Therefore, we are forced to conclude that he is compelled to permit another instrument to be brought in—on the ground that he has brought in two himself; for we are not convinced that God is partial to radios and phonographs! And we are now ready for Rom. 2:1, "Therefore, thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things." Yes, you anti-instrument preachers **DO THE SAME THINGS** that we do, when you preach over the radio—you bring instrumental music into the worship service!

ARGUMENT THREE: "The same logic or argument or principle that justifies the use of the tuning fork, justifies the use of instrumental music."

I have shown previously that the tuning fork produces a sound of music. Since the tuning fork gives the pitch it gives a tone, and since it gives a tone it gives a sound of music, and since it gives a sound of music it is a musical instrument. Therefore, the tuning fork is a musical instrument, and we must contend that the same argument our opponent uses to justify this musical instrument also justifies another musical instrument. He objects to calling the tuning fork a musical instrument on the ground that it has only one note or tone that

can be played at a time. Is the trumpet a musical instrument? It has only one note or sound that can be made at a time. The tones can be changed, of course, but they also can be changed on the tuning fork. The tuning fork has a complete scale and is arranged so as to change its sounds in order to get the pitch to different songs.

You claim you are justified in using the tuning fork because it has only one note that can be played at a time. Well, you cannot object to the piano being used when only one note is used. Surely, you cannot object to my bringing a piano into the church building and using it for the same purpose that you use the tuning fork. If you take one note from the tuning fork you will be forced to give me one note on the piano. If not, why not? You strike the tuning fork and it goes ZOoo-um! I strike one note on the piano and it goes POoo-um! You have the proper sound for the key of the song and so do I. If I have committed sin, you have! Of course, you contend that as long as I use only one note on the piano that I have committed no sin; but you say I commit sin when I use the second note. But I contend if God permits the first note to be used, he also permits the second. Is God partial to the first note? You say the first note is not in the worship service, but the second note is. But this we deny! In one of the Murch-Witty Unity Meetings Brother Edwin R. Errett asked Brother H. Leo Boles the following question: "Suppose we sing several songs during our worship service and we use the note from the tuning fork at the beginning of each song; will it not be during the worship service?" Brother Boles replied: that the space between each song is not in the worship. Thinking that the space between two songs during a worship service was not in the service. In other words, say we sang, "The Old Rugged Cross," and used the tuning fork to

get the pitch and just as soon as we finished it we strike the tuning fork again and sing, "When the Roll Is Called Up Yonder;" Mr. Boles contended that the space between these two songs is not in the worship service. He said the sound of the tuning fork hushed before the worship began. Suppose, however, that some one in the congregation was praying or reading the Scripture between the songs, would not "the worship" be continuing from the ending of one song to the beginning of another? You are forced to answer this in the affirmative. Well, then, "the one note or sound" of the tuning fork is in the worship service.

I contend that if God permits the first note to be used on the piano (and our opposers must say he will in order to justify the tuning fork) he also permits the second, and if he permits the first and second notes he permits the third, fourth, fifth, sixth and all the rest until every note on the piano is being played. If not, why not? Is God partial to the first note? Again! Say it takes ten notes to be playing a tune: When we play one note are we not playing one tenth of a tune? If not, why not? The fact is, there are only four notes that the piano plays at a time: Two in the treble clef and two in the bass clef. So since the tuning fork has one note you have committed one fourth of a sin if we commit sin by playing four notes on the piano. You say it is all right to use an instrument in starting a song but sinful to use that same instrument in carrying the tune of the same song. Is not this a ridiculous position? It is nothing but straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. Surely if God permits an instrument to be used in starting the song he will not object to that same instrument being used throughout the same song to help and assist the individual in carrying the tune of the song.

Brother Inman demanded that each of our brethren get an instrument and all play one. We wonder if each

of his brethren uses a tuning fork? Or do each of them sing a different song all at the same time? If not, why demand each of us to play a different instrument, which would be as ridiculous (since we use it as an aid) as for each of you brethren to sing a different song at the same time? But Inman and his brethren are good in obeying Rom. 14:22, "Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that which he alloweth." But I have taken their own arguments and have shown that they cannot CONSISTENTLY allow the tuning fork and condemn the instrument.

ARGUMENT NUMBER FOUR: "The same logic, argument or principle that justifies the use of the song book, justifies the use of instrumental music."

It takes at least two things in order to sing. First, it takes words. Second, it takes a tune. We use a song book as an aid to give the words and we use a musical instrument to give the tune. Therefore, instrumental music can be justified on the same line of argument that one can justify the use of a song book. If not, why not? Song books and instruments of music stand or fall together. When you take away the song books you take away our aids for the words which are necessary in order to have singing. When you take away instruments of music you take away our aids for the tunes which are necessary in order to have singing. So musical instruments are as necessary as song books. The argument that turns one anti-musical instruments should turn one anti-song books. The fact is, song books are made by the help of musical instruments. That is, the notes to the songs. Notes cannot be written to a song without instrumental music assistance, unless the song writer has had previous instrumental music training. What would you think of a person who would not eat the hen but would eat her eggs? That is exactly what our anti-instrument brethren do. Song books are eggs of the musical in-

struments. They use the song books and refuse to use the instruments by which they are produced. If it is a sin to use an instrument to play the music to a song, it is a sin to use an instrument to write the music to that song.

Brother Inman informed us in his last paper why he can CONSISTENTLY use the song book and tuning fork and condemn the instrument. He said: "When anyone tried to introduce the mechanical instruments into the Christian Worship service, it was ably and strongly opposed. When the song book, tuning fork, etc., were introduced there were not such opposition. This again shows me to be consistent." Had he known his church history he would not have made such a claim. Why Brother Inman, there was opposition to the introduction of both song book and tuning fork as history clearly shows. Even some of your own brethren object to using the tuning fork and they have not failed to put this conviction in writing. The Reformed Presbyterian Church opposes and condemns the use of song books. I have before me a pamphlet entitled, "PSALMODY OR IS THE USE OF UNINSPIRED SONGS IN THE WORSHIP OF GOD AUTHORIZED," by Prof. R. J. George, D. D. In this pamphlet he contends that we are to sing exclusively the book of Psalms, because, says he, Paul specified them in Eph. 5:19. Hear him: "It is now undertaken to show that not only does this passage not authorize the use of uninspired songs in worship, but that it enjoins the exclusive use of the Psalms of the Bible." Again: "The displacing of the God-made Psalter, by the man-made hymn books, in God's worship, is an act of the most daring presumption." Again he says: "If I had a message of praise to send up to God and I employed a hymn to carry it, I would feel uncertain about it." (Pamphlet was published by Witness Committee, Millvale, R. 4, Pittsburgh, Pa.)

I wonder if Brother Inman knew that for years the Churches refused

to even sing, much less refuse to use song books. The following is taken from "The History of the Baptist" by Thomas Armitage, D. D. pages 548-50 and 517-18: "This was not absolutely a Baptist question, for some few Independents refused to allow singing; but the Baptist Churches were agitated by this controversy to their very center, and a number of them were divided into fragments in consequence. The Bedford Church never had singing in their worship during Guifford's or Buyon's ministry. "Even Beza's translation of David's Psalms was called by both Baptist and Independents, "Geneva Gigg's." "The press groaned with pamphlets and books on this controversy. The contest was not at first whether the congregation should sing instead of a choir, but whether they would have any singing at all. Keach was drawn into this controversy, and in 1691 wrote a book on the subject. He resolved to introduce singing into his church, cost what it may, but he met with great opposition. So tender were the consciences of the minority, that they passed a vote not to censure those who went out and stood in the chapel-yard, if they could not conscientiously stay in and hear the singing."

Time and space will not permit more to be quoted but the above shows that they opposed singing with as many conscientious scruples as those who now oppose instrumental music. Yet our opponent says there was not any opposition to the introduction of the song book. When history clearly states that there was plenty of opposition to singing, much less, than to song books. So our opponent concluded that since there were opposition to the instrument and not to the tuning fork and song book (thought he) he had a reason for saying he could CONSISTENTLY condemn the instrument and use the tuning fork and song book. But History as well as everything else is against our opponent for "the legs of the lame are not equal."

I want to re-emphasize again and again that "historical facts" have absolutely nothing to do with this discussion or any discussion on aids. IF BROTHER INMAN WOULD INVENT THE FIRST MUSICAL INSTRUMENT, EVER KNOWN TO MAN, TOMORROW, AND GIVE IT TO ME THE NEXT DAY, I COULD USE IT TO AID ME TO SING provided it did not usurp authority over singing, nor change the commandment of God, nor was not wrong within itself. At least, I could use it by the same authority that he uses the radio, automobile, etc., which have not even been in existence hardly long enough to be historical facts! Do not forget this, Mr. Inman, and it will save you a lot of time which is wasted in digging up history.

I know these four affirmative arguments which I have given in this paper are abundant proof to show that every argument our opponent can make against the instrument can be made against all those things in his proposition. On the other hand, all arguments he can make in favor of those aids can be made in favor of the instrument. So I will not take time to discuss further the collection basket, communion set, chart, church house, automobile, etc., but arguments equal to the ones I have made against the radio, tuning fork and song book can be made against these other aids if space would permit.

So I have now fulfilled my fifth and last duty. In the words of David of old, I charge our opponents: "In the net which they hid is their own foot taken." (Ps. 5:15) The anti-instrument believers set a net to catch the instrument and I have taken their net and caught the radio, tuning fork, song book, collection basket, communion set, chart, automobile, church house and all aids in the same category. So their foot of INCONSISTENCY is suffering pains in the jaws of their own trap!

WHAT ABOUT THOSE OTHER PROPOSITIONS?

The record shows that I offered two

fair propositions on "the one man preacher-pastor system" and Brother Inman feeling the weakness of his position on the work of the elders and evangelist, failed to accept either of these propositions or to submit one with an issue. I regret that I do not have the opportunity to make my position clear to the reader. I am sure if the reader knew my contentions and could read my arguments on the work of the elders and evangelists, he would agree that I stand with the Scripture, on this subject, as I have done on the subjects we have been discussing.

Nevertheless, we have one other proposition to discuss: "Resolved, that I can consistently and scripturally endorse and up-hold agencies in the category of Abilene Christian College, David Lipscomb's Bible College, Gospel Advocate Publishing House and condemn agencies in the category of The Appalachian Evangelizing Association." (He affirms). Of course, we will expect Brother Inman to tell us what rules and regulations he wishes to govern the discussion on this proposition.

WHAT I WILL DO IN MY LAST PAPER!

1. I will reply to Brother Inman's accusation of my personal attacks on him. I will show that he is the guilty party.

2. I will reply to his accusation that my brethren are causing division between us and the denominations and will gladly welcome his accusation.

3. I will show that Inman agreed with my definition of "necessary inference" in his second paper, for he

said: "It is virtually the same as that which I gave." Then in his third paper he says: "My opponent gave a false definition to the phrase "necessary inference," he has been duly exposed in that effort." I will show that he "crawfished" and changed his position in each paper on necessary inference.

4. I will show that his answers to my fourteen questions has him in a dozen contradictions. In this he makes the radio, tuning fork, song book, etc., matters of faith. While he makes the instrument a matter of opinion. Since he makes the instrument a matter of opinion he does not have one, single, solitary reason for being against it. For my opinion is as good as his! In his answers to my questions he gives up his contention on necessary inference and logically admits that the use of aids are authorized by the law of expediency.

5. I will show that he has himself in another "INCONSISTENT PREDICTMENT" for saying that "if Eph. 5:19 necessarily infers the instrument, then that verse of Scripture cannot be obeyed without using the instrument." Then he says the tuning fork and song book are inferred from this same verse. We are left wondering if Eph. 5:19 can be obeyed without using the tuning fork and song book?

6. I will show that his effort to off-set the Bible heart as being the mind is a miserable failure. When he contends that "the heart" must accompany the singing he is merely contending "the mind" must accompany the singing. Great stuff, that is! I will not leave a stone unturned in the recapitulation in my next paper!

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE PAPER

By CLIFTON INMAN

When man has taken his place in the silent halls of death and another reaps that whereon he has sown — when the heavens shall be rolled back as a scroll and the elements melt with fervent heat, God's Word will still stand and God's kingdom will remain immutable. The efforts made by my opponent and me in this discussion will soon be forgot by man, but in the last day we shall give account for every word we have spoke. These words shall be judged by that eternal Word. It behooves us therefore, to be careful how and what we say. It also behooves you, kind reader, to study carefully the things which are written herein and the things written in God's word to see which of our positions is according to the teaching of His Word. Do not reject either side because it does not conform with your own idea. Our ideas are not the standard by which we shall be judged. God's Word will judge us in the last day. (John 12:48.)

I fully and strongly believe that I have remained true to God's Word. With this paper my part of the discussion comes to a close. I call your attention now to the things said by my respondent in his last paper:

VARIOUS THINGS

My opponent has again reverted to his argument concerning Noah and the ark. He contended that the instrument is not in worship. I ask him a question: Is the instrument in the worship service? He must answer "yes" for he has already admitted it, for he said, "... the instrument is used in the service as an aid to assist the person who sings." Since the instrument is in the service, the axe handle, log-cart, etc., mentioned by my opponent are not parallel since they are not in the ark.

He contends that a written sermon may aid one to preach a sermon orally and that therefore, we can use one kind of music to aid us to render another. If there is any logic here, I must admit that I am unable to see it. Suppose a written sermon does aid one to render an oral one—what connection does that have with instrumental music? He tries to prove though that there is no authority for written sermons. Why did he not answer my argument in favor of written sermons from Mk. 16:16? Luke says that many people wrote concerning the life of Christ and shows that he approves of their having done so. (Lk. 1)

He failed to see fit to answer the quotations which I gave concerning the nature of psalms and hymns, but merely repeated that it is ridiculous to think that they are the same. It is his place and not mine to tell what they mean. He contends that psalms are songs sung to the accompaniment of an instrument of music. Let him prove it. If psalms are songs sung to the accompaniment of a mechanical instrument, we have a command for the instrument and not an inference and to obey God must sing to the accompaniment of an instrument. My opponent will not accept this inevitable conclusion and thereby admits that he doesn't believe his own argument.

He contends that there are more than one kind of music specified in Eph. 5:19 because the passage mentions psalms, hymns and spiritual songs. Mechanical instrumental music is one kind of music though there are several kinds of it. Singing is another kind of music though there are several kinds of singing. The music specified in Eph. 5:19 has been proved to be vocal—Paul said we are to speak. We do not

speaking with an instrument. There is more than one kind of songs mentioned in Eph. 5:19 perhaps, nevertheless, they are songs sung with the voices of human beings and not airs played by a mechanical instrument.

After saying that there are more than one kind of music specified in Eph. 5:19, he turned around and said that instrumental music is not another kind of music. If then there are more than one kind of music specified and mechanical music is not another kind, mechanical music cannot be the other specified. Maybe our friend will tell us what one of the other kind is. However, you needn't become alarmed for he admits that instrumental music is another kind of music just after denying it. He said, "He knows the design for which I use the instrument, hence he knows I am not making another kind of music as praise to him, but only as an aid to assist me in singing!" He then admits that in using the mechanical instrument he makes another kind of music "as an aid to assist" him in singing. He asked me to get around his argument, but you see I went right through the middle of it. I would like now to ask him four questions: (1) Is vocal music a kind of music? (2) Is mechanical instrumental music a kind of music? (3) Are they the same kind of music? (4) If they are, will it not be all right to just use the mechanical instrument and have no vocal music at all? If not, why not?

He says that I have argued that two kinds of music are mentioned in Eph. 5:19. Suppose I have. I have proved that we are to make melody in our hearts. The passage says so. I have showed that we are to sing with our voices. Neither of these is mechanical instrumental music. So even this does not help my respondent's helpless plight.

THE INSTRUMENT AND THE TUNING FORK

My opponent tries, by a not too in-

genious argument, to prove that the tuning fork is an instrument of music. Were this true it is not used by us to make music. It is used by us to get one sound. One sound is not music. Music is defined as, "The science and art of the rhythmic combination of tones. . ." (Standard Dictionary, Twentieth Century Edition). We never use the tuning fork to get a rhythmic combination of tones. One tone is not music. It is no part of music unless combined with other tones. The car horn is just as much an instrument of music as is the tuning fork. My opponent's being pleased to call it a noise has nothing to do with its being that unless he can prove that he is right. One can make music easier with a car horn than he can with a tuning fork. The instrument may go "zoom" and the tuning fork "boom." You can thump a watermelon and it will go "thump." What does that prove—nothing!

THE RADIO AND THE INSTRUMENT

In speaking concerning the radio my respondent said that he could prove that it "butchers" Mark 16:16 more than the instrument "butchers" Eph. 5:19. In this statement he admits that the mechanical instrument "butchers" Eph. 5:19. I am not in the butchering business. I do not want to compete with my opponent in a butchering contest. If the radio "butchers" Mk. 16:16, it should not be used. If the mechanical instrument "butchers" Eph. 5:19, it should not be used. Though my opponent contends that the radio butchers Mk. 16:16, he still says that he thinks that it is all right to use it. We must not take him very seriously therefore. He tries to claim that he is using our reasoning and not his. I challenge him to name one person in the Church of Christ who makes the arguments which he has here made or to show that my reasoning against the mechanical instrument is in any way parallel to the arguments which he has made on the radio. He is completely off the subject. He should be

answering the argument which I made for the radio from Mk. 16:16 instead of making some extraneous argument which he admits he does not believe. Since his argument is not parallel and he admits that he does not believe it himself, I should not notice it, but some things in it are just too good to pass over.

1. Radio used to entertain world. My opponent says that he hears jokes and even beer advertisements when he starts to tune in for my sermons. I am glad to know that he tunes in for my sermon. Since I don't preach over the radio though, I wonder why he tries to tune in for it. Does he want to hear some jokes? When he is tuning in for a sermon, he should not waste so much time. If he would be a little more hasty and diligent, he would not have time to stop for the beer advertisement. Lest any one get the wrong idea—Julian never has heard any of my preaching brethren advertising beer.

2. Sending and going. No one man ever did or ever can by himself go into all the world. We do not violate this command by going into a broadcasting studio. When my opponent stands in front of an audience he doesn't go to each individual personally. He stands at the front and sends the Gospel to those in the back by the use of his voice and the acoustics of the building. That is exactly what we do when we use the radio. We are carrying out God's command to go, for we are reaching people with Gospel. That is all we are demanded to do in Mk. 16:16. He says that we go into the broadcasting station and not into all the world. According to this argument my opponent violated the great commission because he goes into a church house and not into all the world and Paul violated it because he went into the synagogue and not into all the world.

Baptizing and the radio. We can baptize as a result of our preaching over the radio the same as one can who preaches in a building which has

no place to baptize. Brother Otis Gatewood preached over the radio in the west recently. Some people heard him. They requested him to come and preach in their neighborhood. He did this and baptized fifteen at the end of his first sermon. Of course, my opponent does not believe in putting off baptizing, so I am wondering why he or his brethren did not get there and baptize these first. We are not guilty of getting people to put off their baptism. We usually baptize the same hour of the day or night.

He contends that we preach to the microphone and not to every creature. I suppose he preaches to the air when he is in a building since that is the thing immediately in front of him as the microphone is immediately in front of the one who preaches over the radio. I have only preached over the radio once in my life. I then preached to people and not to the microphone. I do not know what my opponent might do under the same circumstances.

Another charge is that we beg for money when we broadcast. This has been practiced by a few. Fornication was practiced in Corinth. This does not mean that the whole church was wrong. Those who have begged over the radio have been severely reprimanded by the brethren. The fact that a few do this does not mean that all broadcasts are wrong.

He claims that we cause people to stay away from the services of the church by our use of the radio. Did you ever hear a member of the church of Christ encourage anyone to remain at home and hear their sermons over the radio while public services of the church were in progress? You never did. When a member of church of Christ encourage anyone the radio, he often teaches people that they can not please God and fail to assemble for the public worship. As a result of this teaching over the radio many have been made to know their duty and to begin attending the services of the church who would not

have done so otherwise. I would like for my respondent to name me one individual who has stayed at home because of a request for him to do so to hear a sermon of a church of Christ preacher—such request having been made by a church of Christ preacher. If he can not do this his argument is void.

I would readily condemn one who would bring a radio into the place of public gathering and listen to it there. His doing this would not be in keeping with Paul's admonition to have all things done in decency and in order, since it would disturb many. Neither would I be in favor of playing records on a phonograph of my sermon or any one else's in the place of preaching, but even if I were that would have nothing to do with the question of my consistency in using the radio and phonograph and refusing to use the mechanical instrument of music. The radio and the phonograph are not musical instruments as my opponent contends. They may be used to transmit music, but they are not musical instruments. I have clearly showed the distinction between the use of the radio and the use of the mechanical instrument. Why did not my opponent answer my argument instead of getting away from the subject talking about a string and a spring instrument.

The reason I requested Julian and his brethren to each get an instrument is that he claimed a psalm is a song sung to the accompaniment of a mechanical instrument. Paul said for us each to have a psalm (1 Cor. 14:26). To obey this instruction, if Julian is right, we would each have to have an instrument. I have not claimed that a tuning fork or song book is included in the word, psalm, and am not therefore, obligated to demand that everyone get a tuning fork.

THE TUNING FORK AND SONG BOOK

Julian claims that one can not write a song unless he has had previ-

ous instrumental music training. This is a bare assertion which he cannot prove. He made no effort to do so. Any effort which he may make to prove it in his last paper will be unfair as I will not have any chance to reply to it. He claims also that the mechanical instrument plays the same part as does the song book. Why not then just use a song book. If it plays the same part as does the instrument, the instrument is unnecessary.

I know and have known that there has been some objection to the use of singing in general and to song books. I mentioned as much before. This opposition was neither strong nor general as was the opposition to the mechanical instrument. The song book was never strongly and ably opposed. It was meagerly and weakly opposed. The opposition mentioned by my opponent was among the Presbyterian and Baptist denominations which had their origin only recently. Armitage says that the question was not altogether a Baptist question. By this remark we are surely to gather that it was mostly a Baptist question.

HISTORICAL FACTS

When it is showed by historical facts that the early church opposed the use of the mechanical instrument and that this opposition was general—that is throughout the whole church—we can see that they have much to do with this discussion. Julian says, "IF BROTHER INMAN WOULD INVENT THE FIRST MUSICAL INSTRUMENT EVER KNOWN TO MAN, TOMORROW, AND GIVE IT TO ME THE NEXT DAY, I COULD USE IT TO AID ME TO SING, provided it did not usurp authority over singing, nor change the commandment of God, nor was not wrong within itself." The point is, though, that IT WAS NOT INVENTED YESTERDAY, TODAY OR TOMORROW. IT WAS IN EXISTENCE IN THE DAYS OF THE EARLY CHURCH—IN THE DAYS

OF THE APOSTLES—AND THEY REFUSED TO USE IT. THEY OPPOSED IT.

WHAT ABOUT THE OTHER PROPOSITIONS?

Yes what about them? I submitted a proposition on the "One-man-preacher-pastor system." He said that if I would state it in a positive form that he would debate it. I stated the very same proposition in a positive form. He then wrote me in a private card, "Your propositions on the pastor do not state an issue. I agree that one can preach for a space—or number of months where there are elders. The evangelist should visit the congregations and would be permitted to speak, of course. If you deny that there is a one man pastor system set up in the churches, known as Churches of Christ, I will affirm. Sincerely, Julian Hunt." He wants to debate a personal matter and not the issue. There is no such general set up as he mentions in the churches of Christ. He has said that this is practiced by the Christian Church and not by the churches of Christ. He tried to prove that I am a member of the Christian Church because I (as he claims) am a "one-man-preacher-pastor" of the church at Pikeville. I asked him to name his grounds for making the charge that I am a "one-man-preacher-pastor" and to debate that or else to retract his charge and to apologize for making it. All can see that this is fair. I had never heard another thing of the matter until I received his last paper. Why did he not mention his private card? Is he being fair with his opponent?

He wrote me concerning the proposition on the Bible colleges and publishing houses that he wanted to remove the Appalachian Evangelizing Association from the proposition as he did not want to defend "any missionary." I answered that if he would not defend the Evangelizing association that I saw no reason why I should defend the other things named. He never answered my letter. I understood from this that he had giv-

en the matter up. I am not now disposed to debate the proposition since he will not defend the Evangelizing Association. Any time, however, that he will get the backing of his group I will meet him anywhere he has that backing and debate anything which is at issue between us if the proposition is stated fairly. I will not meet him in another written discussion unless there be a third man selected who is disinterested and who will examine each paper before there is a reply made to it and have taken from it, all things foreign to the issue. Every one can see the reason for this. My opponent has continually introduced things foreign to the issue and dealt in personalities. I am making request now that all the correspondence passed between me and my opponent and his uncle Kenis leading up to this discussion and during this discussion be included in the book. If it does not appear there you may know that my opponent was not willing for it to appear.

WHAT HE IS AIMING TO DO IN HIS NEXT PAPER

1. He says that he is aiming to reply to my accusation that he has made personal attacks upon me. Why did he not do this in his last paper or in some other. We agreed in our contract that "Each participant agrees to answer the arguments made by his opponent before making any new arguments." My opponent filled his last paper with new arguments and failed to notice the arguments which I had made. He says that he will answer them in his last paper. That is a very convenient place to answer them since I will have no reply to it.

2. He said, "I will reply to his accusation that my brethren are causing division between us and the denominations and will gladly admit that we welcome the accusation." Remember that he gave several arguments to prove that we are causing the division which exists between us and him and his brethren. I showed that by these very same arguments

I could prove that he is causing division between himself and other denominations. If he says he welcomes this, he is granting that I am doing no wrong in causing division between me and him and that I should welcome the accusation. He will try to show that he is justified in causing division between himself and the denominations. When he does, he admits that we are justified in causing division between us and him and his brethren.

3. He says that he will prove that I contradicted myself by agreeing with his definition of "necessary inference" once and denying its correctness later. Let's keep the record straight: He gave Webster's definition. Webster defined "necessary" as meaning "That cannot be otherwise; essential, indispensable; a thing that can not be done without." He defined infer to mean "to derive by deduction or induction; accept as a fact or consequence; imply; conclude." Inference: "the act of inferring; the conclusion; deduction; induction." Now there is no especial difference between this definition and the one which I gave. This is Webster's definition. Now Julian in trying to apply this said that if the song book is necessarily inferred it is "indispensable and cannot be done without." In this statement he placed a wrong definition upon the phrase, "necessary inference." He gave the whole phrase the meaning of the word necessary. Webster's definition is correct—Julian's definition is incorrect. By his use he gives a false definition.

4. He says that he will show that my answers to his fourteen questions have me in a dozen contradictions. Why did he not notice my answer to them in his other paper? Is he afraid for me to examine his arguments?

5. My opponent is very careless in the use of quotation marks. When we use quotation marks we signify that every thing which is enclosed in them was said by another. He said in his last paper, "I will show that he

has himself into another 'INCONSISTENT PREDICAMENT' for saying that 'if Eph. 5:19 necessarily infers the instrument, then that verse of scripture cannot be obeyed without using the instrument.'" I recall having made no such statement and am unable to find it. I did say, "Furthermore, he would not have a necessary inference for the instrument, but a direct command for its use." I further said, "If the word psalms means a song sung to the accompaniment of a mechanical instrument, one could not obey Eph. 5:19 without using them." (page five, first negative paper of the first proposition.) I have never claimed that the word psalms includes the tuning fork or the song book. Whatever psalms are that we are commanded to render. Julian says that they are songs sung to the accompaniment of a mechanical instrument of music. Let us then substitute the meaning of the word for the word itself and see what we have. "Speak to yourself in songs sung to the accompaniment of a mechanical instrument of music." Is not this a direct command which cannot be obeyed without the mechanical instrument?

6. He says, "I will show that his effort to off-set the Bible heart as being the mind is a miserable failure. When he contends that 'the heart' must accompany the singing, he is merely contending, 'the mind' must accompany the singing. Great stuff, that is! I will not leave a stone unturned in the recapitulation in my next paper!" All know that I never argued that the Bible heart is not the mind. Paul is the one who told us to accompany our singing with our hearts and our understanding. He may argue with Paul as much as he pleases. I will just stay with Paul.

ARGUMENTS MADE BY ME IN MY LAST PAPER WHICH MY OPPONENT NEVER NOTICED

There were several arguments in my last paper which Julian never noticed in his last paper. He promises to notice them in his next paper.

He is a promising lad—though often disappointing. Remember that he signed an agreement to answer these arguments before making any new ones. Let us notice some of the things which he failed to answer:

1. He never noticed what I had to say about his claim that we are causing division. I pointed out that division contrary to the Doctrine of Christ is the division condemned by the Bible. I showed that the users of the mechanical instrument are causing that kind of division and that it has not and can not be proved that we are causing that kind of division when using the song book, tuning fork, etc.

2. He failed to notice what I said about New Testament usage and the practice of the early church.

3. He failed to notice what I had to say about necessary inference and its meaning except to promise that he will notice it in his next paper.

4. He said not one word about Acts 2:2 upon which he has been basing an argument which I fully answered.

5. He failed to have anything to say about the "forty-four passages" which he claimed mention the instrument. He had given all of these up but two—Rev. 14 and Lk. 15. I answered Rev. 14 by showing that if my opponent's interpretation of it is correct it proves more than he desires to prove. I showed also that if we can use things on earth in our worship service which are in heaven that the Jews could have made another mercy seat and have placed it in the holy place of the tabernacle. I showed that Lk. 15 proves more than my opponent will accept if his interpretation of it is true.

6. He asked me fourteen questions. We all thought that he had something big in mind when he asked them. But to our chagrin, when I answered them he had no more reference to make to them other than

that he would notice them in his last paper. A man should not put off anything as important as they seemed to be.

7. He had accused me of misusing the Harbinger. I replied to this accusation. He ignored my reply.

8. He had tried to prove that the use of the instrument is commanded in Eph. 5:19, but that obedience to that command is not essential. I answered his argument and he had no reply to make.

9. He quoted some scholars and several translations to prove his claim that psalms are songs sung to the accompaniment of an instrument. I answered his argument and added several translations to his list, showing that none of them (with the possible exception of one) supported my opponent's claim. He had no reference to make to this.

10. He had an argument about the communion set. I answered it. He made no reply.

11. He claimed that my principle of a specific command condemns only substitutes. I showed this contention to be unfounded. He made no reply.

12. He asked two other questions. I answered them. He failed to notice my answers. Any effort made by him to answer these arguments in his closing paper will be received as an admission on his part that his replies are weak and that he is afraid for them to be examined.

A RECAPITULATION

In my first paper I pointed out that there are three ways in which a thing may be scripturally authorized; namely, by direct command, by New Testament example and by necessary inference. I also quoted a principle from my opponent which he in turn had quoted from Briney. This principle is that we may use anything to aid in carrying out a command of God if the method of carrying it out is not specified and if such aids are in keeping with Paul's admonition to let all things be done in decency and

in order. I then applied the principle to the things named in our proposition as follows:

1. The song book. In Ephesians 5:19 we are told to sing. In order for us to sing we must have a song. This is necessarily inferred. It is also necessarily inferred that we must get the song from some place. The Bible does not designate the place. We must necessarily infer, therefore, that we may get the song from any place which does not violate some other Bible principle.

2. The communion set. In Mt. 26:26-28 and in Acts 20:7 we have a command and an example for taking the Lord's supper. It is to be necessarily inferred that there be some kind of container for the loaf and the fruit of the vine. There is no limit placed upon the number of containers. We must, therefore, infer that we may use as many as is desirable unless by so doing we violate some other principle of the Bible.

3. The radio. In Mk. 16:15 the apostles were told to preach the Gospel to all the world. From 2 Tim. 2:2 we find that we are to do the same thing. For us to preach we must necessarily have hearers. For one to hear there must necessarily be some form of acoustics. The form of acoustics is not specified in the Bible. We must necessarily infer that we may use any kind of acoustics so long as its use does not violate some other Bible principle. The radio is a form of acoustics. We must infer therefore, that we may use it.

4. The automobile. Mk. 16:15-16 also shows that the apostles were to go. In Rom. 10:14 we are asked how they shall preach except they be sent. In the Bible we are both commanded to go and to send. The method of going is not specified. We must infer that we may use any method which does not violate some other New Testament principle. The automobile is some method.

5. The chart. Christ told the apostles to teach all nations. (Mt. 28:19) Others are to teach also. (2

Tim. 2:2) The method of teaching is not specified. We may use any method therefore, which does not violate some other New Testament principle.

6. The church house. In Acts 2:2 and Acts 20 we are told of the apostles meeting in houses. This is an example for the house. The ownership of the house is not specified. We must necessarily infer that any one may own the house so long as such ownership does not violate some other principle of the scriptures.

7. The collection basket. Paul told the church at Corinth to lay by in store on the first day of the week that there be no collection when he came. It must be necessarily inferred that something be used in which to gather or collect this contribution. The method of collecting it is not specified. We are necessarily to infer that we may use any method which does not violate some other Bible principle.

8. The tuning fork. We are commanded to sing. For us to sing we must sing upon some pitch. We must have some means of obtaining the pitch. The means is not specified in the New Testament, therefore, we are necessarily to infer that we may use any means which does not violate some other Bible principle.

8. The mechanical instrument. This cannot be justified in the above way because the kind of music in which we are to engage is specified. The means of accompanying our singing is also specified.

My opponent never took up these arguments and reviewed them as a respondent should rightfully do. He has not analyzed even one of these arguments. They have stood the test. The only explanation for his not analyzing them is that he was unable to answer them. He tried to evade them in several ways.

First he tried to prove that the scholars do not accept the fact that all things are authorized by direct command, apostolic example or nec-

essary inference. I quoted the scholars on this score. He tried to say that I misrepresented them. When I answered this he had nothing else to say about it.

Second, he tried to offer another way of authorizing a thing—expediency or opinion. I fully answered this. His reply was fourteen questions. When I answered these, he made no reply except a promise that he would reply in his next paper.

Third, he tried to show that the mechanical instrument is inferred by Paul in Eph. 5:19. I have showed that if his contention be right that we have a command and not an inference. He has said that if a thing is inferred we can not do without it. By this logic we are to conclude that we cannot do without the mechanical instrument.

Fourth, he tried to place an interpretation upon the phrase, necessary inference, which it does not carry. This has been duly exposed.

I showed that the early christians opposed the use of the instrument and offered principles which condemn its use. I showed that they offered no principles and no teaching which condemns the other things mentioned in our proposition. The only answer was an accusation that I was off the subject. I answered this and he said that we can not prove any thing about aids from church history. This has been answered.

He has tried to show that the use of the radio and the communion set is wrong. After offering his arguments to prove this and saying that the radio "butchers" Mk. 16:16, he says that he believes we may use them. From this I accuse him of saying that we can use a thing which "butchers" the Bible.

I proved that the users of the mechanical instrument cause division contrary to the Doctrine of Christ. He tried to prove that we are the causers of division. I answered him

upon this score and he made no reply except a promise to reply when I could not examine his reply—in his last paper.

He has voiced his desire not to engage in a discussion of the pastor system and the religious journals. He now tries to make it appear that I am the one who has backed down. Will he let the reader see his correspondence about these?

He tried to prove that specific commands condemn only substitutes. I proved this to be wrong by reference to Nadab and Abihu and to Noah and the ark. He tried to get around this but has never answered my question about Nadab and Abihu. He claimed that my argument based upon Noah and the ark is not parallel to the use of the mechanical instrument by saying that the instrument is not in worship. He admitted however, that the instrument is in the worship service.

He tried to show that since the Bible heart is the mind, it cannot be touched or played. This has been duly exposed.

He said in one place that the mechanical instrument is a matter of opinion and justified by opinion. He next said that it is inferred and then said that it is commanded.

He claimed that the instrument does not make another kind of music and then in the same paragraph admitted that it does.

CONCLUSION

All the world can safely rely upon God and His Word. Man, his glory, his wisdom and his theories shall pass away. Even the heavens and the earth shall be enveloped with fire and pass away. But when every last word by man has been spoken, when his last prayer shall be uttered and his last deed become history, God's Word, His kingdom, His righteousness and those who love, adore and diligently seek out and follow these shall abide eternally. Those who

violate, those who desecrate, those who transgress and those who disregard God's Word and the teaching of His Son shall be cast into outer darkness. Do we desire that heavenly home where shall abide all the true, all the pure all the just, all the honest and all the good — that land into which can enter no sin, no sorrow, no offense, nothing to shame, nothing to mar, no shadow, no sickness, no death and no tear? Let us then be faithful to God, to His Book and to the trust which He has left us. Let us not count him an enemy who through love for our souls tells us of our imperfections and all those things which will cause us to miss that place. Let us go hand in hand with him crying aloud and sparing not. Let us put far from us all things that will hinder, all things that will divide asunder the Lord's spiritual body and all things that will make an offense and let us march triumphantly—hand in hand—with the Bible our only guide and Jesus, the Christ, as our only Lord to that home of the soul where we can live in eternal bliss, bask in the sunlight of God's eternal love and forever in the shade of the evergreen tree of life on the celestial banks of

the river of life sing redemption's sweet song and the song of Moses and the Lamb. In order to do this we must follow meekly, humbly and implicitly the New Testament and its teaching. For

"How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord,
Is laid for your faith in His excellent word!

What more can He say than to you He has said,
You who unto Jesus for refuge have fled?

"The soul that on Jesus still leans for repose,
I will not, I will not, desert to His foes;
That soul, though all hell should endeavor to shake
I'll never, no never, no never forsake!"

Will not you then, dear reader, forsake the sinking sand and all things built thereupon and come to a place where you can give a "thus saith the Lord" for all your religious practices. I thank you.

FOURTH NEGATIVE PAPER

By JULIAN OLYN HUNT

I have approximately forty volumes of debates and have read a number more and in this line of study I have observed that when an opponent is unable to meet the issue he always resorts to one of two things, or to both: First, by "fretting", "back-biting" and "nagging" at his opponent; second, by making an appeal to the sympathy of the reader such as stating "that he believes he has the truth," "he is honest and sincere," "by using some flowery language" (usually copied from some one else) or "by quoting poetry," etc. This has been exactly the tactics of my opponent. He began his last speech by telling the reader that some day "the heavens would roll back like a scroll" and "the earth would melt with fervent heat" and then closed his speech by quoting the song, "How Firm A Foundation Ye Saints of the Lord."

He has been harping throughout this discussion about my attacking him personally. This is all for effect! Because he does not have the slightest cause for such "frets." I have said nothing about him personally as the record will show. However, I am not in the funeral business. He seems to be! He thinks if he can get the reader to find fault with me that it will call the reader's mind from the force of my arguments. In his last speech he kept telling the reader that I was saving arguments for my last speech to which he would have no reply. Why say such? Simply preparing himself to "fall easy" that's why! Of course, he has no reply, and the reader already knew this. I had no reply to his last speech of my affirmative. And in that last speech he said that a brother or relative of mine was converted to the antis.

Then stated that I had intimated that I wanted to join the anti-instrument group. Then said that the four words: "TO DO GOD'S WILL" was not on my chart during our oral debate. All these statements are utterly false, yet I had no reply for he made them in his last speech. Instead of some relative of mine going off anti-instrument after the Hall-Hunt Debate — two of Hall's best friends and the two best informed men among them told me that Hall did not come near touching my arguments. These men were Buff Scott and Estil Hagar, both near Hardy, Kentucky. Furthermore, they made these statements after attending the oral debate between Inman and me. Brother Hagar told me that, while he believed my arguments could be answered, they would have to go on the outside of the Big Sandy Section to find the man. These men are both anti-instrument. They are of age, ask them, Brother Inman; they will tell you what they told me in the presence of witnesses.

Throughout both propositions he brought up my challenging his preachers in the Big Sandy Valley and I ignored it until my second negative paper. When I told of defeating their "bully" and running their preachers out of that section he said: "I am sorry that it even appears in a discussion that bears my name in any way." Then he tells the reader that Roy Hall quit the Belfry debate because of my "impeachable behavior" and in the next breath says he has not said one thing about Brother Hunt. Inman was not at the Belfry debate, for very few of them had the effrontery to attend after Hall's total defeat at Martin, Kentucky in our first debate. So Inman does not know why Hall quit, but I know why! He

failed to have proof for some charges he made against the Christian church. Hall charged the Christian Church with having "ankle-shows," "dance halls," "card tables," etc., in their worship service, but when I demanded him to bring the proof or take it back, he simply failed to have one iota proof, so after a few minutes of blank astonishment, serious embarrassment, he stuttered a moment and then, rather than to take back what he had said, he just fled! But let me say here, a winning man never quits! All who know Roy Hall's style of debating know that no debate could possibly be rough enough for him to quit. Inman knows as well as I that every anti-preacher in that section who has had enough courage to debate is carrying a tanning. If there is one left, bring him around and we will see what we can do for him. And I want this to go down in the book in capital letters: I CHALLENGE ANY OF THE ANTI-INSTRUMENT ADVOCATES TO MEET ME IN PUBLIC DEBATE ON THE PROPOSITIONS THAT HAVE BEEN DISCUSSED IN THIS BOOK; ANYTIME ANYWHERE! I covet such debates because we have nothing to lose and everything to gain. The more opportunities you give us to meet you, the quicker we will expose your hobby, and the sooner unity will come. Come on now, brethren! You have the challenge! The truth is a diamond, the more you rub it, the brighter it shines so try your hand on rubbing it! I am ready!

A man as inconsistent as my opponent should not charge me of attacking his character. In one breath he charges that I have attacked him and in the next breath quotes Rom. 16:17, "Mark them who cause division contrary to the doctrine which we have received and avoid them," and applies this to me. To hear Inman tell it, he always stays on his proposition in spite of heading an article "Who Caused The Division" and he never transgresses the rules of honorable controversy. He is perfectly

sweet at all times. Yet he charges me with being a "heretic," "causer of division," "impeachable behavior" "should be avoided," "A factionists," "should be disfellowshipped," "member of another denomination," and then charged my brother Homer as "traitor" and "deceitful," etc. Time and space will not permit mentioning dozens of other attacks.

If I have insulted Brother Inman or offended him in any way I want to apologize. If I am guilty it has not been intentionally. I am willing to confess that both have broken the rules of honorable controversy. Disputants nearly always do in spite of themselves. However, I wrote Brother Inman and told him that I was willing to cut out all remarks and irrelevant material if he so desired. I did this because he "appeared" to be so worried about it. But to my surprise he replied that he flatly refused to cut out anything. If he is ashamed for his name to be mentioned in a discussion with these remarks why isn't he willing to cut them out? Ah! Brother this tells it in plain words! When a man cannot meet an argument he "harps" and this is true in every debate that I ever read. This debate, of course, is no exception. I hold nothing against Brother Inman for his attacks on me. I can see deeper than his little "smutty" remarks and realize that he is still my friend in spite of them. I would not have humiliated him by bringing them up had he not first mentioned them and then began each article by mentioning them, again and again. He has made a greater effort to put these "smutty" things over than he has to make arguments. For this reason we are led to believe he wished the reader to find fault with me in order to weaken what I said in the reader's estimation.

RE-HASHING THE REMAINS!

In the closing remarks of my last speech I listed six things that I would do in this speech. Our brother would have you believe that I had broken one of the rules we mutually agreed

should govern this debate; viz: "Each participant agrees to answer the arguments made by his opponent before making any new arguments." I did not break this rule! Because there is not one single argument in his third speech but what he had previously made and I had replied. Not one! It was simply hashing and re-hashing the arguments made in his former speeches. Why then did I not have the right to wait until my last speech to do my final "re-hashing?" I did! The reader can judge as to my being afraid of my opponent's "replies" and "examinations." Or whether it is rather Inman dreading my last speech which had cast its shadow before hand. I rather think that's it. For he was rattled enough to state: "Infant sprinkling is a matter of opinion." Imagine that! It is bad enough for him to take sides with the Modernists and Baptists without doing so with the Methodists and Presbyterians. Campbell referred to infant sprinkling as being the opinion of its advocates, but not as an opinion of his own. Inman thought when he took the stand that infant sprinkling was a matter of opinion he was taking the stand with Campbell. But it is a sad disappointment! It is the opinion of yours and the Methodists and Presbyterians. No Bible preacher will agree with you on that! Let's get to those six things.

I. I promised to reply to his accusation of my personal attacks. I did this above and showed "In the net which he hid, is his own foot taken," and "He who judgeth doeth the same things."

II. He next says that my brethren cause division between us and the denominations. To this I agree, and in the same way, that we cause division with us and the anti-instrument brethren. The Bible is a divisive book. It divides right from wrong. We have a Biblical right (the law of expediency) to use the instrument, hence it divides us from those who oppose the instrument. On the other hand, the opposers cause the division

by not adhering to the Scriptural authority for its use, just as the denominations cause the division by not heeding to the Scriptures.

III. Next, he changed his position on necessary inference four times. He changed it in each speech. First, he said the radio, tuning fork, etc., themselves were inferred. I exposed this by stating Websters definition of necessary inference. Which is: "A consequence, implication, or conclusion derived either by deduction or induction which cannot be otherwise, is essential, indispensable and a thing that cannot be done without." Inman saw what an ugly predicament this left him in for he knew he could not claim all this for the radio, song book, automobile, etc. So in his second speech he agreed with my definition for he said: "The definition of 'necessary inference' given by him is virtually the same as that which I gave." After agreeing with it he tried to "crawfish" and contend he did not say the aids, themselves were inferred, but the CONCLUSION to use them was. I exposed this by showing he had made a distinction where there is not any difference. For if the conclusion to use them was "the thing that cannot be otherwise" as he contended, then every apostle and Christian would have drawn that conclusion before they could have obeyed the scriptures. He saw this was still a worse predicament so in his third speech he said: "My opponent never answered this argument, but tried to dodge its force by giving a false definition to the phrase, 'necessary inference.'" To back this charge up he said: "My opponent took the definition of the word, 'necessary' and tried to apply it to the whole phrase, 'necessary inference.'" The reader knows that this accusation is an untruth! Can you recall when I did that reader? No! Because I did not do it! Brother Inman is the very Bird himself to do that. He selected the phrase: "cannot be otherwise" from my definition taken from Webster and applied it first, himself, to each

aid mentioned in his proposition. This is when I accused him of "crawfishing." For he said: "The conclusion that we may use the song book is the thing which "cannot be otherwise" not the song book itself." "The conclusion that we may use a communion set is the thing that "cannot be otherwise" not the communion set, itself." Note the first page of his second affirmative paper. Now he is found charging himself of giving a false definition to the phrase "necessary inference." For it was he, who selected, "cannot be otherwise" from my full definition and used this to the exclusion of the rest of my definition. The reader knows I have no reason for doing it, for it is better for my side of the argument to use the full definition. Why should I want to cut it down to the phrase: "cannot be otherwise." This would have been against me. I took Webster's definition to the word "necessary" plus Webster's definition to the word "inferred or inference" and put the definition of both these words together for the correct and complete definition of the phrase "necessary inference." How else would one get the complete definition if this is not the way? No learned person will deny that all which can be said of the words "necessary" and "inference" can be said of the phrase "necessary inference."

The clear-cut case of necessary inference found in Acts 2:2, agrees one hundred per cent with the combined definition of the words necessary and inference. The fact "they were sitting" necessarily infers some place to sit. Webster defines the word, "seat"—"that on which anyone sits; regular or appropriate place of sitting; chair, etc." So the ground, floor, a chair or any place to sit is a seat. The expression "they were sitting" necessarily infers seats. This agrees with the definition I gave from Webster of necessary inference. But the radio, automobile, etc., can never be said to be inferred, if we accept Webster's definition of necessary inference.

The fourth time he changed his position, he said: "When the Bible tells us to sing and does not specify the source from which to obtain the song. We may necessarily infer that we may use the law of expediency in determining the source." So here he says, **THE LAW OF EXPEDIENCY IS NECESSARILY INFERRED.** This is what I called, "really crawfishing." He has scooted from necessary inference to the law of expediency. Didn't I tell you, reader, when I exposed his theory imposed upon the principle of necessary inference that he would be forced to appeal to the law of expediency where the authority for aids is properly found? Well, he did it, just like I said! For he said the law of expediency is necessarily inferred. **First**, the radio, automobile, etc., themselves, were necessarily inferred. **Second**, the conclusion to use them is the thing inferred. **Third**, he accuses me of giving a false definition to necessary inference after saying that I had given the same definition which he gave. **Fourth**, the law of expediency is the thing inferred. **NOW LET'S HEAR THE CONCLUSION TO THE WHOLE MATTER: SINCE OUR BROTHER CHANGED HIS POSITION ON NECESSARY INFERENCE IN EACH PAPER AND NEVER DID SETTLE ON ANYTHING DEFINITELY. HE DID NOT GIVE ANY AUTHORITY FOR THE USE OF THE RADIO, TUNING FORK, AND THOSE OTHER AIDS IN THE SAME CATEGORY! SINCE HE DID NOT GIVE ANY AUTHORITY FOR THEM HE CERTAINLY DID NOT PROVE HE COULD CONSISTENTLY USE THEM AND CONDEMN THE INSTRUMENT!**

He certainly does not have any authority left unless it is J. B. Briney's principle. Do you know where he got that principle of Briney's? Why he copied it from my paper! We have his own admission. The very principle I used to authorize the song book, tuning fork, radio, etc. I don't know what he

would have done without my help. The fact he copied this principle from me shows that he is unable to establish his proposition. Can he **CONSISTENTLY** borrow my authority without authorizing the instrument? Briney used his principle, himself to authorize the instrument. Don't you think Briney knew how to apply his principle better than Inman? By the way, Briney's principle does not contain one iota of authority for Inman's proposition. While this principle contains authority for the radio, song book, and aids in the same category, it does not establish Inman's proposition. He does not need to prove we have authority for the radio, etc., for we agree that there is authority for these things. **BUT WHAT HE NEEDS IS AUTHORITY TO SHOW, THAT HE CAN CONSISTENTLY USE THE RADIO, SONG BOOK, ETC., AND CONDEMN THE INSTRUMENT.** Briney's principle does not show this, therefore, it does not contain one iota of authority for Inman's proposition. Absolutely none! It was a waste of time for Inman to copy it. It failed to show what Inman intended. It failed to touch the word, "CONSISTENTLY." But that is the only word in Inman's proposition that needed attention, but Briney's principle failed to notice it.

My opponent objected to Briney's principle authorizing the instrument because it mentioned the word "method." It reads: "When a thing is commanded to be done, and the method of doing it is not prescribed, those commanded are at liberty to use their best judgment in devising ways and means to carry out the command, and they are to act under the principle laid down by Paul in I Cor. 14:40, "Let all things be done decently and in order." (Otey-Briney Debate p. 162). Now we wonder if our brother knows what the word "method" means? There is nothing in that word that debars this principle from authorizing the instrument. Webster says: method: "regular arrangement of things; system; order; classification."

Inman says the method of singing is specified. If so, the arrangement of it is specified; the system of it is specified; the order of it is specified; the classification of it is specified. Yet our brother says the place to get the song, the pitch, soprano, alto, bass, and tenor are not specified. He says these are not related to the method of singing. Are they not an arrangement, order, classification and so on? If so, then they apply to method. Hence, if Briney's principle failed to authorize the instrument because it mentions the word, "method" it fails to authorize the song book, tuning fork, etc., from which we get the song and pitch. Therefore, you cannot consistently condemn the instrument and use the song book and tuning fork. **SO WE HAVE SHOWN THAT BROTHER INMAN FAILED TO GIVE ANY AUTHORITY WHATSOEVER FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF HIS PROPOSITION.** He changed his position four times on necessary inference and never did settle on anything definite, and Briney's principle failed to furnish authority, for it failed to deal with the word, consistently. Compare the following:

WHAT INMAN SUBMITTED AS AUTHORITY: The law of necessary inference, which means: "A consequence, implication or conclusion derived either by deduction or induction which cannot be otherwise, is essential, indispensable and a thing that cannot be done without." Now to apply this to the aids mentioned in his proposition: "A song book, tuning fork, radio, communion set, automobile, chart, church house, collection basket and all aids in the same category" are "A consequence, implication or conclusion derived either by deduction or induction which cannot be otherwise, is essential, indispensable and things that cannot be done without" in obeying the Scriptures.

WHAT I SUBMITTED AS AUTHORITY: The law of expediency, which means: "Fit; convenient, suitable;

proper; that which aids as a means to an end; device." Now apply this to the aids mentioned in our proposition: "A song book, tuning fork, radio, communion set, automobile, chart, church house, collection basket, instrumental music and all aids in the same category" are "Fit; convenient; suitable; proper; that which aids as a means to an end; a device" in obeying the Scriptures. You may decide who has the best authority.

My argument on the law of expediency boils down to four things: (1) All proper aids are authorized by the law of expediency. (2) All things authorized by the law of expediency are matters of opinion. (3) The song book, tuning fork, radio, instrumental music and aids in the same category are matters of opinion. (4) Therefore, Brother Inman does not have one single, solitary reason for opposing the instrument, unless it is a desire to force his opinion. The moment he demands others to cease using the instrument, he demands obedience to his opinion. I forced Inman to this same conclusion by those fourteen questions. Note the following:

IV. Of all twisting, squirming and evading in trying to get around the force of my fourteen questions he takes the cake. I warned him that these questions would totally defeat him and I believe he could see it. I promised to show a dozen contradictions that these questions forced him to make. I will now state my questions and the substance of his answers and point out the contradictions:

1. "Is anything authorized by the law of expediency?" When the substance of his answer is summarized it was simply, yes. This is contradictory to his arguing that three ways only, authorizes anything: commandment, example and inference. For now he adds the "fourth" way: the law of expediency! Contradiction number one!

2. "Is any matter of faith authorized only by the law of expediency?" The substance of his answer is, no.

Now since he said in answering question one that something is authorized by expediency and now he says it is not faith—well, then he is forced to say it is opinion. This contradicts his answer to question fourteen. For he answered: "Only half right," to my statement: "All things authorized by law of expediency are matters of opinion and not matters of faith." In question two "wholly right" in fourteen, "half right." Contradiction number two!

3. "Are matters of opinion authorized by the law of expediency?" The substance of his answer was, yes. Question fourteen was really the same question, but to this he answered: "Only half right." Contradiction number three!

4. "Is the law of expediency and necessary inference the same thing?" He answered, "Not the same." Since he says these are different, he will surely say the law of expediency is also different from a commandment and example. This contradicts his claim that scholars (Boswell & Hardeman) say there are only THREE ways a thing may be authorized. Inman adds "law of expediency" which makes FOUR ways. Is he going back on what he claimed Boswell & Hardeman said? You claim you agree with them in one paper and in the next you disagree with what you claim they said. Contradiction number four!

5. I asked the use of the law of expediency, in question five, if aids are authorized by necessary inference. He said: "Answered in number four." But look at number four, reader! He said: "The law of expediency and necessary inference are not the same." Did that answer number five? A thousand times no! He simply failed to answer number five. It was the key question, however! Any sane person knows that since the law of expediency does not authorize matters of faith (according to Inman and I agree) and since aids (opinions) are not authorized by law of expediency (says he) that we have no use for the law of expediency whatever. This

leaves him in contradiction number five; for he was unable to show the law of expediency had any use after saying it authorized some matters.

6. He answered number six satisfactorily.

7. "If the law of necessary inference and law of expediency are not the same laws why did Alexander Campbell contend that aids were authorized by the law of expediency instead of necessary inference?" He answered: "I don't know why." Ah, brother! We know why! Because Mr. Campbell knew more about the law of necessary inference than does Mr. Inman. Hence, he preferred to choose the only law there is for the authority for aids: The law of expediency. This leaves Inman in contradiction with his contention that he stands with Campbell and the pioneers. Inman says aids cannot be authorized by law of expediency, (in this question) Campbell says they can. Contradiction number six!

8. "If they are not the same laws—then did not Campbell contend that all matters of necessary inference are matters of opinion in his article on the law of expediency?" Inman answered: "They are not the same. When the Bible tells us to sing and does not specify the source from which to obtain the song. We may necessarily infer that we may use the law of expediency in determining the source." The fact, he claims the law of expediency is necessarily inferred from the commandment to sing (See Eph. 5:19) is contradictory to the contention of his first paper when he claimed the conclusion was the thing inferred. First, the song book and tuning fork inferred; next the conclusion inferred; next the law of expediency inferred. This makes contradictions numbers seven and eight:

9. "Does the law of necessary inference have any place in determining the articles of faith, acts of worship, or principles of morality?" (Campbell said: "The law of expediency has no place in determining the

articles of faith, acts of worship, or principles of morality." Christian System P. 94). Inman said: "The answer to nine is yes." This makes the radio, tuning fork, church house, automobile, and those aids of his proposition articles of faith, acts of worship, and principles of morality. Because, says Inman, they are determined by the law of necessary inference. But this is contradictory to his second paper where he said the conclusion, not the aids, themselves, is inferred. Now since the aids themselves are not inferred, they cannot be matters of faith; if not matters of faith, then not authorized by law of necessary inference, since necessary inference determines articles of faith. Hence contradiction number nine! Plus this, he is in contradiction with the pioneers. In Campbell's article on expediency he listed, "meeting houses" as one thing authorized by expediency. Inman says the meeting house is authorized by necessary inference.

10. "Are the things authorized by necessary inference matters of faith?" (This question, of course, was answered in number nine, but Inman tried to cover its force by another answer). He said: "We may do them believing that they are right." Why try to evade? You answered this question: "Yes" when you answered "Yes" to number nine.

You knew this question meant total defeat. For when you say, things authorized by necessary inference are matters of faith; then say the radio, song book, etc., are authorized by necessary inference; YOU ARE THEN SAYING ALL THESE AIDS ARE MATTERS OF FAITH! I say honestly, and with kindness when I say, I feel sorry for you, Brother. You have convinced me that you will hold on to your hobby against the instrument regardless to reason or revelation. I have lost hopes of ever converting you. Is there another anti-instrument advocate living or dead who will take the stand that the radio, song book, tuning fork, etc., are matters of faith? The read-

er, of course, is wondering! Yes, reader! They are forced to take this stand when you shoot those fourteen questions or else give up their belief about the instrument. They have to do one or the other. Campbell said: "Whatever is of faith, or the worship, or of morality of Christianity, was both possible and necessary to be promulgated; and is expressly and fully propounded in the sacred scriptures." (Christian System P. 94). Was the radio, tuning fork, automobile, etc., "expressly and fully propounded in the sacred scriptures?" No! So not faith according to Campbell and plain facts. Hence, Inman is in contradiction with his contention that he stands with the pioneers. Contradiction number ten!

11. "Are the things authorized by the law of expediency matters of faith?" Inman answered: "Expediency does not determine whether things are matters of faith but what we can use within the limits of 'the faith.'" Note that statement carefully, reader! It is another total surrender! If "expediency determines what we can use within the limits of 'the faith'" why on earth did he say that a direct commandment, scriptural example and necessary inference (three ways only) determines what is within the limits of the faith? Both of our propositions have been to find out what determines what we can use within the limits of the faith. If you desire to distinguish between "matters of faith" and "the limits of the faith" by saying that "matters of faith" are determined by commandment, example, and inference and "the limits of the faith" (opinions) are determined by the law of expediency, I gladly agree. This is exactly what you have done! But it is a complete surrender to my position and contradictory to your former contentions. Hence, contradiction number eleven!

12. "Is the radio, automobile, song book, collection basket, etc., matters of faith or opinion?" Inman gave two answers, one contradicting the other.

First, "We have faith that we may use the radio, automobile, etc." Second, "the system of faith authorizes them by necessary inference." His first answer shows that he believes these aids come in the realm of what he termed, "within the limits of the faith," which he said was determined by expediency. The second answer is contradictory to this, for he said they are authorized by necessary inference. First by expediency; next, by necessary inference. But he had already said in questions nine and ten that the radio, song book, etc., were matters of faith. But in question twelve he adds: "It does not bind their use as absolutely essential, however." Well now, he has them matters of faith and yet not essential. This contradicts a statement of his when he said: "I will present a round silver dollar to the man who can show me one command of God to the Christian that he can leave off and be eternally saved." Now if something is necessarily inferred it is essential as something commanded. If not, then you explain how one part of faith is more essential than another. In one statement he says necessary inference determines faith. In another he says the radio, song book, etc., are authorized by necessary inference and are also matters of faith. In another statement he says they are "not absolutely essential." In another he offers a round silver dollar to any man who can show one command (any part of faith) where a Christian can leave off and be eternally saved. These are contradictions numbers twelve and thirteen!

13. "Is instrumental music a matter of faith or opinion?" He was kind enough with his answer to tell me what I had said about it. Hear him: "You said it is opinion and not faith." Why evade? Now, what do you say about it, Mr. Inman? We know what I said! But we also know what you have said. Listen to him: "I have nowhere said that the use of the instrument is a matter of faith." This answers my question. You have agreed

with me that instrumental music is a matter of opinion. Now since you have made it a matter of opinion, can you give one good, sound, logical, scriptural reason for being against the instrument unless it is your desire to make me obey your opinions? Plus this, you have contradicted your former contention when you quoted the pioneers to prove that opinions should not be discussed. Do you remember what you said about that? When you preach against the instrument you have admitted you are preaching an opinion. You are now found debating an opinion; something which you said, Campbell said, made you a factionists and therefore should be disfellowshipped. So contradiction number fourteen!

I KNEW WHEN I EXPOSED HIS ERROR OF NECESSARY INFERENCE AND SHOWED THAT ALL PROPER AIDS ARE NOT AUTHORIZED BY THAT LAW THAT IT WOULD FORCE HIM TO THE LAW OF EXPEDIENCY WHERE THE AUTHORITY FOR ALL PROPER AIDS AND LAWFUL OPINIONS ARE FOUND—THIS BEING DONE HE IS LEFT WITHOUT ONE SINGLE, SOLITARY REASON FOR BEING AGAINST INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC OTHER THAN HIS DESIRE TO MAKE US BOW OUR KNEES TO HIS OPINION! THIS IS THE FINAL AND LASTING CONCLUSION TO THE WHOLE INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC CONTROVERSY!

14. "Was I correct in my statement: 'All things authorized by the law of expediency are matters of opinion and not matters of faith?'" Inman answered: "Only half right." This contradicts his answer to question three for his answer was simply, "Yes." No, "half right" to it then. But he answers fourteen further: "IT MUST BE A MATTER OF FAITH BEFORE WE HAVE THE LIBERTY TO EXERCISE OUR OPINION." (capitals mine). Great heavens! What else shall our brother resort to in trying to dodge the truth. How can he

say it must be a matter of faith before we have the liberty to exercise our opinion? Is the radio a matter of faith? You take the liberty in exercising your opinion when using it don't you? Is it your opinion that we may use the song book? Tuning fork? Collection basket? If so, are they matters of faith? Of course, you have said time and time again they are, but I deny it! You were forced to this position, as the last straw, in retaining your stand against the instrument. But in the language of the school boy, "just look what you went and did and done." YOU HAVE MADE THE INSTRUMENT A MATTER OF OPINION AND THE RADIO, SONG BOOK AND AIDS IN THE SAME CATEGORY MATTERS OF FAITH! Do not be alarmed reader, because when a man gets messed up in crooked positions and false teachings he is subject to get crossed up and tangled into all kinds of ugly predicaments.

I only promised to give twelve contradictions but have already given fifteen, but one more will not hurt. The fifth thing I promised to do was: (V) To show that Inman has himself in another INCONSISTENT PREDICAMENT! He has said time and again if Eph. 5:19 necessarily inferred the instrument then that Scripture cannot be obeyed without using the instrument. That it is not an inference, but a command and being thus is essential. Then turned right around and said himself that the song book, tuning fork are inferred from this very passage. Therefore, according to his argument this scripture cannot be obeyed without using the song book and tuning fork. This makes contradiction number sixteen! However, he says the song book, tuning fork, etc., are "not absolutely essential" even though he says they are matters of faith.

6. He made a pitiful effort in dodging the force of my argument that the heart of the Bible is the mind. He says: "Everyone has heard

the expression "heart strings," "cords of the heart," etc. Paul evidently knew something of this figure of speech when he told us to "pluck the heart." How does he know everyone has heard these figurative expressions? He supposes they have! How does he know Paul knew about them? He guesses he did, and therefore proceeds to risk the cause he represents upon "a guess" or upon "what everyone has heard." Isn't that some foundation for an argument! You may live to be a thousand but the "heart" of the Bible will still mean: the affections, desire, the conscience, the mind and nothing more. On the Day of Pentecost when they were "pricked in their hearts" simply means, they were "pricked in their conscience." It does not mean that their hearts were musical instruments as you say! But to cap it all, in his last speech he says: "All know that I never argued that the Bible heart is not the mind." So he admits "the Bible heart" is the mind. Then he is forced to admit when he insists that the Bible specifies "the heart" to accompany the singing it does nothing more than specifies "the mind" to accompany the singing. But what grounds does he have for saying the mechanical instrument is excluded simply because we use our minds when we sing? Great stuff, that is! **THIS SHOWS THE RIDICULOUSNESS OF HIS SECOND PRINCIPLE, THAT OF A SPECIFIC COMMANDMENT WHICH HE CLAIMS EXCLUDES THE INSTRUMENT.** The reader can see that I have thoroughly exposed his contention based upon the principle of a specific commandment. Because there is nothing about "using one's mind" when he sings that excludes the instrument from being used to aid in getting the pitch and tune. If so, the radio is excluded as an aid for acoustics, for we use our minds when we preach. When all is done and said it boils down to the fact, that because the Bible specifies the mind to be used when we sing, this (they think) excludes the

instrument. But only the love for a hobby would force one to such a conclusion. Inman said I could have it out with Paul for he is the one who says the heart and understanding accompanies the singing. I agree with Paul! But Paul did not say this excludes the instrument. I prefer having it out with Clifton Inman, who goes beyond what Paul says and contends that the fact the heart (mind) is mentioned excludes the instrument. I do not deny Paul mentioning the heart, but I deny Inman the right to exclude the instrument.

REPLY TO INMAN'S LAST PAPER

1. He thinks because I said the instrument was used in the worship service, that it is not parallel to Noah's "hickory-axe-handle," "beech log cart," etc., for he says he; "These were not used in the ark." But in this argument he is wrong. God commanded Noah to build an ark out of Gopher wood. In obeying this commandment Noah was in the service of God. He could have used a "hickory axe-handle" and a "beech-log cart" in this service of God. Likewise, God commanded us to sing. In obeying this commandment we are in the service of God. We may use the instrument in this service of God. A perfect parallel! This shows that just as a specific commandment to use gopher wood did not exclude other kinds of wood from being used in the service, as aids, so the specific commandment to sing (make music) does not exclude other kinds of music (instrumental music) from being used in the service, as aids.

2. He says he cannot see any logic in saying that "one kind of preaching" can aid to do another kind just as "one kind of music" can aid to do another kind and, of course, vice versa. I am sure the reader sees the logic!

3. Next, he said I contradicted myself by saying there are two kinds of music and then denied it. Why the accusation? I said instrumental music was not another kind of music

offered as praise unto God (that is, an act of worship) but that it is another kind of music, used to aid us to sing. No contradiction here, but simply a misrepresentation!

4. Next, he says the tuning fork is not a musical instrument. We have you in another contradiction, Mr. Inman. Because in your first negative paper of our first proposition you said: "In the first place, an instrument of music is any instrument which produces music." But now you say it must be "a rhythmic combination of tones" to be music. Eight scholars say there are only two kinds of sounds: musical and unmusical. Since the tuning fork produces a musical sound (a tone) it produces music. Therefore, according to your first definition it is a musical instrument. Hence if "one kind of music" specified in Eph. 5:19 (as you claim) excludes "other kinds of music," then the tuning fork is excluded; for it produces music. Therefore, you cannot consistently use the tuning fork and condemn the instrument; so your proposition falls!

5. Next, he accused me of saying that the radio "butchers" Mk. 16:15 and the piano "butchers" Eph. 5:19 and then said, I said, I believed in them both. This deceiving effort did his cause no good. Because I made it clear to the reader just what I was doing. **HE KNOWS THAT I WAS USING ANTI-INSTRUMENT LOGIC IN THIS ARGUMENT!** I did not use my own logic but theirs! Some of Inman's brethren are anti-radio as well as anti-instrument. Having dealt with all kinds of antis I knew their arguments. So I borrowed the arguments against the radio, from one of Inman's brethren who is anti-radio. This cooked Inman! Because he knows his anti-radio brethren are consistent in their reasoning in condemning both the radio and the instrument with the same arguments. Of course, I do not believe these arguments made against the radio nor against the instrument either. But we are not dealing with what I believe or disbelieve,

but we are dealing with **CONSISTENCIES!** I was showing, by the argument against the radio, that Inman was not **CONSISTENT** in using the radio and condemning the instrument. I made it clear that according to my belief, according to my line of reasoning, according to my position we can use both the radio and the instrument of music. But according to Inman's position and line of reasoning he cannot use either the radio or the instrument. When he uses one and condemns the other he is **INCONSISTENT**. This is all I claim for my argument against the radio.

6. Next, he tried to shield himself (at the expense of his brethren) by saying he did not preach over the radio. But this is immaterial, since the word "radio" is in his proposition. He is forced to defend it. He knows if he preaches over it, he is compelled to permit one to be in the worship service, hence in tuning for his sermon we have jokes and beer advertisements in the worship service (according to the "anti" conception of a worship service).

7. Next, he demanded that I mention one preacher who preaches over the radio, who asks people to stay away from the church and listen to the radio. Whether he asks them or not, the people do! Hence, the charge is true that the radio keeps more people out of the church than does the instrument. I will turn that demand around: You find one preacher who ever asked the people to stay at home to keep from hearing the instrument!

8. Next, he says the song book and tuning fork were meagerly and weakly opposed at their introduction into the worship service, but the instrument was ably and strongly opposed. Judging by this debate it has not been strongly and ably opposed. Nor any other debate! If it has been so ably and strongly opposed, then how do you account for the fact that nearly every church uses it? All opposition against it has been weakly and meagerly. Since the tuning fork is inferred as you say from the com-

mandment to sing, then I insist that each individual must have one if he obeys this commandment. This takes care of your demand for each of my brethren to have an instrument, and points out another inconsistency! The inference of a Scripture is the teaching of that Scripture. So if the scripture infers the tuning fork it teaches one.

9. Next, He brings up "historical facts" and says the early church opposed the instrument. There is no record of the slightest opposition until the sixth or seventh century. We are sure the Apostles did not oppose it, though they had forty-four opportunities to do so. He says I gave up the forty-four passages in the New Testament which mention the instruments of music. Great imagination, you have! I will not give them up until God sees fit to re-write the New Testament and leave them out. Have you wondered why he did not deny what I said about the Clubb-Boles Debate? Brother Clubb "flooded" Boles with Scholars proving that the instrument was used during the days of the Apostles and down through the centuries until the very present. Inman has this debate, and he knows all reliable authorities are against his "historical facts." His effort to twist the fourteen translations which translated "Psallo" in Eph. 5:19, to "make music," "strike strings," "play on harp," etc., was a miserable failure. All can see by reading these translations that they mean not only to infer instrumental music but to teach it in plain words.

10. Next, he reminds us that I failed to answer his question on whether Nadab and Abihu could have used fire as an aid. All know that I thoroughly threshed this story out and showed that if the fire, used by them, had the same relationship to the commandment of God, that instrumental music does to singing, it could have been used with profit. But such was not the case, hence "strange fire" is not parallel to the instrument.

166

11. He certainly gave a lame excuse for backing down on the proposition, which he had signed his name to. He gave two excuses: First, that I would not defend a missionary society. Second, that a third man must be selected to read each paper and cut out all personal matters. Now, to "blow up" these excuses I will agree to leave the Appalachian Evangelizing Association in the proposition that we have formerly agreed to discuss and I am willing also that the third man be selected. Now, what will Mr. Inman do? He will back down, and the reader will know why, if that proposition is not discussed. I can agree with him for one on the "pastor-system" too. He denied a statement which I will affirm: He said: "His proposition leaves a false impression in the minds of the readers. It leaves the idea that the "one-man-preacher-pastor" has generally taken over the work of the elders throughout the Churches of Christ. This is not true." But it is true, too, and I will affirm it! Will Inman deny? You see reader, that he has no excuse for refusing to debate these propositions.

12. Next, I agree that the "cup" does not refer to the container, (in the Lord's Supper) but to the contents of the container. But when you have several containers you have several "cups" (contents). This is the objection offered by Inman's "one cup" brethren. They say we must have "one container" in order to have "one cup" which is as good an argument as can be offered against the exclusion of the instrument—by a specific commandment.

A RECAPITULATION!

Since I have endeavored to be thorough in my arguments throughout the entire debate and have already practically given a summary in this paper, I deem it wise to merely mention the major arguments and principles which have been used.

First, my opponent offered the law of necessary inference as the authority for all proper aids. I exposed

this in my first paper by six arguments which he hardly referred to, much less than meet.

Second, I made six arguments which proved that the instrument had a much better chance to be inferred than did the radio, tuning fork, etc. While on the other hand I showed that if we were sure it were not inferred, we still had authority for its use in the law of expediency.

Third, my opponent offered next, the principle involved in a specific commandment. I did two things to expose this: (1) Showed that a specific commandment excluded substitutes, not aids; (2) Showed that the heart of Eph. 5:19 is the mind, and not an instrument, therefore, no instrument is specified to accompany the singing hence cannot exclude the musical instrument.

Fourth, I showed, however, if a specific commandment excluded the instrument it also excluded the song book and tuning fork.

Fifth, I made four affirmative arguments (besides some sub-arguments) which showed that every argument that can be made in favor of the radio, tuning fork, song book and against the instrument, can be made in favor of the instrument and against these other things. I showed that the law of expediency is the proper authority for all proper aids. But that this authority governs opinions. Inman admitted that the instrument is a matter of opinion. So I close by saying that since the instrument is a matter of opinion, it should be left to each congregation to decide whether it wants the instrument or not. To do otherwise, is to force our opinion. This has always been the position of the Church of Christ.

167

APPENDIX

A Compilation of the Correspondence which Preceded the Debate

Petry, W. Va.,
September 6, 1941

Dear Brother Inman:

Received your letter stating a proposition in a way I do not believe. I don't want to affirm a proposition I don't believe. As you suggest we will turn the matter over to Julian and you will hear from him in a few days concerning a proposition.

Sincerely,

KENIS HUNT

Bluefield, West Virginia

Mr. Roger Clifton Inman,
Pikeville, Kentucky,
My Dear Brother Inman:

Your letter and proposition for a debate written to Brother Kenis Hunt were placed in my hands.

I am glad that you are willing to discuss the subject of instrumental music as most of your group in that vicinity have given up the idea! I now take the pleasure to challenge you for a written debate on the subject. Of course, I accept your challenge for an oral debate, but why not have both an oral and written discussion?

If you are not willing to share in publishing a small booklet on instrumental music then you can leave it to our side of the house to do so. I feel if you are interested in getting the truth before the people, as you see the subject, you will accept the written debate.

The proposition you presented does not state my views on the subject so I present the following proposition for your consideration:

"Resolved, that instrumental music aids the individual and is therefore not sinful when used to exercise God's commandment to sing during Christian worship service."

JULIAN OLYN HUNT, Affirms
Denies

"Resolved, that the brotherhood of the Church of Christ that I (R. C. Inman), stands identified with, speaks where the Bible speaks and keeps silent where the Bible is silent."

Affirms

JULIAN OLYN HUNT Denies

I submit two propositions. You know it is fair for you to affirm half time. A four nights' debate is all right with me; at least it should not be less than four nights. Two hours each night. Thirty minutes each speech. The affirmative speaker getting ten minutes the last night of his affirmative.

It is doubtful that the church in Pikeville will endorse a debate. I am unwilling to hold the discussion anywhere it is not wanted. However, I will write Lee Ford in Pikeville and ask him in regard to having it in Pikeville.

Let me know in regard to the written debate. We should agree on rules, etc., to govern the written debate and announce during the oral debate that immediately we will begin on the written discussion.

Yours for two debates,

JULIAN OLYN HUNT,

Evangelist of the Church of Christ

Hedges Rules of Logic are all right to govern the oral discussion.

Pikeville, Kentucky

Mr. Julian Olyn Hunt,
Bluefield, West Virginia,
Dear Brother Hunt:

I have in hand your letter of September 9. I am also glad that you are willing to discuss the subject of instrumental music as most of those of your group throughout the United States have decided that they don't believe in debates since having a few with us! That, of course, is entirely beside the subject though.

Yes, it would be pleasing to me to engage in a written debate also. However, there will have to be some agreements made concerning this. Hedges Rules of Logic should be used here also. There will have to be some understanding as to who will publish the discussion and who will bear the expenses as well as some understanding about proof reading, etc.

Now as to your proposition: I think that it leaves too much room for misunderstanding. You realize that the clearer that a proposition is written the less likelihood there is for misunderstanding and misrepresentations and the more likelihood there is for agreement. Below I am quoting your proposition as stated and adding one in its stead which, I think, states your views and at the same time is a little more to the point.

Your proposition:

"Resolved, that instrumental music aids the individual and is therefore not sinful when used to exercise God's commandment to sing during Christian worship service."

Amended proposition:

"Resolved, that mechanical instrumental music aids an individual to worship God and is therefore, in harmony with the teaching of the New Testament with regard to the conducting of christian worship service."

CLIFTON INMAN denies.
Affirms

In your proposition you would be made to affirm a negative. No man should be asked to do that. There is room also for some argument as to whether a man can exercise a command, which discussion would only cloud the issue. Further, you fail to state what the instrument aids the individual to do.

Two propositions are perfectly satisfactory to me. I believe that I suggested as much in my letter. Your proposition leaves room for much unnecessary argument though. In the first place, if I signed to negate the proposition which you have, I would admit that there are two or more brotherhoods of the Church of Christ. This I emphatically deny. Some of the brotherhood is in error. Some who claim to be in the brotherhood are not in it, but there are not more than one brotherhood. The apostle Peter, who said, "If any man speak let him speak as the oracles of God," could not affirm that the church of which he was a member (using the term church to refer to the members) always did this. He himself was guilty of not doing so upon one occasion. (See Gal. 1) Now I realize that when I say this you will immediately

ask, "Well, why is it that you will not fellowship us then?" Well, read Rom. 16:17 and Titus 3:10. The church at Corinth had many things in it that were wrong. They were warned to put them away. I am sure if they had not done so that the apostle would have had nothing to do with them thereafter. (See the fifth chapter, the last few verses and also the letters to the churches of Asia recorded in Revelation). Whenever I see anyone violating the principle of speaking where the Bible speaks and keeping silent where it is silent I rebuke them for it.

I believe that the brotherhood in general does not violate this principle. I believe that the christian church does almost every time they meet and even when they don't. You, of course, contend that you are not affiliated with the Christian church. This contention is more technical than real, however. Now I will submit a proposition which I will affirm. Above it I state the proposition that you submitted.

Your proposition:

"Resolved that the brotherhood of the Church of Christ that I (R. C. Inman) stands identified with, speaks where the Bible speaks and keeps silent where the Bible is silent."

Proposition which I submit:

"Resolved, that to please God one must speak where the Bible speaks and keep silent where it is silent."

CLIFTON INMAN Affirms
Denies

After thinking over the first proposition a little more I believe that the following will be better:

"Resolved that the use of mechanical instruments in the worship service of the church for the purpose of aiding the individual in his worship is scriptural."

CLIFTON INMAN Affirms
Denies

Either proposition is satisfactory with me.

Yours in love and for the truth,

CLIFTON INMAN

Bluefield, West Virginia,
September 13, 1941

Mr. Roger Clifton Inman,
Pikeville, Kentucky,
Dear Brother Inman:

Your amendments to my propositions are unfair to my position. It is not necessary that I analyze your amended propositions and state why, because this would not change a fact. To save time I will present the following propositions which I consider the best ones by far to both of us:

"Resolved, that a mechanical instrument of music aids an individual to sing and is therefore not sinful when used during Christian worship service."

Affirmative JULIAN OLYN HUNT

Negative _____

The word "mechanical" will hold the discussion on such instruments as the piano, organ, etc., and debar the mouth and throat from being brought in. You notice I state precisely what the instrument aids the individual to do—that is, TO SING! I demand that the expression "therefore, not sinful" be in the proposition, because your brethren think it is sinful, hence, why should you object to its being in the proposition? There is nothing to what you say about affirming a negative. In fact, some propositions are better stated in a negative form. For an example: I had rather affirm that a Baptist is wrong

in Origin, Name, Doctrine and Practice as to permit him to affirm he is right. Or I had rather he affirm that I was wrong as for me to affirm that I was right, because this way, one could merely hit the issues and cull the vast material upon which we both agree.

Anyway, if I desire to affirm instrumental music not sinful, I am the man doing it, and you should not worry. I consider this, a good reason for having or retaining this in the proposition.

The expression "during Christian worship service" will hold the discussion on this side of Acts 11:26, since they had no christians before this time. I mean, to say that it will hold the discussion under the Christian dispensation.

In your amended proposition you want me to affirm that "Music aids an individual to worship God." This is entirely too broad: because, if you so desired you could hold me to the entire worship program of God, hence, make me affirm that instrumental music aided one to preach or to baptize, etc. This is not the issue. The issue with me is that instrumental music aids an individual to sing!

"Resolved, that the brethren who stand with me are scriptural, reasonable and consistent in what they teach and practice."

Affirmative _____

Negative JULIAN OLYN HUNT

This proposition is by far better than the first I asked you to affirm, that is, Where the Bible speaks, etc.

Surely, you will not object to affirming a proposition like the above. In fact, I can sign the affirmative and affirm it myself.

Brother Inman, we can make a real discussion out of these issues, provided they state what each believes or disbelieves. If you are not satisfied with either of these propositions, why do not sign them. Because we will want to use the same propositions in the written debate that we use in the oral one. So we do not want to be arguing over a misunderstood proposition. WE WANT TO DEBATE THE ISSUES!

It will suit me to have the debate in October. I will be through Pikeville September 22nd or 23rd on my way to Bosco, Kentucky (Floyd County) and will be in a revival at Bosco for thirteen nights—until Oct. 5th.

Anytime after Oct. 5th will suit me to have the discussion. Now, as to the place: Why not have it at Harold, Kentucky?

Hedges Rules of Logic will be used in both oral and written debates. However, it will take more than this for the written one. We must agree on the number of pages, size, length of time each gets in replying, cost of publishing, etc.

I have some fine rules to govern a written debate somewhere in my files. Will look them up in time to send for your consideration.

Yours in the spirit of peace and love,

JULIAN OLYN HUNT,
Evangelist, Church of Christ

Pikeville, Kentucky

Mr. Julian Olyn Hunt,
Bluefield, West Virginia,
Dear Brother Hunt:

The question between us is not whether mechanical instruments of music aid one to sing, but whether it is right to use them in worship service. For this reason I think your proposition is not very well worded. It would make me deny that an instrument aids singing. This would allow for a lot of reasoning irrelevant to the issue.

Your wanting to use the phrase "not sinful" doesn't worry me. Nevertheless it is an effort on your part (whether intentional or not I am unable to say) to put me in the affirmative or in the lead. You desire to have two propositions. You aver that it is only fair that we each affirm one proposition, yet by the wording of your propositions you put me in the affirmative on both. There is something to what I say about affirming a negative. Consult any book on polemics—about all of them will agree with my statements. Yes we teach that it is sinful but you use it and thereby declare that it is in harmony with New Testament teaching. It therefore falls your lot to show that it is in harmony with New Testament teaching. I submit the following propositions. You may select either of them or submit another in their place.

"Resolved, that a mechanical instrument of music aids an individual to worship through the avenue of singing and is therefore in harmony with New Testament teaching."

_____ Affirms
CLIFTON INMAN Denies

"Resolved that the use of mechanical instruments of music to aid one to sing in the christian worship service is in harmony with New Testament teaching."

_____ Affirms
CLIFTON INMAN Denies

Your other proposition allows too much room for mud slinging. It would be altogether a debate of personalities. Any discussion that I have I expect to be concerned with the Bible and held upon a high plane. I refuse to indulge in a discussion of personalities. The apostle Paul or Peter would not and could not affirm the proposition which you have submitted. I stand with no man in his error though I may approve his general actions, teaching and conduct. Do you not think that the following proposition is fairer and covers the issue that you want to discuss?

"Resolved that my teaching and practice in religious matters are consistent with my stand as regards the use of mechanical instruments of music in the worship service."

_____ Affirms
CLIFTON INMAN Denies

Any fair proposition that gets the real issue is all right with me.

Kenis tells me that you will use him as your moderator, I have not selected mine as yet, but I think that when I have selected him that he and Kenis should get together and choose a chairman moderator. This would make for a debate upon a higher plane.

Any time in October is suitable to me. Harold is a suitable location provided it meets with the approval of the congregation there. I still believe that Pikeville is the more logical place as it is centrally located and would afford better attendance. I believe that Wheelwright would be better than Harold or that even Zebulon would be better. We can thrash some of these things out when you are through here.

Sincerely yours,
CLIFTON INMAN

Mr. Roger Clifton Inman,
Pikeville, Kentucky,
My Dear Brother:

Bluefield, W. Va.,
Sept. 18, 1941

"An individual has authority to use a mechanical instrument of music to aid him to sing during christian worship service."

Affirmative: JULIAN O. HUNT
Negative: CLIFTON INMAN

"I am scriptural, reasonable and consistent in what I teach and practice."
Affirmative: CLIFTON INMAN
Negative: JULIAN O. HUNT

In my affirmative you desire me to prove instrumental music in harmony with the teaching of the New Testament. This is hardly fair to the issue: because this clause is misleading! We could spend much time arguing what it means to be in harmony with the teaching of the New Testament. You of course, would affirm it means to have a direct commandment, apostolic example or necessary inference, and this, I deny. I desire to use the word "authority", also the phrase, "during christian worship service." This will demand me to give the proper authority and will hold the discussion to reason based upon scriptural principles. May I ask: "Could an individual justly use anything "during christian worship service" and not have the proper authority?" The term "christian worship" means much in holding the discussion to the proper source of reasoning.

In your affirmative: I have left out, "the brethren who stand with me" and have left you in a one man church as you seem to desire. I am not interested a little bit in dealing with you personally, but the proposition is plainly stated: "what I teach and practice." I will assure you that personalities shall not be introduced by me for I will not have time for anything like that but will be engaged in showing the "number of things you teach, use and practice" that are unscriptural, hence you are unreasonable and inconsistent in condemning instrumental music. Will see you in Pikeville Monday.

Sincerely,
JULIAN HUNT

January 27th

Dear Clifton:

The rules of the written discussion says nothing about a three page rejoinder. I am satisfied without it. It will only make our book larger and in it we can say nothing new—so it will consist of a hash and re-hash of what has been said. However, if you insist we will have a three page rejoinder. I am leaving Bluefield and going to Arkansas. Write me by return mail and state whether we shall or shall not have the rejoinder. I am leaving here next week.

Your friend,
JULIAN HUNT

Friday, January 30

Dear Clifton:

It will not be necessary to have the rejoinder. The book will probably be too long. You may send your manuscript (affirmative) to me in care of F. W. Strong, President Ozark Christian College, Bentonville, Arkansas.

Clifton, we will need to get together and cull all material irrelevant to instrumental music from our speeches. Both have been guilty of breaking the rules which we agreed would govern us. Your propositions on the pastor do not state an issue. I agree that one can preach for a space—or number of months where there are elders. The evangelist should visit the congregations and would be permitted to speak, of course. If you deny that there is a one man pastor system set up in the Churches, known as Churches of Christ, I will affirm.

Sincerely,
JULIAN HUNT

Bluefield, West Virginia
February 2, 1942

Dear Clifton:

Since writing you a card asking that you send your manuscript to F. W. Strong, Bentonville, Arkansas, things relative to my welfare have happened, therefore, I have decided to stay here some longer.

In case you have not mailed the manuscript, you may send it to me to the above address. However, I am writing Brother Strong to forward my mail, hence I will be safe in receiving your speech.

Nothing has been said in regard to the agreement for a discussion on the societies and Bible Colleges. You accepted the proposition I presented on this question, you know. Of course, after thinking over that proposition I have decided that the Evangelizing Association should be struck out, as I do not want to defend any missionary. I did not mention this society to defend it, but in order to let you know that the societies that are organized by individuals can be justified on the same ground or argument that one can justify Bible colleges which are organized by individuals.

You know there are Bible colleges which fall into a class different from other Bible colleges. The same is true with missionary societies. I do not ask you to defend a modernistic Bible college and of course you will not understand me to be claiming that any missionary society can be justified by the same argument as you would justify Abilene Christian College.

Best wishes,
JULIAN OLYN HUNT

Pikeville, Kentucky,
February 7, 1942

Dear Julian:

I have just today returned from a trip to West Virginia where my wife is staying during her confinement, therefore, I have just received both your card and your letter. From this you will understand the delayed answer.

As I had not received your card, I sent the manuscript to you at Bluefield. I suppose you have it by now.

Concerning the irrelevant material in our manuscripts—I am satisfied as the manuscripts are. It was agreed, I believe that we would cooperate in checking them over. I am opposed, however, to deletions on a major scale. Some will be necessary perhaps. It is understood that when one party to a contract fails to keep his agreement, the other is automatically released.

In your manuscript you charged me with being "a one-man-preacher-pastor" of the church here in Pikeville. If you do not think that the proposition which I offered states an issue, then name the ground (or grounds) upon which your charge is based. We will then discuss that. If you will not do this you should retract your statement and drop the matter. There is not any such set-up as you mention throughout the Church of Christ as a whole. There may be a few isolated cases. The propositions which you have offered would be altogether a debate of personalities. I refuse to indulge in such.

In the other proposition mentioned you will not necessarily be called upon to defend the Evangelizing Association. It is altogether a question of consistency on my part. If you will not defend it, however, I see no reason why I should be asked to defend the others. But if you wish, I shall be glad to discuss the proposition as it is.

I do not wish to be contrary. I wish to be fair to you. I must at the same time ask that you extend me the same consideration.

Sincerely yours,
CLIFTON INMAN

174

Bluefield, West Virginia
March 29th, 1942

Dear Clifton:

Your letter received. I should apologize for not informing you that I had received your manuscript, but have had very, very little time in which to reply.

Am working every day and preaching every night. Sat up until two o'clock last night (Saturday) and wrote eight pages on it. Will finish it this week and mail it to you by the last of the week any way.

I thought of writing you every day and asking for a few days extension as I am so busy, but each day I neglected it until the time had gone longer than I had realized.

It is mighty nice of you to say a few days longer will be satisfactory.

Say, how is that big girl? And wife? Here is hoping they, both of them, are fine. Congratulations to both of you! You should see our big boy. He will be five months old April 8th. He weighs eighteen pounds now.

You will receive my reply to your paper in a few days.

Thanks.

Your friend,

JULIAN

I think Fern has the baby some little gift.

Bluefield, West Virginia
April 9, 1942

Dear Clifton:

Your letter came today and I note what you say about not being able to lift my manuscript until Saturday. I suppose it will arrive in Pikeville by then, perhaps, not before as I will mail it tomorrow.

I am very sorry that my manuscript is three weeks late. It is hardly the fault of my own, however! I have been working long hours every day and preaching at night. Hardly had time to do anything. Last week I lay off from work because of our revival here—thought I would answer then, but took a most terrible cold, which resulted into an infected ear. I have been so dreadfully sick with corruption coming from my ear and my eyes have been too weak to study much. So I guess when all has been considered I have a valid reason for replying at a late date.

Clifton, you made mention of the spirit of my last letter having a higher tone or something. Let me say that I have never intentionally or knowingly indulged in a bad spirit. My wife tells me I have a streak of dull wit and stinging sarcasm in me. I guess it is a part of me to say hurting things but I am not aware of it most of the time.

Of course, in the debate we ought to write with force and power as much as lieth within us in order to go to the bottom of the issue. I am frank to say that I am more firmly convinced that it is not a sin to use the instrument then I was at the beginning of the discussion.

Of course, one of us is wrong and I would to God that that person could see it—but I am unable to if I am wrong.

Your friend in Christ,

JULIAN O. HUNT

Pikeville, Ky.
April 14, 1942

Dear Julian:

My wife asked me to have you to give her thanks to your wife for the nice gift for the baby. We appreciate it very much.

175

Everyone realizes that in the heat of controversy there is necessarily pointed remarks. We put forth every effort to justly prove our convictions. There are no hard feelings over these things. I feel, however, that you have said some unjustifiable things. You have been prone to deal in personalities. These do not add to the forcefulness of what you say. They merely weaken it.

I realize that all may be guilty of doing such things at times. I may do so myself. Nevertheless, I feel that you have been more guilty in this case. That does not mean that I do not love you and care for your soul.

If I had ever had a doubt as to the truthfulness of the position for which I contend, I would not have it now. I feel that the security of it stands out in bold relief in our discussion. I do not expect you to feel the same. I wish also that we could be together and teach the same things. I hardly expected to accomplish that result from our discussion. Disputants in a controversy seldom change as a result of it. Those who read and study the controversies are changed many times, however. Maybe that will be accomplished in this. If so, my prayers and my expectations will have been fulfilled.

I hope that you are feeling much better now and that you will not be hindered by sickness any more soon.

Sincerely yours,
CLIFTON INMAN

Harold, Ky.
May 15, 1942

Dear Julian:

Enclosed is my last paper. I commend it to you in love. I trust that our effort has been beneficial to us, to the kingdom of heaven and to the souls of men. I have no feeling but of love for your soul.

There were a few things not mentioned in our agreement which should have been mentioned. I am enclosing other agreements which I hope and trust will meet your approval. If they do not, feel free to suggest any changes. You may add any other agreements which you desire. I am enclosing two copies that you may sign one and return to me and have one to keep.

When you are through this way come by to see me. We will be glad to have you. Also bring your wife and boy. We live at Harold now. We have a nice place with a large garden.

Sincerely yours,
CLIFTON INMAN

Bluefield, West Virginia
June 2, 1942

Dear Brother Inman:

In another cover I am mailing my last paper to you. Also I enclose with this letter the additional agreements signed. You made mention that you felt our correspondence leading up to this discussion should be included in the book. Personally, I think this would be a waste of money to pay the additional expense. There isn't anything in our correspondence that is worthwhile. Nothing that I would care for the world knowing. Nor is there anything I would pay a cent to have them know. However, if you wish the correspondence to be included, that is, if you think there is anything in it, that will help your cause I consent to its inclusion on conditions that you pay the additional expense.

All those private letters will not be of interest to the reader. I thought you wanted personal matters cut out of the book, seemingly, judging from your manuscripts.

I think it would be nice to put our pictures in the book. Possibly when we get old and unable to argue we can look at ourselves and wish we were

young again. I know when I read a debate I like to know something of the persons doing the debating. How he looks, etc. If you agree to this, we should submit a picture to a printer in order that both "cuts" be the same size and have the same finish, etc.

Next, I think it proper for each to have one of his brethren to write a very brief forward or preface to the book. We should agree on the length of this. Say, not more than one type-written page for each of our brethren. Or if you do not fancy this idea, and the proper publisher is agreed upon, we might ask him to write a joint preface.

Next, I think we should get together and read out papers together, helping each other with mistakes, and then re-write all our papers on note-book paper, double spacing it, which shall then be placed in a stiff-back notebook and submitted to the printer.

Next, the printer at Pikeville suits me all right provided he is cheaper than most printers. However, I think it wise that we write or contact several printers, giving them approximately number of pages and words, and get their prices. I believe it would be better to get a publisher who is interested in religion in order that he might handle the book for us. I will ask the printers here in Bluefield and get their price. You find out at Pikeville and let me know.

I will be through Harold this month. Am attending our Young People's Camp at Paintsville beginning June 14th., ends June 21st. If you think it wise to have a conference, let me know, and I will stop by.

Your brother in Christ,

JULIAN OLYN HUNT

Harold, Ky.
June 5, 1942

Dear Julian:

Yes, it will be perfectly satisfactory to me to get together when you come through the fourteenth. However, as that is Sunday, I do not know whether it can be arranged. We are beginning a protracted meeting on that day. That morning I preach at Pikeville; go to Betsy Layne in the afternoon and back to Pikeville that night. Perhaps we can arrange to get together some other day if you are at Paintsville any length of time.

I notice that you make a challenge with a big flourish in your last paper for any of the brethren to meet you on the propositions discussed in our papers. That challenge was very unnecessary since I had already accepted it. You name the time and the place, prove to me that you have the backing and the support of your brethren in that place and I will be there.

As for the other propositions: Julian, do you believe in the use of and the maintaining of missionary societies? You have stated, "I have no desire to conceal any belief or practice that I endorse. My opinion is that if the local congregation had been preserved as the only missionary society, Bible College, publishing machine, and so forth, on earth, that the Church would not stand today as a barren pathetic picture." Now, if you will not defend your practice in regard to the missionary society, why should I defend mine as regards the other things named. However, if you will get the third man (or help me select him) I will be glad to meet you. This book as you have said will already be large. I suggest therefore that if we do have that discussion that we have it bound under separate cover.

You know that you are not stating an issue about the "pastor." Will you affirm that the congregations of which you are identified do not use the "pastor system?" Now just come on out and be fair with yourself and the

public and state your reason for saying that I am a "pastor" of the church at Pikeville and debate that. If you will not do that you admit that you were wrong in your assertion.

I will gladly bear the extra expense incurred by the printing of our correspondence, though a request for me to do so is unfair. Your excuse that it is personal matter is unfounded. It is a very general practice for the correspondence to be published in the book with the discussion. This correspondence bears directly upon the subjects under consideration. You have introduced things in the bulk of the discussion and have tried to finish them on the outside. It is only fair to the public that they see all that has been said. I do not request this because I need it to help my cause as you would try to imply. That ruse will not work. You evidently do not want it published because you know that it will not help your cause.

I see no reason why we should try to go to a lot of extra trouble in re-writing our manuscripts unless the printer requests it. I have neither the time nor the inclination to do this. I think that my manuscripts are reasonably legible as they are. What grammatical errors there are in it can easily be corrected. If you desire to rewrite yours, I have no objection, provided that I have the opportunity to check it with your manuscripts which you have mailed to me.

It is perfectly satisfactory to me to have the preface and the pictures. I hope the pictures will not scare someone away from examining the rest of the book though.

I shall see the printer at Pikeville at the earliest possible date. We want the books printed reasonably, but not shoddily done. F. L. Rowe is not even to be considered by me if you should have him in mind. We will talk these things over in person though.

Sincerely yours,
CLIFTON INMAN