

1100

A DEBATE



BETWEEN

J. CARROLL STARK *and*
JOE S. WARLICK

PROPOSITION:

*The word of God authorizes the use of instruments of
music for praise in the church of Jesus Christ*

J. CARROLL STARK *Affirms*
JOE S. WARLICK *Denies*

GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

A DEBATE

BX 7073
G 694

BETWEEN

J. CARROLL STARK *and*
JOE S. WARLICK

PROPOSITION:

*The word of God authorizes the use of instruments of music
for praise in the church of Jesus Christ*

CENTRAL CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
OF THE BIBLE 4068

J. CARROLL STARK *Affirms*
JOE S. WARLICK *Denies*

PRESENTED BY

Frank L. Watson

JAN 23 1962
GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY
NASHVILLE, TENN.

PUBLISHERS' NOTICE.

In November, 1903, J. Carroll Stark and Joe S. Warlick, two Christian preachers, held an oral debate of four days' duration at Henderson, Tenn.

It was agreed that the discussion should be published; and, in order to dispense with the expense of the stenographer, each disputant promised to write his speeches for publication in a book. By mutual consent they afterwards decided to make each speech much longer than as delivered, and in this way decrease the number of speeches, which they did. It was further agreed that they would try to retain certain features of the oral debate. This will account for the order of the speeches as they occur in the book, also the address to the moderators at the beginning of each speech, and for various references to the oral debate throughout the book.

The publishers beg to say that all the speeches appear in the book just as written. Each writer examined and indorsed the proof of his speeches as they went through the press.

Knowing that instrumental music in the worship is considered a matter of much importance by many or all religious people, and believing the discussion of it by competent men will result in good and no harm, we send forth this book, praying God's blessings upon it and upon all who may read it for profit.

PUBLISHERS.

blessed." Balaam understood it just as we would understand it, and said: "God refuses to let me go with you." All who understand must understand alike. It is only those who misunderstand that differ. But when the promise of reward was increased, Balaam, loving the wages of unrighteousness and not delighting in God's will, said: "Tarry thou here, and I will see what God will say more." God does not tamper long with the rebellious or oft repeat his plain injunctions, but answers the willful according to the idol in their hearts; and he said to Balaam: "Go." But "God was angry because he went." It is a fearful thing to go to God when the heart wanders and our desires are uppermost.

By Ezekiel God said: "Son of man, these men have set up their idols in their heart, and put the stumbling-block of their iniquity before their face: should I be inquired of at all by them? Therefore speak unto them, and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God; Every man of the house of Israel that setteth up his idols in his heart, and putteth the stumbling-block of his iniquity before his face, and cometh to the prophet; I the Lord will answer him that cometh according to their own heart, because they are all estranged from me through their idols. Therefore say unto the house of Israel, Thus saith the Lord God; Repent, and turn yourselves from your idols; and turn away your faces from all your abominations. To every one of the house of Israel, or of the stranger that sojourneth in Israel, which separateth himself from me, and setteth up his idols in his heart, and putteth the stumbling-block of his iniquity before his face, and cometh to a prophet to inquire of him concerning me; I the Lord will answer him by myself: and I will set my face against that man, and will make him a sign and a proverb, and I will cut him off from the midst of my people; and ye shall know that I am the Lord. And if the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I the Lord have deceived that prophet, and I will stretch out my hand upon him, and will destroy him from the midst of my people Israel. . . . The punishment of the prophet shall be even as the punishment of him that seeketh unto him." (Ezek. 14: 3-10.)

To the man determined in his error God will give an excuse for his heart's desire, that he may go on to destruction; and when he seeks to some teacher who will advocate that which he desires, God will himself deceive that teacher and set his face against all who set up idols in their hearts and separate themselves from God and the truth. To separate ourselves from God is to separate ourselves from his word. That is a departure from Christ. Jesus says: "I am the truth." Then no man can reject the truth and receive Christ, and all who joyfully receive the truth into their hearts receive Christ into the soul.

Again, Paul says by the Holy Spirit: "And then shall that Wicked

be revealed, . . . even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." (2 Thess. 2: 8-12.) God will force the truth upon none. No operation of the Holy Spirit will carry the truth to an unwilling soul; but God will send a strong delusion to them who love not the truth, that they may believe a lie and be damned. Lost, continue lost, lost forever! Men are lost through error, and must be saved or continue lost forever. Error saves no one. Nothing but truth can save. Truth is the basis of all righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth." (John 17: 17.)

In Rom. 1: 17 Paul says: "Therein [the gospel] is the righteousness [what he appoints for right] of God revealed from faith to faith [from faith in the preacher to faith in the hearer]." All error is death. James (5: 19, 20) says: "If any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know, that he which converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and hide a multitude of sins."

Honesty in religion, or anywhere else, avails nothing except to cause one to seek and accept the truth. To misunderstand is to be deceived. God deceives no one. All understand alike when all understand. Deception is of the devil. To be deceived and to follow that deception is to be led by the devil—led to sin, to the transgression of the law, which is death; led to death, when death means hell.

Paul says Eve was deceived. She was honest. Adam was not deceived. His was willful transgression. But the consequences were the same to both. She was equally in the transgression, and death passed upon both alike.

Temptation came by desire, and sin came by deception. Deception is easy when desire is strong. If any one err from the truth, he must be converted or lost. (James 5: 19.) Error means death. Somebody is wrong, and death and hell are before him. His error has divided the saints, caused strife among brethren, brought reproach on the cause, used authority without law, and set up rebellion in the kingdom. Somebody is deceiving the people. Somebody is working for Satan. Somebody is going to hell and dragging those he has deceived down with him. It is time we begin to ask: "Master, is it I?" It is time we were looking for the "sop."

Some are opposed to investigation on this subject. They object to any answer being made to the continual cry against organs. It is well enough to talk and write on one side of the question; but though

the saints are divided and the church rent in twain, the other side must not be heard. Such are afraid of the light. One editor says he thinks he is honest. No doubt but he thinks so; but the honest heart is willing both sides shall be heard, and from his paper you get but one side. Many of our papers will publish nothing on either side, lest they may be unpopular with some. Such study the interest of their paper more than the interest of the kingdom. I have less use for them than the others. Like Pilate, they would sooner let Jesus be crucified than to risk their popularity with the Jews. Somebody in the regions of darkness will carry the destruction of all those he has deceived upon his conscience forever. It will be a terrible hell to the deceivers, whoever they are.

The object of this discussion is to learn the right and save the church. If my brother is wrong, I hope to convert the sinner from the error of his way and save a soul from death; if I am wrong, I hope he may save me. May God give us wisdom and knowledge and power, and may truth and righteousness prevail.

With this introduction, we come to the question at issue. It is said my opponent is the hero of more than a hundred such tournaments. It is prophesied I will be most terribly "Warlicked." So I doubt not that side is well represented.

I affirm: "The word of God authorizes the use of instruments of music for praise in the church of Jesus Christ." But what do we receive as the word of God? This is important beyond measure. Do we accept the old law, not a jot or tittle of which shall pass away till all is fulfilled? God said: "I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel." Paul says: "Not all Israel are of Israel." The children of Abraham's faith are as much counted for the seed as the children of Abraham's flesh. On this assumption I presume there will be no discussion. The law to the one is not the rule of the other, but the principles of both are the same. Principles are arrived at only through rules. No principle can be reached except we pass over the stepping-stones of arbitrary rules. Rules are for children, but principles are for those of riper years. Rules give place to principles when we have grown up to their comprehension, and by rules of law are made to understand the principles which underlie them. Under rules, men are slaves, and are in bondage till by rules they have grown up to the higher principles which underlie all laws and are embodied therein, and then we step upon the plain of liberty. So Paul reasons that under the law, which was a system of rules for the restraints of the flesh, the people were in bondage; but cut loose from the law, they, by the gospel of Christ, came under the principles of a cultured spirituality; and he advises such to "stand fast in the liberty wherein Christ hath made them free; and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." Coming out from under the law, they were not to

be entangled again with laws, but were to enjoy a wider growth under the principles which were set forth under the law and taught by the prophets whom God appointed as expounders of the law in the development of the people under the law. These prophets taught the same principles through the Spirit of Christ, which was in them and by which they were made to speak, as were proclaimed by the apostles with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven. (See 1 Pet. 1: 10-12.) But the principle could only be learned by the law, as Paul says: "I had not known sin, or lust to be sin, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Sin can only be learned by the law, and its most terrible consequences must be learned by the judgments under the law. No man, therefore, can preach the glad tidings of salvation till he has learned the condemnation under which man is placed by the law. Take away the Old Testament, and none can preach the gospel of the grace of God. None try to do it. If, therefore, the Old Testament furnishes sublime illustrations of faith and righteousness under patriarchs and prophets, why should its illustrations of praise—acceptable, ordained by the Spirit of Christ in the prophets—be rejected, especially since by that Spirit they "taught the same things which were reported to us by the apostles, with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven?" Take away the law and its principles as set forth by the prophets, and no man can preach or understand the principles of spirituality as given in the grace of God. Such must preach only the legal enactment of the gospel of Christ and go back under the bondage of legalism from the liberty of the grace of God, as is argued by Paul in his Galatian letter. Few, if any, are the laws given to the saints under the gospel of Christ.

The grace of God comes not to us in the form of laws to be kept, but in teaching to be observed. "The grace of God . . . hath appeared to all men, teaching us," not commanding us. (See Tit. 2: 11, 12.) Some men can see no difference between a code of narrow legal enactment for babes and the teaching of great principles which dispense with laws in bringing men up to the stature of Christ under the liberty of the grace of God.

Laws are for restraining. "Thou shalt not" is the form in which they are written. Teaching is for advancing, and its form is, "Thou shouldst," as it sets forth the principles of life and true living.

The Mosaic law engraven on stones and given for the restraint of the flesh was taken out of the way—nailed to the cross; and the principles of grace and truth which came by the light of God's word ("the light is the life of men"), as embodied in the divine One, are now, through his life as an example and the truth he taught, written so fully upon the heart through the wonderful life and teaching he gave us that not a law of restraint can be found under the reign of our King. All he has given us comes, not in the form of law, but of teaching. Did we ever think of this?

Ten were the commandments of the old dispensation, and ten are the principles taught under the new dispensation, which, when observed, we have no need of the restraints of the law. On the one table of stone were written the three restraining laws, in our relation to God, given in the negative form: "Thou shalt not have any gods before me;" "Thou shalt not venerate and do homage to any;" "Thou shalt not take my name in vain." These had reference to God, and him only. Analogous to these and given in advancing form under the new system are also three that have reference to God, teaching us by faith to hold him in the highest esteem and most confiding trust—intellectual; by love we venerate him as chiefest among the ten thousand and the one altogether lovely—the affection of the heart; by baptism we take his name (the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit) upon us—physical. Thus spirit, soul, and body are given up to him in a delightful service. Faith is the submission of the mind to testimony unto implicit trust; love is the submission of the heart to divine love manifested in the death of Christ; baptism is the submission of the rebellious flesh to the divine will, by which we come under the divine government. These things in the end of the world are taught as governing principles, and not commanded as legal enactments. These principles are the antipodes of the commands of the law for the restraint of the world.

The other seven commands on the other table of stone refer to the moral relations of man to his fellow-man. So the seven principles taught by the grace of God and summed up by Peter in the first chapter of his Second Epistle as virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity, are all moral in their bearing. To restrain the flesh from violating these principles underlying the law, inspired prophets taught and inspired sages sung their instructions to the people. The principles which underlie the law are set forth in the gospel of the grace of God, and the principles proclaimed in the gospel were the basis of the legal restraints till the spiritual in the race could be developed.

There can be no antagonism between the law and the gospel. Each was the effort of God in his wisdom for the development of the race—our exaltation and final glorification. The gospel was not a change in the divine will and character; but when humanity, held under legal restraint, was sufficiently developed through the teaching of prophets sent of God to come under principles of higher culture as set forth in the prophets, God took it from under the bondage of the law and placed it under the culture of a higher spirituality. As one pertains to the fleshly, it is called "the ministration of the flesh;" while the other, pertaining to the spiritual, is called "the ministration of the spirit." One was for the race in its minority—in the early period of its years—ere trust in God and love for the Father of mercies, as

seen in the One anointed, could be developed through the revelation of the son. Paul joins them beautifully when he says: "Ye are built upon apostles and prophets, with Christ as the corner stone." The teaching of both are a necessity in building up the body of Christ.

The character and attributes of God cannot be learned from the New Testament alone, and in the apostolic teaching there is a continued allusion to Moses and the prophets. That which God accepts as right, his divine character, his judgments upon the ungodly, and many other things of his government, are learned only from the Old Testament. I have never known a man who rejected the Old that was not narrow and bigoted and domineering in his teaching of the New. By the prophets was the character of God made known, and the principles he would develop in men were by them set forth. Peter connects the prophets of the Old and the evangelists of the New under the guidings of the same Spirit when he, speaking of the great salvation—the salvation of their souls—says: "The prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified before hand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven." (1 Pet. 1: 10-12.) The Spirit of Christ in them preached the same things that are preached by the evangelist in the gospel with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven. Can anything be plainer? As Paul indorses the Scriptures of the Old Testament to Timothy, so Peter indorses the prophets as proclaiming the same things preached by the evangelists of the gospel with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven.

That I am right in this is evident from the testimony of the other side. Those who reject the Old Scriptures on the music question cannot preach a sermon or write a book or an essay against organs without going to the Old Testament for authority continually. I hold in my hand a booklet from the office of the Gospel Advocate, of Nashville, Tenn. To reject the counsel of God against him the writer accepts the destructive critics' position and repudiates First and Second Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah as uninspired, and declares David to be in antagonism with God all his life. Such a bundle of contradictions, assertions, special pleadings, and infidelity I never found in the same volume and in the same space. Does his cause demand it? If so, the cause had better be left out and the sacred oracles retained. Having rejected the five books named, he accepts Deuteronomy, against which the destructive critics set themselves determinedly, and quotes Moses as authority when sitting in judgment upon his opponents. Per-

haps his text may apply to himself and those on his side for having added a new command to God's laws—namely, "*Thou shalt not have an organ in the church of Jesus Christ.*" This command is the foundation of their church, and on it they are building up a sect by separating from those who stand upon the word of God alone.

On page 1 of the booklet the writer takes his text from Deut. 4: 2: "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God," etc. (Read again Deut. 12: 8, 32.) Why go to Deuteronomy to find law for this new dispensation? If the teaching of the Old Testament is authority on one subject, why not another? If he can use it as a text against his opponents, why cannot they use it in proof against him? Every last one of them get from the Old Testament examples of faith and acceptable service. Why cannot the same scriptures be used to illustrate acceptable song? This is a mystery in their logic that caps the climax of all reasoning. When on the music question they all deny the authority of the Old Testament, but go to it for authority on all other subjects.

But how apply this passage to those who sing as "God commanded by his prophets," and not apply it to those who add a new law to God's commands and say, "Thou shalt not use an organ in the church," when God has given no such command? God said by David to praise him on instruments of music in his sanctuary—in the congregation of the saints. Then this passage will not apply to those who do it, but it will apply to those who command us not to use it. His text is against himself and no others in this controversy. It is he who has added to the Lord's commands.

Having established the canon of authority, I will proceed to the argument. We lay it down as axiomatic that what the New Testament indorses is New Testament teaching; that what the Holy Spirit indorses is the teaching of the Holy Spirit; that what Christ indorses is the teaching of Christ; and that what Paul indorses is the teaching of Paul.

In Luke 10: 25 a lawyer asked Jesus what he must do to inherit eternal life, and Jesus said to him: "What is written in the law? how readest thou? And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself." This was the lawyer's answer, but Jesus said: "Thou hast answered right." That indorsement made it the answer of Christ. The answer also shows that the principles of the law were more than the law, for the laws gave no promise of eternal life; but the principles which underlie the law added the promise of eternal life to the promise of the life that now is, the same as the gospel.

My first argument is from 1 John 3: 4, "Sin is the transgression

of the law;" and Paul affirms (Rom. 4: 15), "Where no law is, there is no transgression," and says: "I had not known lust as sin, had not the law said, Thou shalt not covet." The law came, and with it came sin; the law died, and man was delivered. Paul, representing the race, said: "I was alive without the law: but when the law came, sin revived, and I died." There is no sin against God where there is no law from God to be broken. Christ took the law which condemned us out of the way, nailing it to the cross. Since that, God has given no law of condemnation. Christ died to redeem us from the curse of the law, that we might live under grace—not without law, but under a law to Christ, who has given no law on this subject of music.

If, then, sin is the transgression of law and God has given no law against the use of instrumental music in his praise, there can be no violation of law by its use, and, consequently, no sin, especially since it has always been acceptably used by the people of God throughout the ages, with no objection from God either in the past or present dispensations. Therefore we conclude there can be no sin in its use when offering praise to his holy name, according to the teaching of the prophets by the Spirit of Christ which was in them. (1 Pet. 1: 10.)

In this booklet, which was evidently written to divide the church, for the union of which the Master prayed, the author argues that God did not institute instrumental music in his praise, yet he tolerated it. How does he know God tolerated it? Because he said nothing against it. Then on page 9 he says: "While he tolerated them, he did not impute to them sin." The argument, then, is, if there is any argument in the booklet, God tolerates what he does not legislate against. God has not legislated against instrumental music in his praise in the church of Christ. Therefore, God tolerates it here, and there is no sin imputed to those who use it; and since by God's command it was appointed by the Lord through his prophets for his praise in his sanctuary (2 Chron. 29: 25), it must by divine command be taken from the praise of the service of the sanctuary. If God by a law put it in by his prophets, in whom was the Spirit of Christ (1 Pet. 1: 10), causing them to speak the same things as are taught by the Holy Spirit in the apostles, then God by command through the apostles must take it out of the praise of his sanctuary, or it remains where God placed it in his sanctuary by his Spirit in the prophets. He who assumes to take it out without authority from God assumes the place of the "man of sin" spoken of by Paul. God tolerates such praise now, if the assumptions of this booklet are true.

But how does the author know all this? Jesus says: "No man knoweth the Father but the Son and he to whom the Son will reveal him." Paul says: "No man knoweth the things of God but the Spirit of God." But this author seems to have entered into the counsels of the Most High and, without any revelation on the subject from the

Son or the Spirit, assumes to tell us what God approves and what God does not approve. It is a specimen of the conceit and dogmatism of the leaders of that opposition. Their own *ipse dixit* is all they can produce on the subject. They have not a passage of scripture to sustain them. This is a bold assertion in my first speech; but when the debate closes, you will find I am right. I have known them from first to last—from Campbell down to Warlick—and I am right.

But we will be told that this will admit infant sprinkling. If they will show where God by command authorized infant sprinkling, I will not let my prejudice get the better of my faith and denounce it before God by command rejects it. But I have no objections to infant sprinkling. If the mother wishes to sprinkle her babe, I would not object; but if she claims to do it in the name—by the authority—of Christ, I may ask to see her authority. If she gives it, I must subside; but if she fails to find such authority, then she has taken the “name of the Lord in vain.” None can do in the name of Christ what Christ has not commanded.

If I do not find authority from the word of God for instrumental praise, we certainly, according to this booklet, may offer such praise as a privilege; for since God has not objected to it and has not legislated against it, he will not impute sin to it. If God, not having legislated against it, imputes no sin to its use, what of the man who writes a book to divide the church of Jesus Christ because of his likes and dislikes and cultivates in his own heart the spirit of the devil and seeks to impart it to others? I have read this booklet with care, and the strongest plea in it is for the division of the church of my Master from the assumption of his opinions without a passage of scripture to support them. We will see how much scripture they will find.

The summary of this argument is: Sin is the transgression of law; where there is no law, there is no transgression; what God does not legislate against, he tolerates; what he tolerates, he does not impute as sinful.

The plea of the Gospel Advocate for division is a plea for a separation from the sinless. I hope my brother will meet this squarely. If he finds any teaching or a precept in the law of my Lord against it, I am convicted at the beginning and the debate is over. If he can find none, then if I do not show they are authorized by precept, I have the assurance they are tolerated; and David—not the king, but the doubter who denies the king's inspiration—says God will not impute sin to those using them, since he tolerates them. To answer this, my brother must draw his sword against Paul or raise mutiny in his own camp. Paul to Timothy writes: “Foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes.” (2 Tim. 2: 23.) To Titus he writes: “Avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and con-

tentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain.” (Tit. 3: 9.)

If the opposers find nothing against instruments of music in praise, then they are in rebellion against Paul. They are giving their energies to untaught questions in direct opposition to New Testament teaching, and I demand they shall “be silent where the Scriptures are silent.” If God is silent, why not they? Again, I defy them and say that from Genesis to Revelation they cannot find a word against it in the three dispensations; while I will find it commended in all, and, passing beyond the “gate ajar,” I will find it commended in the “city of gold” among the glorified. Their ground of objection is because there is nothing said about it. The silence of the Scriptures in the New Testament is their only plea. Did not God know they would introduce it in the latter days? If he objected, why did he not reveal his objection? It is purely with them an untaught question. If they will find a word against it in the whole Bible, I will give up the debate and go with them. My brethren will all go along. If there is nothing said, why set up their authority? If God has not spoken, why have they added a new command to his law—such as, “Thou shalt have no organ in the congregation of the saints,” or, “Thou shalt not praise God in his sanctuary with instruments of music as David taught?” These commands of men are the creed of their division of God's people. Like Paul's “man of sin,” they have taken their place in the temple of God and assume to speak as God. God put it into his sanctuary by command; and if he has not taken it out, it remains there, unless some one claiming superior authority to God shall as God put it out of the temple of God. That character Paul calls “the man of sin, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God.” The doom of such is hell. If God has put it out, then joyfully we accept the decision. Let God be true; let the authority of Christ be established. Let us wait and see what they can find. If they find nothing said, the question is to them an untaught one, and they are violating divine teaching by raising it. If God has said nothing against it, they have no authority for opposing it. I need no authority for using it; for where there is no law, there is no transgression.

When one worships God, the worship is between himself and God. When Daniel bowed himself in Babylon with his windows open and his face toward Jerusalem and offered prayer and supplication to Jehovah, was he responsible for the beating of the tom-tom by the Babylonians in or around his house, or for any of the excesses of the city? If I enter my closet to pray in secret to Him who heareth in secret, if a hen cackles, must I leave my devotions and go and club her off because the Scriptures say nothing about hens cackling? Surely our worship is not what it should be if we cannot worship with surroundings we have not chosen. If I am hymning my devotion to God

and inside or outside some one is playing an instrument in praise to his name, must I stop my praise and go over and raise a fuss to stop his devotions? Am I responsible for his unlawful praise, if it is unlawful, or is he responsible for mine? Our worship is between us and our God; and what others may do in praise to God's name is not a concern of ours, except to teach them what God has said, unless God has said nothing. Will God be more likely to accept my praise of song if I go over and raise a row with my brother because he does not praise God as I command him? If I stop my hymning out of pure dogmatism, will God vouchsafe acceptance to me, even though his praise is rejected? Who said: "Thou shalt not judge another's conscience?" Does he not stand or fall to his own Master? What am I, that I shall judge another man's conscience? If I do not play, is it any of my business if another does? Can I not hymn my praise, though another acts unlawfully? If I stand there and am singing and one here is playing a harp, does that interfere with my worship of God? Not if I am worshipping as I should.

What have they to do with my worship of God? The whole thing comes from a devilish, domineering spirit, which, instead of worshipping God, has taken God's seat in judgment to control the praise others may bring. It is for us to ourselves serve God acceptably and let others examine themselves to see if they are in the faith. It is well enough to teach them; but "rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry." (1 Sam. 15: 23.) If I were devoutly worshipping as I should, would I be troubling myself about the manner of other men's praise, whether they worship aright or do not worship at all? If I am interfering with the praise of others, am I myself worshipping at all? If really conscientious in my own worship, will I dogmatize over others and say how they must worship? If they refuse to hear me, will I go into a passion and myself refuse to worship more? Such surely have a weak conscience, but strong stubbornness. If I, without any instruction from the divine One, am binding my view of an untaught question upon my brethren, am I fit to worship God at all? Will God accept my offering of praise? But what about a man of God, with a congregation of sinners before him, who will not preach Christ to the lost on account of some who, from their own convictions of duty, play and sing a psalm of praise after the manner of David to Him whom they adore? Some very conscientious about some things have no conscience against a quarrel among brethren. Nothing but the grace of God can bring such a man to repentance. If taken as he is to the "city of gold," he would surely raise hell in heaven and make all "know and feel what it is to be there."

My second argument is from worship. What is worship? The great trouble with men is their failure to discriminate in the use of words.

Proper discernment in the use of terms would often do away with much misunderstanding. A song is not worship. If so, all songs would be worship. Singing is not worship, for one may sing without worship. Praise is not worship, though it may proceed from worship. An act of worship is not worship, any more than an act of mine is me. An act of worship is produced by worship, which must be in the soul before the act can be ascribed to it, before it can produce the act. While singing, praise, thanksgiving, etc., are not worship, they may each and all be acts of worship and proceed from worship. An act of worship is an act produced by worship, and that act may in one be different from an act in another. It is simply an act prompted by the emotions of the soul, called forth from worship in the heart.

Worship is of the soul, and pertains to the inner man. It is the veneration, exultation, adoration of the heart for some object of highest esteem. This feeling of reverence, adoration, in the heart may be manifested in different ways, in different actions; and these may properly be called acts of worship—acts produced by worship—by the emotions of the soul within. By metonymy these acts may be spoken of as worship, and sometimes are so designated. We say the kettle boils. The kettle does not boil; it is only the water in the kettle that boils. So when the heart is full of love and adoration and breaks forth in song, we by a figure of speech call it worship. So whatever act such veneration may produce, whether it be dancing, shouting, hand clapping, leaping, playing, singing, or thanksgiving, may by the same figure of speech be called worship, while they are only acts of worship—acts produced by the emotions of the soul—the outbreaks of love and veneration, exultation and adoration, of the heart within.

A man like David, with his heart full of gratitude and devout reverence to God, would find a response in the murmuring streamlet, the falling cataract, the rolling thunder, the rattling raindrops; in the sound of the viol, the harp, and the pleasant psaltery, which he touched with such a master hand, and from the worship of his soul gave forth such notes of praise as the best he could bring of all his powers, and, with trumpet peals and songs of praise and thanksgiving, put the worship of his soul into expressions sublime. Could such feelings and emotions of gratitude, with such veneration and reverence for God and his goodness and greatness, touch the heart of a Mozart or a Beethoven, they would seat themselves to their piano or great pipe organ, and, from their finger touches on the keys, would cause an audience of thousands to bow their heads, with teardrops hanging to the eyelids and glistening on the cheeks, and reverently and silently worship God with hearts overflowing with gratitude or bursting with emotion, the same as filled the soul of the almost inspired musician.

When such emotions of worship filled the soul of A. D. Fillmore, of blessed memory, who could not play, but who could sing, he came for-

ward in the presence of hundreds, and, in a voice of the sweetest and most tender minstrelsy, sung—

“We speak of the realms of the blest,
That country so bright and so fair,
And oft are its glories confessed;
But what must it be to be there?”

while the audience, hushed into the most profound silence, brushed back the starting tear, and each seat trembled with the emotions of its occupants. When such emotions of divine worship filled the heart of Alexander Campbell, who could neither sing nor play, he would stand erect, and, with eyes lit up with heavenly fire, with an eloquence natural and cultured, he would repeat Ps. 19: “The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork,” etc. Or with a hush of tenderness he would repeat Ps. 23: “The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want,” etc. Or in words most eloquent (for when the heart was full, his utterances were sublime) he would offer thanksgiving and praise, giving glory, honor, majesty, dominion, and power to the great name of the Eternal forever and for evermore. Shall Alexander Campbell, who could not sing or play, say to the sweet singer or the wonderful musician: “Keep still and let expressive silence muse his praise?” Shame on such dogmatism, when God has given us such varied talents!

Who put the twelfth commandment into God's law, saying: “Thou shalt not have an instrument of music in the congregation of the saints?” David, the destructive critic, when, like the “man of sin,” he sits in the temple of God, says: “Thou shalt not.” That is the corner stone of his departure—the foundation of his schism. Their church is built upon it, and a few old fogies have made it a test of fellowship. God will shake their thunder out of them and put some lightning into them one of these days.

Another sophism is calling praise a service. Praise comes from the heart's adoration; service, from the desire for reward. Service is of works; praise is from admiration—gratitude. One is from a heart overflowing with love and wonder, admiration and adoration; the other, from desire to attain. One is works; the other is not. Neither is worship. You will notice in the style of their preaching that they linger long on the side of works for reward—service.

My third argument is from Amos 6: 1-6: “Woe to them that are at ease in Zion! . . . Ye that put far away the evil day, and cause the seat of violence to come near; that lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon their couches, and eat the lambs out of the flock, and the calves out of the midst of the stall; that chant to the sound of the viol, and invent to themselves instruments of music, like

David; that drink wine in bowls, and anoint themselves with the chief ointments: but they are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph.” The man who uses this as against instruments in praise is too ignorant to be a teacher in Israel or too dishonest to belong to the kingdom. The woe is to them at ease in Zion—that are antimissionary and are not grieved over the affliction of others. God had blessed them. They dwelt among the mountains of Samaria, amid the grandeur of nature. Riches and luxuries had been given them, and they had returned to God acceptable praise on instruments of music, as David did. All this was in their favor, and was commended by the prophet. What, then, was lacking? They were not grieved over the affliction of Joseph. God demands that we shall care for others; and though we may be blessed of God and render to him acceptable praise in the finest minstrelsy we can invent—with stringed instruments and organs—using all our inventive genius to render him the praise most acceptable, as did David, if we are not grieved over the afflictions of others and are antimissionary, the woe of inspired denunciation is upon us. Parallel passages to this are found in Rev. 2, 3, where many things of the church are commended, but a curse pronounced because of what was wanting. A man must have a hard case or be a very indifferent exegete to try to make Amos cry against instrumental music.

WARLICK'S FIRST REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The introductory remarks made by Brother Stark are well stated, and it is fair to say that they justly represent the condition which now exists with a once united and happy people—a church whose membership had before been united in work and in worship, perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment, all speaking the same things, respecting and showing before a world of opposition the unity advised by Paul in 1 Cor. 1: 10, where he says, "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment;" also the unity prayed for by our Lord in John 17: 20, 21, from which we read: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." When we remember how greatly the Savior desired union among his disciples and how earnestly the apostle advises it in these passages, then look around and see division, amounting almost to a hatred for one another, without a parallel in the annals of all religious history, then inquire as to the cause of the division and consequent alienation between brethren of the same church who before worked hand in hand for the same results—yea, even members of the church, belonging to the same family in the flesh, are torn apart religiously and are now fighting and devouring one another—if we inquire as to what or who is responsible for the present sad state of affairs, well may we ask: "*Lord, is it I?*" But the wonder is why Brother Stark, or any one else, should seem to fail to find the easy answer. Every one knows that those who have introduced and brought in the divisive things, including instrumental music, into the worship of the saints are alone and altogether responsible for the division. Judas Iscariot knew that it was he who should betray the Savior and that the blame should rest with none of the innocent eleven, and I am persuaded to think that our brother himself knows that he and those on his side of this question are to be blamed for the division; and any effort upon the part of any man to place the responsibility upon those of God's saints who still worship as we all did before instrumental music was introduced, which was and is to worship just

as the New Testament directs, is really amusing to all sensible people, and even disgusting to many. It is to be hoped that Brother Stark in this discussion will not resort to such puerility or offer such a subterfuge as a cloud of dust under which to hide the malignity of his unscriptural and rebellious proposition. If, however, he does pursue this course, his argument will be the more easily answered and exposed; for everybody knows in advance that there is not one word of truth in such a claim, but that the charge is perfectly absurd.

Those who imagine that the disciples of Christ who oppose the use of the organ in the worship of the church are in any way to be blamed for the division resulting from its introduction have certainly closed their eyes and ears to the facts, and have hardened their hearts, lest they see, hear, understand, be converted from their error, and be induced to repent and turn from their evil course and discontinue the habit of trying to do injustice to those who have stood, and still stand, all day long with outstretched hands to a disobedient and gainsaying people. It is a fact that in every place where the organ has been introduced into the worship of the saints, to the destruction of the peace and harmony in the congregation which had hitherto obtained, those who object have always protested against it in love and patience; and after the division, they have ever stood ready to forgive and work with its advocates just as before from the very moment of its removal. It has been done in many cases with this result. The very opposite spirit is shown by those who advocate the organ, both before and after its introduction. In this connection it is perhaps not out of place to read an extract from that almost matchless thinker and writer, Moses E. Lard, in his "Quarterly" of 1863, pages 330-333:

"As a people, we have from the first and continually to the present proclaimed that the New Testament, and that alone, is our only full and perfect rule of faith and practice. We have declared a thousand times and more that whatever it does not teach we must not hold, and whatever it does not sanction we must not practice. He who ignores or repudiates these principles, whether he be preacher or layman, has by the act become an apostate from our ranks; and the sooner he lifts his hand high, avows the fact, and goes out from among us, the better—yes, verily—the better for us.

"Now in the light of the foregoing principles, what defense can be urged for the introduction into some of our congregations of instrumental music? The answer which thunders into my ear from every page of the New Testament is: 'None.' Did Christ ever appoint it? Did the apostles ever sanction it? Or did any one of the primitive churches ever use it? Never. In what light, then, must we view him who attempts to introduce it into the churches of Christ of the present day? I answer: As an insulter of the authority of Christ and as a defiant and impious innovator on the simplicity and purity of the

ancient worship. In no other light can we view him; in no other light should he be viewed. But we are told that there is no harm in instrumental music, and that, therefore, it may be innocently introduced into the church of Christ. I shall certainly attempt no grave reply to this shallow thing, for argument I will not call it. Grant, then, for a moment that there is no harm in instrumental music. The question arises: 'What kind of instrument shall be used?' 'An organ,' shouts the sickly puling of Rome. An organ, indeed! And shall we have only an organ? Is there no good music in anything else than an organ? We know there is. Why, then, have only an organ? This is arbitrary and tyrannical. But what signify arbitrariness and tyranny in a church which has consented to be disgraced by an organ? Simply nothing. These are now its spirit and its law, and, of course, are no offense to it. But despite of even these (for now we care nothing for strife, nothing for the feelings of brethren), we shall insist on the right both for self and others to introduce each for himself the instrument with which he can best conduct his worship. For the son of Mars, then, we claim the right to introduce the fife and the drum; and for self, the right to introduce (for I could never make music on anything else, but am capital on these) the Jew's-harp, the tin pan, and the barrel head. I even go farther, and, with all the pluck of a Lacedaemonian, contend for the right of the Caledonian to have his bagpipes and the ancient Israelite his ram's horns. To all of which let us still add a few fiddles, a tambourine, and a gong. *Vive la* music made on instruments! This is about as like pandemonium as anything we can well imagine, and about as near that place as we can get unless we could get between that place and the church that has adopted instrumental music; and we think there is left little room between the two on which to stand. Soberly and candidly, we are pained at these symptoms of degeneracy in a few of our churches. The day on which a church sets up an organ in its house is the day on which it reaches the first station on the road to apostasy. From this it will soon proceed to other innovations; and the work of innovations once fairly commenced, no stop can be put to it till ruin ensues. Then the spirit which precedes and fosters these innovations is a most dangerous spirit—dangerous because cruel, intractable, and unreasonable. It is cruel, because it is ready to immolate everything that in the least stands in the way of its wicked work; intractable, because it will not yield even one tittle of its innovations; and unreasonable, because it will heed neither the voice of God nor that of man. Indeed, when a church has once introduced an organ, we believe it to be true, as a general rule, of those members who take the lead in the work that they will suffer its Bible to be torn into shreds before they will part from their pet. No matter how unanimous or how kind the voice of remonstrance may be, the spirit of innovation never retraces its steps. When

once it sets in to accomplish a certain object, accomplish that object it will, though ruin marks every step in its advance. Church history teems with proofs of what is here said. Let now, as further evidence of this, any set of brethren, no matter how pious and true, set about inducing a church which has introduced an organ to put it away, and these brethren will soon fall under its proscriptions, and it will absolutely go to the length of putting them away before it will put away its organ. It will part from everything and anything rather than its infamous box.

"Let those brethren who oppose the introduction of an organ first remonstrate in gentle, kind, but decided terms. If their remonstrance is unheeded and the organ is brought in, then let them at once, and even without the formality of asking for a letter, abandon the church so acting, and let all such members unite elsewhere. Thus these organ-grinding churches will in the lapse of time be broken down or wholly apostatize; and the sooner they are in fragments, the better for the cause of Christ. I have no sympathy with them, no fellowship for them, and, so help me God, never intend knowingly to put my foot into one of them. As a people, we claim to be engaged in an effort to return to the purity, simplicity, freedom from ostentation and pride of the ancient apostolic churches. Let us, then, neither wink at anything standing in the way nor compromise aught essential to this end. The moment we do so our unity is at an end and our hopes are in the dust."

History in the majority of cases proves that the suggestions made by Brother Lard more than forty years ago were absolutely true in every particular. It is not generally claimed that the organ is essential to acceptable worship, for all but the fewest of its friends say that we may worship acceptably without it; but when once they desire to introduce it, it is brought in, and always at the expense of driving out of the fellowship the best, truest, and purest members of the congregation; and generally no sort of persuading and begging will induce them to remove the unscriptural thing and restore peace and fellowship among the saints. One instance, a recent happening, is a congregation at Lexington, Ky.—planted, I believe, and fed for years by the matchless scholar and renowned college professor, John W. McGarvey—a congregation whose members had feasted upon his sermons for years—determined to have an organ in the worship. Brother McGarvey protested with tears and besought them not to bring it in, assuring them that he would not worship with it; but rather than have his fellowship they introduced the instrument and drove him, with other good members, out of the congregation. Is this not a sad and lamentable thing to contemplate? With such facts and figures before us as a people, is it not strange that any one professing to have the love of God in his heart and a desire for the salvation of

man in his soul would ever be guilty of such conduct—and this, too, in the face of the Savior's prayer for unity and peace? May we not hope that some day we shall have such divisive things removed from the churches? I think so, and I believe that our hopes for the speedy arrival of the day are not altogether in vain. I do not wish to be understood as saying that all digressive members of the church of Christ will return to apostolic faith and practice or to New Testament teaching in their work and worship. Some of our so-called brethren have, I fear, never known the way of righteousness; and some who have, but who have gone to God with "an idol in their heart," resolved to set up the idol, may go on from bad to worse until they finally lodge in the different sects and denominations around us; while all of them who really have any admiration for the truth as it is in Christ Jesus may some day come to themselves and return to the Father's house, where there is plenty and to spare. May I not now say to all such that they try in vain to feed themselves on the husks of the swine, which are but the traditions and doctrines of men, the vain speculation of human opinion and husks of theology? No child of God can love and serve God acceptably on such diet. In this discussion I hope to convert many such sinners—including Brother Stark, perhaps—and in this way hide a multitude of sins.

Take another case bearing upon the matter of the present divided state in the church of Christ. A few years ago R. P. Meeks, of this town, and E. A. Elam, of this State, both preached the same things and in the same way. They were in fellowship each with the other. They could then—and, perhaps, did—hold meetings together. It is certain that they both preached acceptably for the same churches. But when Brother Elam came to Henderson a few months since to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ, just as he has always done and as Brother Meeks used to do, the latter brother joined in with others and closed the doors of the meetinghouse, on the front of which is written the "Christian Church." When I first began preaching, some fifteen years ago, I read of and heard of R. P. Meeks as a sound gospel preacher. Then Brother Meeks preached to the same churches to which his brother-in-law—that matchless pulpit orator, T. B. Larimore—preached and still preaches. Why does Brother Meeks not visit those churches now? It is because of his love for that infamous "box" [pointing to the organ], as Moses E. Lard calls it. Brother Meeks, just like those who stand with him, seems to love the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for evermore. Why are there two congregations and two meetinghouses in this comparatively small town? If that organ—a human invention, brought into the church by human authority—had been removed, there would have been but one congregation, with all of its members dwelling together in love, all at peace, and working for the same grand results.

I heartily agree with Brother Stark on what he says about the importance of the question and our great need for light on the subject. I am also fully aware of the fact that it is hard to find those on his side who are willing to discuss it. Indeed, I know of no other man among the "digressives" who will affirm this proposition. In a discussion I held with Clark Braden, in Dallas, Texas, some five years ago, he affirmed; but his proposition was quite a different one from what Brother Stark affirms here. What my brother says in reference to our papers refusing to publish both sides of a discussion on the question relates only to the papers on his side. Those on my side stand ready and anxious to publish a debate on the subject between any two reputable men, provided only that the organ side will publish the discussion in one of their papers. The fact is that we have actually sought such discussions, because we knew that we had the truth on the subject, and we are anxious to get it before those brethren who are in error. We believe that if we only had an opportunity to teach the people the truth it would soon be thoroughly understood; and when our people once understand this, as they do other matters of vital interest to our distinctive plea, they will send the organ back to the Roman Catholics, from whom they borrowed it; return to apostolic precedent and New Testament authority on all matters of religious faith, practice, worship, and duty; unite their efforts with all the hosts of Zion for the expulsion of all humanism from the work, worship, and service of the church; and fight under the banner of Christ, our King, upon which is inscribed: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." (Peter.) "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks unto God and the Father by him." (Paul.) Paraphrased by Thomas Campbell: "Where the Bible speaks, we will speak; where the Bible is silent, we will be silent." If Brother Stark thinks we are not anxious for the debate through the papers, let him get any one of the "digressive" periodicals to open its columns to the discussion, and he shall see how ready we are to take up the work. Let them find a man who will affirm their practice through the press. I believe I will now take the liberty to say that we challenge them to the fight. They will not accept the challenge. They are afraid of the light. They seem to have no love for the truth on this question, and they love even less the man who dares to call their attention to it. Their cry is, like their illustrious predecessors: "Let us alone; what have we to do with thee? hast thou come to torment us before the time?" This is usually true of those only who are consciously guilty of wrongdoing. I suppose Brother Stark is an exception; but he seems to stand alone, for he is the only living man who will affirm what they teach and practice and who seems not to be afraid of investigation. So I am very glad to have this, my only chance for a debate with them.

My brother's reference to the fact that I have had many debates shall serve him no good purpose here; for I have held only one debate on instrumental music in the worship, and he has written a book on the subject. So I suppose this will make us even on that score. Neither should Brother Stark throw out a petition for your sympathy by telling you that he understands my brethren have predicted his defeat. I might say in reply that I heard from his admirers before I reached Henderson that he was the smartest man in the world; but I was not alarmed, for I knew that he had engaged to affirm a proposition which betrays weakness somewhere. I wish he had defined the terms of his proposition; but I shall raise no special complaint, for I am perfectly willing for him to pursue his own course in the debate. I want him to feel free to take every advantage that to his mind may seem to offer aid in the very difficult and impossible task now before him.

My brother's disquisition upon the law of the Old Testament and the gospel as found in the New Testament is certainly amusing. He says that the law, taken in all its parts, consisted of certain rules which are expressed in the term: "Thou shalt not." He declares that such things are for babes and those not advanced; but the gospel, which he says is for those who are advanced, is expressed by the term: "Thou shouldest." Now the amusing, not to say absurd, thing he would have us believe is that, instead of walking in the light of the gospel, whose principles make us free, he would place all, both the learned and unlearned, back under the law and have us try to serve God as David did in the olden time. He would have us serve God under rules which he himself says are for children, and not for those of mature years. It is strange that in trying to defend wrong it seems no one is able to keep himself out of contradictions. But is our brother correct in what he says about there being only a very few commandments in the New Testament to the Christian? By no means. As is usual with those on his side, he is mistaken. With all of Paul's freedom, he said that he was under law to Christ. (1 Cor. 9: 19-22.) It is true that ours is a law of faith, the law of liberty; but it is law, just the same. That it contains commandments to which our Lord requires strict obedience may be shown by many passages, a few of which I will quote here. John 14: 15, 23: "If ye love me, keep my commandments. . . . Jesus answered and said unto them, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." John 15: 10, 14: "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love. . . . Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you." James 2: 10: "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." 1 John 2: 3,

5, 6, 17: "And hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. . . . But whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby know we that we are in him. He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked. . . . And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." 1 John 3: 22, 24: "And whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight. . . . And he that keepeth his commandment dwelleth in him, and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us." 1 John 5: 2, 3: "By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous." 2 John 6: "And this is love, that we walk after his commandments. This is the commandment, That, as ye have heard from the beginning, ye should walk in it." Rev. 12: 17: "And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." Last, but by no means least, when the time comes for our final entrance in through the gates into the New Jerusalem, our Lord shall say: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." (Rev. 22: 14.) We feel that Paul's advice to the Galatians is in point just here: "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." (Gal. 5: 1.)

When Brother Stark attempts to say that the New Testament is no more than a restatement of the lessons taught in the Old Testament, he is coming very close to what the Bible calls "wresting the scriptures;" and yet this is just what he does try to teach in his exegesis of 1 Pet. 1: 10-12. Here the apostle says that the prophets testified of "the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow"—not the glory that went before as our brother would have us think. The apostle also says that the prophets themselves did not understand what they said; and, more than that, he says that the angels desired to look into those things, but were not permitted. Now, in the face of all this, our brother wants you to think that the apostles had to depend on the prophets for the explanation of the gospel which they preached. Is it possible that any of his own friends will indorse what he says on this matter? Surely not.

When our brother says that no man can preach the gospel to-day unless he has an understanding of the old law, he is not correct necessarily; and in the light and for the purpose which moved him to make the statement he is wrong, palpably wrong. The apostle says in the passage just quoted that the apostles preached "with the Holy

Ghost sent down from heaven," and Paul to the Galatians said that the gospel which he preached was by the revelation of the Holy Ghost. (Gal. 1.) In verse 17 he says that he did not even go up to Jerusalem to learn of them who were apostles before him; and yet Brother Stark will teach that Paul did not know what his own words meant, except through the explanation found in the teaching of the prophets. Do you suppose that there is another man on earth who would dare say such a thing?

Our Savior, in Luke 5: 36-38, will have us remember that the Christianity taught only in the New Testament is no *patch* made of new cloth put on an old garment or new wine put in old bottles. Let our brother read this parable, and I think he will never again repeat what he now claims on the subject. Read, also, Gal. 3: 23-25.

If further evidence be necessary to show the difference between the truth and our brother's contention, I refer you to Heb. 8: 6-13. Here it is declared that the covenant under which we live is a new one, not an old one, and that it is not even like anything that preceded it. Now that a new one has been made, the first, or old, one decays and is ready to vanish away. It is strange that these scriptures and arguments should be called for in a debate between our people. The pioneers of this reformation used to quote them to show the denominations how to rightly divide the word of truth. By these they showed that the law of pardon to the alien was not found in the books of Exodus and Leviticus, nor was the law of Christian living learned from the Song of Solomon or the Psalms of David, but that for the conditions of remission of sins to the alien we must come to the New Testament, to the teaching of Christ through his apostles; and if we would know how to live the Christian life, we should read the Epistles to the churches. Now there has arisen a faction among us who have forgotten how to divide the truth, and hence they talk and argue just like the denominations have always done. They need to be taught what be the first principles of the gospel of Christ. Let us teach them in patience and with that degree of forbearance best calculated to bring the best results. Their desires for the unscriptural things are so strong that deception with them is easy.

My good brother makes a very unnecessary mistake when he says that "not a law of restraint comes under the reign of our King." This statement looks a good deal like licentiousness; but, fortunately for the truth, it, like everything else that is said in support of my brother's unscriptural proposition, is simply not true. Does not Paul say he labored to keep his body under, lest he should be a castaway? (1 Cor. 9: 27.) Does he not tell the Hebrews to fear, lest they fail to obtain the promised rest? (Heb. 4: 1; see also Heb. 10: 26-29; 2 Pet. 3: 17.) Paul, after telling of those things which befell the disloyal and disobedient Israelites, says they are examples for us. (1 Cor. 10.)

In verse 12 he says: "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." Now if I did not know that the "digressives" generally use this argument to justify their course in using the organ in the worship, I should be inclined to pass it by without notice. They cry, "We are not under the law, but under grace;" and, refusing to give the rest of the passage, they say this means that they are free to use anything they wish. If it works well and suits their taste, they bring it in; and if one calls for their authority, they answer: "We are not under one single restraint, and where has God said: 'Thou shalt not use the organ?' We may do anything not specifically forbidden." If we show them that such a course will admit of infant baptism and infant church membership, they generally get mad and turn away from us, saying, sectarianlike: "I see no use of arguing. I have as good a right to my opinion as you have to yours." One in a thousand perhaps, like Brother Stark, will reply: "I do not object to people sprinkling their babies, provided they do not profess to do it in the name of the Lord." Just so. Neither do we object to people playing the organ outside of the worship; but when they bring it in and propose to use it in the worship of God, then we object and call for your authority, just as you call for the Methodist preacher's authority for sprinkling the infant. I defy any man beneath the stars to make one argument in favor of the organ that cannot be used in favor of infant church membership. Do you say that David praised God on the organ? I answer that David took his infants into the church with him, too. So I shall insist that if you use the organ because David did, you must also take your babies in for the same reason.

Brother Stark asks: "Did not God know that the organ would be introduced into the worship in these latter times? Then, why did he not say something against it?" I reply: Did not God know that infant baptism would be introduced? Then, why did he not say something against it? Just here I want to state a fact that ought to cause every "digressive" to tremble, and that is that infant sprinkling was practiced for more than four hundred years before the organ was ever used in worship. It was brought in and used by the same people who had introduced the innovation of infant baptism. Again, I insist that if you must have instrumental music in the worship, you must bring in the babies. It is certain that God will accept one as readily as he will the other. The truth is that he will give no credit to either.

My good Brother Stark seems to be very much exercised over a tract written by Brother D. Lipscomb, of the Gospel Advocate—a man who has done more for the cause of Christ, perhaps, than Brother Stark and a hundred others like him, and who knows more of God's word than both my brother and myself shall ever know. Brother Stark's criticism of Brother Lipscomb reminds me of several little Baptist preachers with whom I have debated trying to correct the mistakes of

Alexander Campbell. The comparison, I think, is about the same. But that all who hear or may read this discussion may see and know that Brother Stark does not understand Brother Lipscomb or the scriptures he uses, I pause long enough to expose his objections. You will observe that he calls what Brother Lipscomb says "blasphemy" or something worse. He reaches his conclusion by scrapping the few quotations he makes from the tract. Brother Lipscomb shows by the Bible that God did actually permit among the Jews things which he had not commanded or authorized. If Brother Stark will read carefully Deut. 24: 1-4 in connection with Matt. 19: 3-9, he will certainly be ashamed of himself, and will apologize to Brother Lipscomb and to this audience for talking about something he does not understand. I will give here the two passages in part. Moses, a prophet, in Deuteronomy, says: "When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her: then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife. And if the latter husband hate her, and write her a bill of divorcement, and giveth it in her hand, and sendeth her out of his house; or if the latter husband die, which took her to be his wife; her former husband, which sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife, after that she is defiled." In Matt. 19: 8, when the Pharisees called the Savior's attention to what Moses had taught, Jesus replied: "Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so." Other passages might be quoted, but these are sufficient to show that Brother Lipscomb is not to be spoken of in such unbecoming and unchristian-like terms as those employed by Brother Stark.

When our brother reasons that he may use the organ in the worship in the gospel age, though God may not authorize it, just because David used it in his temple, he mistakes his privileges. God allowed the Jews to do some things on account of the hardness of their hearts, but he does not carry this principle into the Christian dispensation. I have no doubt but that many "digressives" have as hard hearts as the Jews had, but they have more light. So God will not hold them guiltless. But suppose it be admitted that God did command the organ to be used in the worship in the days of David, does it follow that we may use it now by his authority? By no means. God commanded animal sacrifice, the burning of incense, and many other things in his worship and service which if we were to do now would be nothing short of rebellion. When Paul said to the Hebrews and Galatians that their desire, as shown by their conduct, to go back to the law was equivalent to falling from grace, does he not say as much to Brother Stark and to all other "digressives" who quote David as authority in church worship under the Christian dispensation?

Of all the amusing things said by my brother, what he says in commenting upon Paul's advice to Timothy in reference to not striving about questions to no profit is no less funny than the most ludicrous. All untaught questions, of course, belong to this class; and since instrumental music in the worship, as far as the New Testament is concerned, is an untaught question, Brother Stark thinks, of course, that no one has a right to raise any objection to it; for, says our brother, it is an untaught question, and on such things we must maintain perfect silence. We shall see if there may not be other untaught questions found among the religions of the times. Take counting beads, as practiced by the Catholics. I wonder if the brother would hold membership in a congregation whose members counted beads as a religious rite. Again, Brother Stark admits that infant baptism is an untaught question. Would he object to his congregation adopting this practice as a custom? But suppose he should object; would they not reply, as he does to those of his brethren who do not use the organ in worship, and say: "Sir, you strive about an untaught question; I demand that you be silent where God is silent?" Why, the thought is almost too ridiculous to deserve even a passing notice. It would simply open the flood gate and admit every kind of innovation the human mind could ever dream of, and no one would dare molest or make afraid him who would bring them in. Let the Catholic pictures used in their devotions, their bead counting, with all their paraphernalia for attraction and show, come into the service, and we will see to it that Brother Stark bends his neck to the yoke and wears it without a murmur. If he opposes, though it may have been his money largely that built the house of worship, we will make these things tests of fellowship; and if he cannot in conscience worship with them, he can get out. So we drive him out of the house he built and confiscate the property. This is the course taken by the "digressives" in almost every place where the organ has been forced into the worship. If it is not the spirit of the devil, then Beelzebub himself will be in heaven and the great red dragon of Rev. 12 will walk the streets of the New Jerusalem, sanctified and made meet for the Master's use.

Brother Stark wants to know if, when praying in his closet, an old hen cackles outside, whether he should cease praying and go outside and compel the hen to quit cackling until he has finished his prayer. Of course not in that case. Neither does any one object to the organ playing on the outside when not in the worship. I now ask my brother whether he would continue his prayer if some one should go outside, get that old hen, bring her into his closet, and compel her to cackle while he worshiped, and thus compel him to cackle with her or else cease cackling entirely. He would, no doubt, leave his own closet in the possession of the two intruders. Does he say that he would object? But what could he do? Would not the man reply: "You will

just submit or get out. You must not speak where God has not spoken; and I challenge you to show in all the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, where God has said, 'Thou shalt not bring a cackling hen into the sanctuary of the saints;' and, besides, does not David say: 'Let everything that has breath praise the Lord?' This chicken has breath; let it praise the Lord?" My brother, how do you like this argument? It is precisely like what you offer in favor of the organ. If there is any difference, it is better than you can find for your proposition.

Brother Stark's childish twaddle about the difference between praise and service and between these two and worship is worse than nonsense. If we pray to God, we worship him; if we sing praise to him, we worship him; and since he commands us to do both, when we pray or sing his praise, we serve him. If we speak of the service on the Lord's day, we mean the worship. Most children know better than he seems to know about such things. I regret to have to correct my brother on so many of these little things which you, ladies and gentlemen, feel that all should fully understand; but if he will spend his time in this way instead of coming to the question and making an honest effort to prove his proposition, since I am only the respondent, I suppose I must follow him.

It is really interesting to hear what the brother says about the effect upon an audience of a thousand people produced by the playing of the two musicians whose names he gives. He thinks that because the music made on the instruments aroused the emotions of the hearers, it certainly must be of God. Well, I do not suppose Brother Stark is the preacher who, after seeing how the actor swayed his audience with a lecture and play on fiction, inquired of the actor about how it came. Said the preacher: "I preach the truth, and yet I cannot control an audience with it like you do with your fiction." The actor replied: "The explanation is easy. I preach a lie just like it is the truth, and you preach the truth just like it is a lie." If Brother Stark had been that preacher, he would, no doubt, have contended: "The fact that you arouse the emotions of the people and move them to tears shows that what you do is from God. That is the way the people do when they hear Mozart and Beethoven play, and this shows that God is in them and in the very music they make. So God must be in you and in your play for the same reason." I suppose that no stronger emotional feeling or greater admiration for the service can be found than is generally shown at the modern mourner's bench. I wonder if my good brother thinks that this is all from God? Who bows the head and heart lower than the ordinary Catholic at the confessional or sheds tears more bitter than his? Does my brother think, therefore, it is all of God? Surely we shall not hear of this argument again in this debate.

I believe rhetoric teaches that one should arrange his arguments so that the strongest one in the speech may come last; but if it be

possible for one of our brother's arguments to be weaker than the others, he has certainly saved that one for the last. It is on Amos 6. What he says about this betrays a conscious weakness in his own case. There is a woe pronounced against these people for a number of things, one of which was for inventing instruments of music like David did. Now our brother says that Amos is mistaken about all of these charges except one, and that was that the people were "antimissionary." I suppose he thinks that they would not give of their means for missionary work. Well, those who are familiar with digressive ideas will not be surprised at this. As a rule, they will excuse any kind of conduct in a member if he will only pay his pledges, and thus help support their human machinery. Because some people give their means for mission work in and through the church of Christ, it does not prove them antimissionary. The church at Philippi sent their aid direct to the man in the field. Was that church antimissionary? But back to Amos 6. Let us see about the instruments of music in the passage. I read in connection Amos 5: 21-23: "I hate, I despise your feast days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies. Though ye offer me burnt offerings and meat offerings, I will not accept them: neither will I regard the peace offerings of your fat beasts. Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols."

You can now easily see that instruments of music was one of the very grave charges preferred against these people and strongly condemned of God.

My time will soon be out. I beg my brother to come to the rescue of his proposition. If there be in all the Bible one chapter, one verse, or even a part of a verse authorizing instrumental music to be used in the worship of the church of Jesus Christ, bring it forward. We want to see it. Promises will not satisfy. The one text is what we want. When my brother goes into heaven to find his harps, we shall show him some other things with which those harps are associated. What we want now is a passage giving authority to use instrumental music in the church of Christ to-day. This is our brother's first duty, and here is where his proposition cries out most piteously for his assistance. Will he come up to the work? Our Savior said to his disciples that when the Holy Spirit came he would guide them into all truth. (John 16.) Did the Holy Spirit guide them into the use of the organ, or did it inform them to teach others to use it? If so, *where is the passage so stating?* Echo answers, "Where?" and this is the only answer we shall ever have, for there lives not a man in all the earth who can point to the passage which my brother's proposition so much needs. The great apostle to the circumcision said to Christians: "God according to his divine power hath given us all things that pertain to life and godliness." Where has he given instrumental music for the churches of Jesus Christ? If he has not given it to us, then it is cer-

tain that it does not pertain to either life or godliness; and if it does not, it must then pertain to death and ungodliness. The latter is, no doubt, the truth in the matter. So we had better refrain from using it and do like the apostle advises—make melody in the heart, not on an instrument. May God help us to see and accept the truth.

STARK'S SECOND SPEECH.

Mr. Chairman, Brethren, and Friends:

I had intended to continue my arguments without replying to my opponent just now; and had he answered anything I have said, I might have done so. He seems not so much inclined to answer arguments as to talk about matters. In my experience of years I have never been called upon to answer such a mixture of assertions and misleading statements.

The first I will notice is his appeal to the prejudice concerning who have divided the church and destroyed the unity for which Christ prayed. This could better have waited until nearer the end and see who is scriptural and who is not. Strange time in the first speech to assume to decide the question at issue! But since it is introduced, I will say a few words upon it. The church is a unit, and always will be when standing on the word of God alone. Introduce a law God has not given, and that law becomes an article of faith to all who receive it; and if forced upon a church, it becomes the foundation for a sect; and a party breaks off from the old church that will not submit to its mandates, and stands on that, and forms a sect with that as the foundation. If that command is found in the word of God, then all who stand on the word must accept it, and all such will be united. If not found in the word, those who introduce it make of it an article of faith; and to enforce it upon those who deny its authority divides the church and forms a sect on the authority of men. It is thus all sects are formed. Thus the Dunkards were united in faith till some questioned their law of dress and, finding no authority but of men for the law, rejected it; and that separated them from the old church. Which was to be blamed for the division? Most assuredly those who would no longer be controlled by an unauthorized human precept could not be the cause of division. So here if it is said, "Thou shalt not use an instrument in your praise to God," it is a law of God or a law of man. If of God, it must be clearly defined, and all who stand on the word of God will accept it; but if of man, those who attempt to enforce it cause strife and make it the foundation of a sect. If my brother can find it in the word of God, then all who refuse obedience are sinners; if he cannot find it clearly defined in the word and he attempts to enforce it, he forms a sect, and his party is built on a humanism without divine authority. He, therefore, should be on the affirmative in this debate; but I can afford to affirm more than should

be required. Strange he shall assume the matter settled at the beginning, in the first part of his first speech. Before he asserts who caused the division he would do well to find a divine law as authority upon which to divide the church. If he finds no law, his party is a sect and his teaching is a damnable heresy. If he makes the law, he is a devil; but if he finds the law, I am a sinner.

All his talk about Brother Meeks is naught but buncombe. Brother Meeks still preaches the word as of yore, turning sinners to Christ and helping to build up a good church in this most delightful city; and the brethren were in harmony, praising God, as authorized to praise his name in the congregation of the saints, with all manner of stringed instruments and organs. Brother Elam came here with his man-made creed, saying: "Thou shalt not praise God in his sanctuary with instruments of music." Though the brethren, like Brother McGarvey, "besought him with tears in their eyes" not to bring that question into the church and told him he could have the house in which to preach Christ, but could not preach in it his humanism, he persisted in his devilish undertaking, divided the church, and built up what I propose to show to be a sect founded on a human creed. The command, I will show, came from the devil; and it raises the devil wherever it goes. It has not a particle of divine authority in it. It is that which divided the church here. If in this debate he finds divine authority for his creed, the old church will put its organ out and go with the new one; if he does not find it, the new church is a sect and has gone into the service of the devil. The proof should rest with him. He must find a law, or he has no authority for anything. That is what this debate is for.

It is early to assume at the beginning of his first speech that the matter is settled, but assertiveness and the spirit of assumption has always been characteristic of the leaders of this sect. They set up their human authority, like the "man of sin" in the temple of God; and if any do not respect it, they accuse them of making strife. Who cause the division—those who make the law without divine warrant or those who refuse to obey a human command from some who would be pope? So if the "antis" have no divine warrant for the law of their creed, they cause division by introducing it. I will not, like my brother, assume the whole question of the debate settled before we begin; but I will prophesy that he cannot find a passage in the whole Bible to sustain the arbitrary law of his creed. Now watch him, and you will find it all assertions.

Another thing in his speech I must notice is his quotations from Moses E. Lard and J. W. McGarvey. After describing them as matchless thinkers and writers and the large amount of good they have done, lauding them to the skies, he tells what they have said on the subject of music in the church. No doubt they were good and great; but both were human, and Lard, especially, had much human nature in his

make-up. John Calvin was also good and great. Brother Warlick says my friends think I am smart, and, no doubt, his friends admire him; but what has this to do with what the word of God teaches? If these men are so great and such students of the word, they surely can find some scripture for their views. In his quotations there is not a word of scripture given. It is naught but assertions of their own. Not a passage is alluded to. Nothing but their opinion is given, and that opinion is as human as the opinion of John Calvin. But I have as high esteem for their opinion on this subject as my brother has for what they say on other subjects. Both of these men were charter members of the missionary society when Brother Campbell was made its first president; and Lard was a life member, and McGarvey is still a life member. My brother has not a particle of respect for their judgment on that subject. All the wind he put into that was only for effect. They are great only when they agree with him. The wind here spent was useless.

Another specimen of his assertive style is in his exaltation of Brother Lipscomb, who, he asserts, knows more of the Bible than he and I both. This is a specimen of most of his speech. But how does he know this? How does he know of my knowledge of the Bible? He never met me till to-day. He says he only heard of me as "the smartest man in the world." How can he sit in judgment between Brother Lipscomb and myself? A man's competency to judge ends where his knowledge ceases. How, then, can he tell how far Brother Lipscomb's knowledge goes after it has passed his ken? Is this speech a specimen of the bombast that is to characterize this discussion? I do not think it is common to the man, but he has nothing else to put in.

My brother says: "Every one knows that those who have introduced and brought the divisive things, including instrumental music, into the worship of the saints are alone and altogether responsible for the division." In my proposition I affirm that God put them into his praise when he said by the Spirit of Christ in his prophets: "Let them praise his name in the congregation of the saints with stringed instruments and organs." If God put them in, they are "alone and altogether responsible for division" who attempt to put them out on human authority alone. He says: "As we all worshiped before instrumental music was introduced, which was and is to worship just as the New Testament directs." What assumption! That is the question of the discussion, and he assumes it all settled before we begin. Yes, we would all be one, like the Catholic Church, if we would let some little pope rule us. That was what was said of Luther, and the sects said it of Campbell, charging them with divisions. But why continue to assert what the New Testament teaches? Why not find it? One sentence will do. The trouble is that it is not there. He has got to assert it; and, no doubt, he has "told it so much he believes it himself." The whole opposition to such praise comes from the assertions

of such men. In this debate he will not find a passage against it. Now watch him.

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 schoolboy because he could not have his way. He could leave like a man and go where there was no organ, which he did. He had no interest in their music. He, nor Brother Lard, nor Brother Franklin, nor Brother Campbell, could not distinguish the chords of the "pleasant psalter" from a horse fiddle; and "Mean," sung "*meaner*," was good enough if it were only short so they could get to preaching. This appeal to the prejudice and talk about Brother McGarvey's crying is their best stock in trade. Think of his whole speech all through! Not an argument in it—nothing but assertions, for he has naught else to bring.

Brother Warlick's talk about Brother Meeks is as misguiding as it is untrue. While Brother Meeks may indorse the use of the organ, he does not advocate it where he goes. He can praise God with it or he can praise God without it. He did not favor Brother Elam coming here, where they had been using the organ in peace for twenty years, and raising a fuss to put it out, and that without the shadow of a divine warrant.

He talks about the papers on the organ side. I know of no such papers. I know of none who have published a line in favor of such praise in the church or out of it. Brother Freed, of this place, leads the opposition to its use for the praise of God in the church, but uses it, with a whole orchestra, in the morning worship at the school, I am told. But my brother must say something. He must put in his time.

My brother climbs upon the judgment seat of the Eternal and judges between Brother Lipscomb's work and mine, and says that he has done more for the cause of Christ than I and a hundred like me. Of course he knows. But what he calls "good" God may denounce as evil. They may disagree. That might be unfortunate for the Lord. I have been preaching more years than he, and "I have kept the faith;" while Brother Lipscomb has gone with the "destructive critics" and taken the two books of Chronicles, the book of Ezra, and the book of Nehemiah from the sacred oracles, denied the inspiration of David, and made God a liar when he said David was a man after his own heart, declaring David antagonized God all his life, while seeking to give glory to an earthly kingdom, to which God objected. This dear man may have done a great amount of good; but, like the cow that gave a large flow of milk and then kicked it over, he should have died before he gave up his faith for his hobby. Brother Lipscomb, in his booklet, takes his text from Moses that we shall not add to or take

from, writes against the use of the Old Testament in our Christian teaching (they all do), and then comes into the church with a new commandment: "Thou shalt not have an organ here." From his own book I ask: What will become of him for this addition to God's law?

On the hen illustration, if I understand my brother, he thinks one should not stop praying when the fault is with the hen; but if some one manipulates the hen, he may stop praying and fight. Not so with Stephen, who worshiped while they stoned him. He would worship, though a trumpet sounded.

I will retouch Amos 6: 1-4. He says in his criticism: "There is a woe pronounced against this people for a number of things." Not so. The people are clearly defined: "Them that are at ease in Zion, and trust in the mountains of Samaria; . . . that put far away the evil day, and cause the seat of violence to come near." They "lie upon beds of ivory." Is there any sin in that if God blesses them, as he evidently had? They "stretch themselves upon their couches." Is there sin in that? It is only an indication of God's blessing them. They "eat the lambs out of the flock." Is that sinful? They eat "calves out of the midst of the stall." There is no sin in that. It simply shows God's blessings upon them. They "chant to the sound of the viol." Who said this is sin? They "invent to themselves instruments of music, like David," who was a man after God's own heart. "Heart" here means "mind," "will," "desire," etc. Could there be sin in doing as David did and as David taught by the Spirit of Christ that was in him? They drank wine in bowls and anointed themselves with the best ointment, showing how much God had done for them. "But"—but what? What is wrong? They "are at ease in Zion" and "are not grieved for the affliction" of others. If this passage does not place the chanting to the sound of the viol and the invention of instruments of music, like David, among the things commended, I am deficient in my understanding of the English language.

My brother thinks so many of these things are "funny." Well, some minds are so constructed they can see "fun" when they cannot see an argument. There is much in the make of the man. He says I have written a book on this subject. That is about as accurate as he gets things. He ought to know better, for he has the book. I have written a book on "The King and His Kingdom," in which I discuss the work of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; church organization, how its officers are appointed, and their work and duties; church finance, how the exchequer is kept up in the kingdom; how men from the kingdom of darkness are naturalized and made citizens of the kingdom and the praise they render to the King; but I have never written a book on church music. In that book I show how to deal with heretics who introduce new commands and divide the church, lording it over God's heritage without divine warrant, giving laws for what we may have and what we shall not. Let the people read it.

But I am using too much time in reply to side issues, and will proceed with my arguments.

My fourth argument is from Gen. 4: 21. Mr. Campbell said: "Jubal invented the harp, and piety consecrated it to the praise of God." From that day to this musical instruments have been used in the praise of God through all dispensations, and God has never objected to it. I would consider this a pretty strong indorsement. Not a word against it from Jehovah all these years, either by himself, his Son, the Holy Spirit, his prophets, or the apostles! Yet David—not the king, but the "higher critic"—says God was opposed to it all the time, but tolerated it because of the hardness of human hearts. Of course he knows just what God was opposed to, and needs no revelation from his word. He says it is like divorce. Then, why did not Christ correct it while correcting divorce? Some men have a peculiar faculty of knowing just what God likes and what he dislikes without God's revealing it to others. It is that peculiar faculty in some that has divided the church in all the past and seeks the same thing in this day. He says the organ divided the church. It never divided a church in the world. It is but an excuse. It is that spirit of dogmatism that assumes to know God's likes and dislikes, independent of divine revelation, that has divided the church of my Lord. Their style is to make a quotation of scripture and add as many assertions as their cause demands.

Were God opposed to such praise, would he accept it through the three dispensations without a demurrer? I trow not. Had it been a parallel with divorce and tolerated because of the hardness of their hearts, why did not Jesus correct it when he corrected the others? Why did the apostles and early evangelists, led by the Holy Spirit, make no corrections? It was a prevailing custom in their day, and why was it left for some prejudiced old fogies of the nineteenth century, who have an ax to grind, to stir up sedition and discord in the church of Christ? Did not God know that some would use organs in our day? Then, why did he not give some indication of his disapproval by a word from some prophet he sent? Since it was so early invented and was used through the ages without an objection from God or Christ or the Holy Spirit, I can but consider it an indorsement of its use. Who said God did not approve it, but simply tolerated it? No man of God ever said it.

My fifth argument is from Rev. 14: 1-5: "And I looked, and lo, a Lamb stood on the mount Sion, and with him a hundred and forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads. And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of great thunder: and I heard the voice of harpers harping with their harps: and they sung as it were a new song before the throne, and before the four beasts, and the elders: and no man could learn that song but the hundred and forty and four thousand, which

were redeemed from the earth." The same lesson is also taught in Rev. 5: 8; 15: 1-3. These are either figures or facts. I care not which. Passing the dispensations earthly to that which is spiritual, where no flesh and blood abound, where God is and the Savior reigns, in the city of gold, where the spirits of the redeemed come home, bearing palms of victory, to sing a new song in the spirit land, from every kindred and people, with harps in their hands, to join with the angels in singing his praise and to shout his hosannas and worship him that liveth forever. So God, who tolerated it because of the weakness of the flesh, tolerates it in the spirit land, where there is no flesh or hardness of hearts. For shame on such nonsense! Not an objection from God or the angels! Could we have a stronger indorsement than God has here silently given? Since God has offered no complaint, shall we, who are pledged to speak where God speaks and be silent where God is silent, enter the temple of God, like the "man of sin" Paul speaks of, and assume to say what God likes and what God dislikes, and lay down as law that which God has not spoken and make it a standard of fellowship among brethren? In the home of the soul, where the loved ones gather when life's toils are over, shall we join in the song of the redeemed, giving praise to God with harps in our hands? Dear me! What a sad place it will be for those who have fought such things here all their lives to go there (if they get there) and find a whole orchestra joining in praise to God and the Lamb! I fear Brother McGarvey would call for a letter and go and join elsewhere. Dear Lord, my faith is in thee; and what pleases thee I will love, nor will I fight what thou hast ordained. God forbid that I should divide heaven if instruments of music are found in the skies. What I can fellowship in heaven I will fellowship in this preparatory state, where Christ in his school is training me for bliss eternal. Did I think the unbelieving would be there, I would fellowship them here; or if the unrepentant would join me in songs triumphant, I would admit them here; or the unbaptized, I would not reject them from fellowship on earth. If God has forbidden all instrumental strains among his saints on earth, we will not be troubled with them in the unseen holy, and the vision John saw was not from the Lord, but from Satan's abode—a vision of death by the enemy of souls.

Peter had a vision from above which was contrary to his prejudice; and he called it "unclean," and God said to him: "What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common." God's pictures must not be slighted to conform to our prejudice. If God gave a picture of harps in the skies, it was an indorsement of harps on the earth. If God has in his word revealed that indorsement, that word authorizes the use of instruments of music in his praise on earth in the church of Christ, which is a part of the same family. (Eph. 3: 15.) If God authorizes it in his family there, he does more than tolerate it in his family here—the same family. He authorizes it.

My sixth argument is from 1 Sam. 10: 5, 6: "After that thou shalt come to the hill of God, where is the garrison of the Philistines: and it shall come to pass, when thou art come thither to the city, that thou shalt meet a company of prophets coming down from the high place with a psaltery, and a tabret, and a pipe, and a harp, before them; and they shall prophesy: and the Spirit of the Lord will come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy with them, and shalt be turned into another man." These were prophets, holy men, who spoke as they were "made to speak by the Holy Spirit"—"the Spirit of Christ which was in them." Yet David Lipscomb says they were in opposition to God, who was opposed to such music. He tells us David, the king, invented these instruments to give glory to the kingdom, to which God was opposed; but this was before David and before the kingdom, and is found in the book of Samuel, which he indorses. Peter says these men spoke by the Spirit of Christ (1 Pet. 1: 11), and Paul says: "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." This book is unimpeached by our "higher critic," and what can be stronger than this from the book he indorses? It came from the Spirit of Christ in the prophets, and Peter says they declared the same things as were taught by the apostles with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven. The prophets came down with a whole orchestra. They prophesied; and the Spirit of the Lord—the Spirit of Christ—came upon Saul, and he was turned into another man. If the Spirit of Christ would come upon the "antis," they would be turned—converted—into other men. The Spirit of Christ in them is the Holy Spirit. Who said the Holy Spirit has been converted—changed—into another spirit? At that time it would change Saul into another man when invoked by music instrumental; now such music would invoke a spirit in the "antis" that will change a saint to a devil. Can one conceive of a stronger indorsement? This surely is given by inspiration in a book which Brother Lipscomb approves, and is, therefore, profitable to Timothy for correction and instruction in right doing, thoroughly furnishing him to every good work. If their preachers go to the Old Testament (which they do) for examples in faith, obedience, and every good work, I can see no reason why we should not go there for examples in praise. They are all like my opponent with Lard and McGarvey, who are great when they agree with him. So these examples are good when they can use them. How they will preach of Abraham's faith and Lot's wife and Uzzah's death and Moses' command not to add to or take from! They can find examples on every page of the Old Testament if there is no harp in it; but if there is, they will "harp" against it.

From this passage I reason that if any refuse to preach, teach, or exhort because of an instrument of music, the Spirit of Christ is not in them. "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." With this association of the Spirit of God with psalteries, tabrets,

pipes, and harps, who said such music is gross and fleshly? Who has become so wise above what is written? Can a man read this and doubt that the word of God authorizes the use of instruments in God's praise? If God has changed, how did they find it out? Who told them? Are we all left to conjecture? Do they know God's thoughts and purposes untold? The question is not as to what they know of God, but as to what the word authorizes. Have we found the answer? Is the question so important or their stubbornness so great it must be answered so repeatedly and then go unheeded? We shall find the answer often repeated before the discussion is ended, and they have not a passage to lean on. Watch and see if he finds one.

My seventh argument is from 2 Kings 3: 10-17. The rebellious king of the ten tribes said: "The Lord hath called these three kings together, to deliver them into the hand of Moab." The good king of the two tribes asked for a prophet of the Lord. Elisha was named. "And Jehoshaphat said, The word of the Lord is with him;" and Jehoram and Jehoshaphat went down to him. Elisha rebuked the king of Israel, and said: "Were it not that I regard the presence of Jehoshaphat the king of Judah, I would not look toward thee, nor see thee. But now bring me a minstrel. And it came to pass, when the minstrel played, that the hand of God came upon him. And he said, Thus saith the Lord," etc. It was a most wonderful prophecy, and was wholly fulfilled, and came by the playing of a minstrel. Brother McGarvey would have left if the minstrel had played, and the prophecy would have been lost; but Elisha called for a minstrel, the Spirit of God was invoked, prophecy was given, a miracle was wrought, and salvation was brought to the host that was famished for water. Will God accept praise from that which brings blessings so full and so rich? To the great prophet of God, Elisha, no Spirit came till a minstrel had played. Then the hand of the Lord came upon him, and he spoke the word of the Lord, and a miracle was wrought in God's name—a most wonderful miracle. Will God accept praise from such service now? If his word does not authorize it, why does he recognize it? Why does God send blessings down from a service to which he objects—only tolerates?

I am ashamed to expose such folly in an old preacher, but it is the only way to stop the heresy he heads. Mark this passage as from the book of Kings, as the other was from Samuel, both of which he permits to remain in the Bible. Let me read from his booklet: "The invention of instruments of music by David is plainly condemned and placed among sins offensive to God. Every time it is said to be ordained or appointed by David it is condemned by God, since no service added by man could be acceptable to God." This is a specimen of the assertions in which the opposition abounds. There is not a word of truth in it; and if we had any church organization, he should be tried for heresy before he ruins all the young preachers in his school. He

at the head of a Bible school, and knows so little of, and cares so little for, the Bible! He himself in another place says God did not impute it as sin. If the cases I have brought are a mark of God's displeasure, I would God would disapprove me. Who said God disapproved it? Did David, the prophet? Did God say it? Never. David, the "higher critic," says: "I said it." How did he find it out? Just as he found out that the books he rejects were not inspired. How does he prove it? He seems to think if he asserts a thing, it is enough, and henceforth needs no proof. Hear him again: "*This music came in to give glory to the earthly kingdom and passed away with it. It is not mentioned in the lengthy history of the kingdom as given in the books of Samuel and Kings.*" Was it ignorance that caused that statement? Or was it a lack of honesty in the writer? Or was it a delusion sent from God to such as receive not the love of the truth, that they should believe a lie because they have pleasure in unrighteousness? (2 Thess. 2: 11.) I prefer to call it "ignorance," though God has said: "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge; because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee." (Hos. 4: 6.) If God's people are destroyed for lack of knowledge, what will become of him who darkens counsel by such statements, that he may divide the church and separate those who "swear by his paper" from those who do not? No wonder he will not submit to a review through the columns of his paper. Nor do I wonder that he indorses the books of Kings, which are a history of the rebellion, and that he repudiates the history of the two loyal tribes as given in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah—loyal to the kingdom God gave them. If the statement were true, it would only prove that those in rebellion against God are the ones who oppose instrumental strains; while the loyal, even loyal prophets in Samaria, praise God on the harp, etc. This is true. Not one of the rebellious prophets sought to any minstrel. It was Elisha and the prophets of God. This dear brother needs regenerating by the word of God, and it will be done if he will only believe.

Who said: "This music came in to give glory to the earthly kingdom and passed away with it?" It came before there was any kingdom—before Samuel, Judges, Moses, Abraham; it came in the days of the patriarchs of old. This editor says it bears the clear marks of God's disapproval, even in the Mosaic dispensation. Where are the earmarks? Is it possible he cannot tell anything straight? In the first piece I ever saw from his pen he garbled Paul to sustain an assertion. Give me the latitude of these men, and I can prove anything. I would only have to assert it and get my brother to tell what a great and good man I am; and if I were on his side, he would do it for me. His pets will have to have another "send off."

My eighth argument is from 2 Chron. 5: 11-14. Let the hearer turn to the passage. I will quote only a part of it. The temple was being dedicated. The singers, "arrayed in white linen, having cymbals and

psalteries and harps, stood at the east end of the altar, and with them a hundred and twenty priests sounding with trumpets. . . . The trumpeters and singers were as one, to make one sound to be heard in praising and thanking the Lord [can you thank God with a trumpet?]; and when they lifted up their voice with the trumpets and cymbals and instruments of music, and praised the Lord, saying, For he is good; for his mercy endureth forever: . . . then the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of the Lord; so that the priests could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud: for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of God."

The author of the booklet to which I have so often referred seems to be a seer among those opposed to organs and societies, and upon him the mantle of Ben Franklin seems to have fallen; but, contrary to his predecessor, he accepts the infidelity of the destructive critics, denies the inspiration of the five books I have before catalogued, and denies the use of the rest of the Old Testament, prophets and all. In my controversies with the preachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church I have had to defend a part of Mark's Gospel; with the "higher critics" we have had to struggle for Deuteronomy, Jonah, and Isaiah; and with our antiorgan brethren we must now contend for the inspiration of Psalms, Ezra, Nehemiah, the two books of Chronicles, and sustain David as a prophet of God. Another hobbyist and Second Peter is gone, and Hebrews will be thrown away soon, since faith in both is even now questioned. Another hobby to defend, and a few more leaves must be torn from the old book. Save the covers, brethren! O, save the covers, I pray you! They will not hurt your hobbies. I will gather up the leaves where they have fallen, put them all back as best I can, and clasp the dear old book to my heart as my hope and the hope of my mother and all the dear ones in glory. The dear old book has made me all I am in this world and given me all the hope I have for the world to come through its blessed teaching, and my heart aches to see it mutilated in the hands of the unregenerated. You shall not mar the history of God's chosen or take from me the inspired devotions of the sweet singer of Israel. My faith in the dear Master would go with them, for he indorsed all; and my lifeboat would go down in the darkness and the storm of that night, a sad wreck forever. My faith in that book has cheered me thus far on life's billows and been my light in the darkest of hours, when earth's storms lashed the sea to a foam. When the lifeboat of my mother was wrecked and that of my wife and of my daughter beloved went under the wave and they bade me good-by till the meeting beyond, it was my comfort. Spare the dear old compass unbroken a little longer, dear brethren, just a little longer, till I anchor my bark, for I am nearing the port. Please spare it unsullied till I anchor. Let its light shine a little longer, for I am almost there. Then, what will my children do? And what will the dear beloved ones do without God

and his word? O, spare it as it is till we all get home by its light! Let our hobbies all die, but let us not mar the book. You, too, may need it if it does bring the music of heaven into the church of my Lord with harps and new songs to cheer us as we pass down the slope through the mist to the sunlight.

The author of this booklet seems to know so little of the Bible, and yet, I understand, is at the head of a school of young preachers. Outside of baptism; which is a small part of Christian teaching, he seems so deficient. Strange so many take his *ipse dixit* for their light. Let me say here that you cannot take out the record of either Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Chronicles, Ezra, or Nehemiah without making a gap in the now complete history of God's people. Kings is the history of the rebellious tribes, and Psalms is the only book of inspired devotions. God has given them, and in them he tells us how to sing his praise. Jeroboam divided Israel, and the ten tribes went off—went off forever. They rejected God's law and rejected God's ordained praise, as Brother Lipscomb well suggests, though God in such examples as we have given through his prophets sought to teach them his proper praise, as we have shown. None of the rebellious used instruments in the praise of God, but it is recorded of all the good kings who would carry the people back to God's service. So I fear for some that go off now that, like Esau, they will find no place for repentance. Strange the author of the booklet takes their rebellious history for his light instead of the history of those who remained as God's chosen to wait in the land of their fathers for the long-promised Messiah. Ezra and Nehemiah give the history of the return from Babylon. Talk of them as being written by Ezra, the priest! They are the inspired archives of the nation; and the Bible would be very imperfect without them, as the devil well knows. I am sorry to see good brethren training in such ranks, casting doubt upon the records because of some hobby they fail to support. Let us come out like men on the Lord's side and accept whatever he teaches.

If we have now sustained the authority of the book, let us carefully examine this passage. Solomon had built the temple. He was to build after God's pattern, and the glory and beauty were from God's architecture. The whole plan was from God. To say it was built to enhance the glory of the kingdom is a slander upon God. In beauty and grandeur as a temple it was no higher in design or more perfect in its completion than was the tabernacle in the wilderness, with its gildings and curtains. Whatever God designs is magnificent; whatever he touches is beautiful. The blue dome, with its loftiness and diamond sets; the forest, with its foliage, verdure, and golden leaf; the blooming beauties, with painted petals and gilded stamens—all these tell us God's love of the beautiful; while the roar of the cataract, the murmur of the streamlet, the hum of the forest, and the thunder of the storm cloud give us some conception of the quartet he admires. That

temple, with its gildings and service, was a type of the church and what it should be now. I am not one who thinks that what we bring to the Lord should be lame and halt and haggard and diseased. I wear my best clothes when I appear before God; and on Sunday after meeting, when I would sing praise to his name, I would go into the best-furnished room and bring out the best music I can possibly command—something as good as I would vouchsafe to the flesh, and not fear it will be fleshly. Into that temple was brought the best of all God gave them, as it should be in the church of my Lord, the present temple of God. There they wore their best linen; and they brought the best music they could command under God, and by his command through his prophets, and the best service they could bring, and made the worship of God as delightful as possible; with a chorus of singers, the best trained of that age, and with harps, and psalteries, and tabrets, and pipes, and trumpets, they would join in with nature, with its thunders and cataracts and rippling brooklets and the choruses of songsters, and with its rustlings and rattling and zephyrs—all join as God made them in the minstrelsy of praise. Do not tell me God regards not the best music we can bring to his courts. Think of an old religious foggy whose daughter is finely educated in music the most refined, her ear trained to the most perfect chords, and her taste educated to music the most charming, gratified for six days in the week by responses to her refined culture and grace, carried off to the Lord's house on the Lord's day to hear some old fossil strike the tune on his nose and whine sixty out of "Old Hundred" because he does not know any better! If that day, to that refinement, is like heaven, she will sing all the time ere she reaches home: "O, what must it be to be there!"

This dedication was arranged by David under God's special direction, as David said to Solomon: "All this . . . the Lord made me understand in writing by his hand upon me, even all the works of this pattern." (1 Chron. 28: 19.) The whole thing was of God—not by permission, but by ordinance; and Hezekiah followed the divine counsel in rededicating the temple years afterwards, and said he followed God's command given by David, Gad, and Nathan. (2 Chron. 29: 25.) The whole arrangement was ordained while David, Gad, and Nathan were yet alive, but all were dead when the second temple was dedicated. When the second temple was dedicated, the same ceremonies were kept, and were said to be the ones God commanded by the prophets David, Gad, and Nathan. The testimony is as clear that it was of God and commanded by him as that God raised his Son, Jesus Christ, and sent him to bless us. I tell you, these "antis" are as antisciptural as antiorgan. How dare a man say this was gotten up by David to enhance the glory of his kingdom? If it was to enhance the glory of the kingdom contrary to the will of God, why did God draw the pattern? Perhaps the author of the booklet will insist that David, the king,

lied and the whole story is a fabrication. Then let him give up his Bible school and start a school of infidelity.

Hear again: "Furthermore David the king said unto all the congregation, Solomon my son, whom alone God hath chosen, is yet young and tender, and the work is great: for the palace is not for man, but for the Lord God." (1 Chron. 29: 1.) It was for God's glory, not a human kingdom. God's dwelling place it was to be. This temple was built to glorify God, and not the kingdom; and it was arranged by God and dedicated to God, and the dedication and the music were arranged by God and by him commanded (see 2 Chron. 29: 25); and when the music began, God came down and accepted it. It is a most terrible slander upon David by his unbelieving namesake to say all this outlay and labor was to glorify the kingdom of Israel, which God disapproved. I am ashamed that a man would make such a blunder for a hobby.

But what were the manifestations on the occasion? When the God-appointed orchestra, "arrayed in white linen, having cymbals and psalteries and harps, stood at the east end of the altar, and with them a hundred and twenty priests sounding with trumpets," as God had ordained by his prophets, who were to speak the words of the Lord, "it came even to pass, as the trumpeters and singers were as one, to make one sound to be heard in praising and thanking the Lord [could they praise and thank God on instruments of music?]; and when they lifted up their voice with the trumpets and cymbals and instruments of music, and praised the Lord, saying, For he is good; for his mercy endureth forever: that then the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of the Lord; so that the priests could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud: for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of God." (2 Chron. 5: 12-14.) If God put instrumental music into his temple for praise by command, who will put it out of God's temple without a command? God has commanded that it may be used in his sanctuary (Ps. 150), and who says it shall not be used in his sanctuary now? He says: "Let them use it in the congregation of the saints" (see Ps. 149), and who but a rebellious doubter would dare to say they shall not? Somebody is in more opposition to God than was David, the king. Such charges against David, a man after God's own heart! When one can see nothing but selfishness in others, I doubt the nobility of his own heart. Then to talk of dividing the church in opposition to the prayer of the Savior!

Can any man read this passage and the other to which I have referred (2 Chron. 29: 25), and doubt that God has authorized the use of instruments for his praise in his temple? The church is the temple of God, and God dwells in it, as in his temple of old; and if he commanded it in one and has not taken it out of the other, is it not authorized in one as much as in the other? God's silence concerning it leaves it where he put it—leaves it in his temple. Had he wanted

it out of his temple and from his presence and his praise, why, after commanding it in, did he not command it out? God could give no stronger evidence of approval than to command it to be used in his praise, and, when it was so done, come down in a cloud and fill the house with his glory. All manner of instruments and one hundred and twenty trumpets were brought into requisition to offer praise to the Lord and thanksgiving to his name, and God sanctioned it and gave it his emphatic approval. Do you call it machine worship? Then give me more of it if the Lord sanctions it with such divine manifestations of favor. Some men are very free to judge what God likes and what God dislikes. "*No man knoweth the Father, but the Son, and he to whom the Son shall reveal him.*" The Son makes no revelation but by the word. Where has the Son revealed the Father's disapproval of instrumental praise? He himself worshiped with it in the temple; and while it is written, "He drove out the money changers," it is nowhere said he drove out the singers, with their harps and trumpets. It is said some men are wise above what is written and some do not know what is written.

WARLICK'S SECOND REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I knew that my speech would confuse my brother; but, really, I did not expect him to show so much temper this early in the conflict. I beg to assure him that I have the highest regard for him personally, both for his age and professed honesty; but I have absolutely no respect for his proposition, and less, if possible, for the argument offered in its favor. I congratulate him on his courage, for he is the only man in all the land who will affirm it and word it as he does. I knew that he had overestimated his own ability, else he would not undertake the unreasonable task now before him—that of trying to show by the Bible authority for a practice in New Testament churches upon which that book is as silent as the tomb. But I did hope that he would do something besides complain at his opponent and presume to advise me about how I should proceed with my part of the debate. I ask that he excuse me if I do not follow the course he maps out for me; for I feel amply able to take care of my side of the question, fully as confident, perhaps, as he seems to be—yea, a hundredfold more. I have the teaching of Christ and his apostles to direct my thoughts and abundantly support my conclusions, while he has nothing—*absolutely nothing*—upon which to rely.

He says I am full of assertions. Assertions, indeed! I have asserted nothing, nor shall I assert anything in this discussion, except that which every one knows to be true; and even on the plainest facts I shall take the pains to prove what I say, for fear Brother Stark, who is the only living man to dispute them, might feign deny and assert something to the contrary. When I said that the introduction of unauthorized things into the worship, one of which was instrumental music, was alone and altogether responsible for the very unfortunate divided condition which now obtains among us as a people, I did not suppose that any one, not even Brother Stark, would deny it; but he does, and undertakes to show that it is a mistake. He illustrates by a reference to the Dunkard Church. He says those who insisted upon the enforcement of their law of dress—which, he says, was an unscriptural law—were responsible for their division. This is not true, unless he can show that before the division they all opposed the law; and this is just what he cannot do. Before the division they were a unit in advocating and observing the law, but there arose a faction among them who were opposed to the old custom, or law. These pro-

tested and brought the division. Of course my brother knows this. Is it possible he cannot represent the Dunkards correctly? Remember, the question is not about the scripturalness or the unscripturalness of the law. That is an after consideration. The question is: What was the practice of the church before the division, and what is its practice now?

Take our people as another example. The first organ that was ever introduced into a church of the disciples was in the "Olive Street Church, St. Louis, Mo.," in 1869. It divided the church. Whereupon a committee was appointed to settle the matter. That committee was composed of Isaac Errett, Robert Graham, Alexander Proctor, and J. K. Rogers. The committee decided to remove the organ and restore peace, which was done. From that date back to the beginning of the reformation no division over the instrumental-music question was ever dreamed of. Are any silly enough to think that those who worship now just as all did before 1869 are in any way responsible for the present divided state of the church? If my good brother still contends, he will appear not only simple, but actually ridiculous, in the eyes of every one who has any regard for the facts. Does he say that the use of the organ in the church of Christ is scriptural? Then let him find the passage in the New Testament authorizing its use and cease howling about the eleventh commandment or a law forbidding its use.

Again I wish to remind him that he ought to define the terms of his proposition. He has not even told us what he means by "churches of Christ." I think if he understood his own proposition he would be saved the trouble of going back to the day of David, and even as far back in the history of the race as to the third generation. Does he think the law for worship in the New Testament churches is found back there? But of this matter I shall speak more later on.

Brother Stark says I should not quote from Lard and McGarvey on the music question, because I do not indorse their position on the societies. Well, I wonder! I suppose if my brother in debate with a Methodist were to quote from Dr. Bledsoe, who says there is no authority in the New Testament for infant baptism, he would be forbidden, because the Doctor taught that baptism may be performed by sprinkling—a thing that Brother Stark does not indorse. How about it, my brother? Do you indorse the logic of your own words? But was the missionary society of which Campbell and Lard were members the same concern we have to-day? To prove it would be like trying to prove Baptist Church succession. My brother will not say it is the same. Does he know when the thing was incorporated and chartered? Will he tell? If Campbell and Lard were able to come back from the quiet tomb and attend one of the modern conventions, they would not be seated, but would be fired out and called "old fogies," "antis," or something worse.

What I said about Brother McGarvey's importuning with the Lex-

ington church was every word true. That occurrence is too recent for my brother to deny it. The witnesses are still living.

The most amusing thing in the entire speech is his getting insulted at me because I said that Brother Lipscomb knew more about the Bible than both of us together, and that he had done more good for the cause of Christ a hundred times over than Brother Stark had done. The latter statement I would be willing to change in one way only, and that is to multiply it by ten, and thus make it one thousand instead of only one hundred; and then I doubt if I could find a man (Brother Stark excepted, of course) who would say I had done justice in the premises. But my brother wants to know how I found out anything about his knowledge. Well, I reckon I have read his book; and when I saw his name as the affirmant on the proposition we are now debating, I said: "This gives him away. A man who will affirm such a proposition certainly knows but little about the word of God." This I can prove by his own friends in the church; for all of them, except himself, know too much to affirm the proposition. He is the only one who will undertake it. So when I heard he was so smart, I knew that if it were true in any sense it was not in a knowledge of the Bible.

But I will proceed. In regard to Brother Lipscomb and his position I have but little to say. I will not permit Brother Stark to go uncorrected, however, on his misrepresentations of the brother. His tract on "Instrumental Music" should not be brought into this discussion, unless all that is said upon any question is given, and not mutilated and misrepresented, as my brother does here. First, I want to say that there is not one word of truth in the statement that Brother Lipscomb denies the inspiration of David or of any book in the entire Bible. Neither do I believe that Brother Stark thinks he does. He holds Brother Lipscomb responsible for his own construction of Lipscomb's language, being, as it seems, himself unable to comprehend the argument. He calls Brother Lipscomb a "higher critic," when I doubt if there be another man among us, excepting J. W. McGarvey, who is as able to answer the arguments of the "higher critics" as is David Lipscomb. It is really amusing, as well as disgusting, to hear what my brother says of Brother Lipscomb's knowledge of the Bible. My opponent speaks of David as a man after God's own heart, just as if he thinks this was true of David in all he ever said and did during all of his life. I wonder if Brother Stark thinks that David was after God's own heart when he numbered Israel or when he had a man slain to get his wife. David was polygamist, and yet Christ says it was never right. David also made instruments of music which were used in the Jewish worship. (See 2 Chron. 7: 6.) David was not the first to play on musical instruments, but he was the first one to use them in worship, and God by the prophet Amos condemns it by pronouncing a woe against those who follow the example.

My good brother may try as much as he pleases to twist the mean-

ing out of Amos 6: 4, but he cannot. It still reads: "Woe to them that . . . invent to themselves instruments of music like David!" This is made doubly sure by the preceding chapter: "I hate, I despise your feast days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies. Though ye offer me burnt offerings and your meat offerings, I will not accept them: neither will I regard the peace offerings of your fat beasts. Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols." (Amos 5: 21-23.) I put special emphasis upon this passage in my first address; but I observe that my good brother studiously avoided the passage, also the argument I made on it. I should like for him to try at least to notice all the arguments offered in reply to him. Though it be only a trial, it will satisfy; for we know this is all he can hope to do—to try. This would be far better than to give us the bare, unsupported assertion that my speech was destitute of argument, and then fall back and call on me to prove something for him, as though I were in the affirmative, with the laboring oar in my hands. Let him try to prove, and I assure him that I shall be ready to examine his proofs of whatever sort. I will do more than this. I will not only take from him every passage upon which he relies and show that he misapplies each one, but I will go further and show that those who use instrumental music in the worship of the churches of Christ are in that matter enemies to God.

Now, my brother, I ask that you give yourself no uneasiness about my part of the work, but make yourself busy with your own work. If there be anything in all the Bible which seems to point in the direction of favoring your unscriptural practice, bring it out. Let us see it. We will all be glad to look at it, and I assure you that I will examine it gladly. So come on with your matter if you have any to offer.

Let Brother Lipscomb alone, Brother Stark. He is not in this discussion; neither is his position on the earthly features of the Jewish kingdom under review now. You and I will have to study some time yet, I fear, before we are able to think of criticising a man like David Lipscomb on such deep questions; and, besides, I am the man whom you have engaged to meet in this discussion, not Brother Lipscomb. You are wasting your time, which to you ought to be considered very precious. Come to your work, and let Brother Lipscomb alone. No one can tell from what you read from the "booklet," as you call it, what the author believes on this or any other question. Those who have seen the tract know that you do not represent him correctly. If you do not propose to deal fairly with what he says, let the book alone and come to the rescue of your already perishing proposition.

My brother's apology for Brother Meeks was, as usual, very weak. He says Brother Meeks preaches what he always did. This is more than Meeks would say for himself. Anyhow, the brethren in the State who know him know better; and so they do not need him to preach now in many places where they used to hear him gladly. Brother

Stark says that Brother Meeks, with other brethren here, did not want Brother Elam to preach his creed in his meeting here. This is just about as straight as "digressives" generally get matters. The truth is that they wanted to bind Brother Elam by their creed, compelling him to speak only on certain things and to be silent on those things which they were determined to hold to. They had not long before that allowed a Universalist to preach in the house. I wonder if they presented the same creed to him. Strange Christian brethren these! Let an infidel speak in the house, but shut the door in the face of as pure and as good a man as E. A. Elam! Why, I ask—why did they do this? I know, and you know. It was because they had more love for their infamous "box" than they had for God and his cause and for the fellowship of his saints. Then tell me that those who act that way have the Spirit of the Christ! I tell you if they have, then the power of the devil is no longer in operation in this country, for his kingdom has been overthrown.

My brother says that Brother Freed, who opposes the organ in the worship, permits it to be used in the college. Well, what of it? Brother Freed knows the difference between the training of school children in vocal and instrumental music in the school and the members of the church of Christ met together for the worship of God. Does Brother Stark not know this difference? It seems he does not. Away with such childish play, my brother! Can you do no better than to give us this kind for argument? We will wait patiently to see.

My good brother complains of what I said about his book, but I am not ready to change what I said about the book. I think the whole thing was written just to get to say what he does say in favor of instruments in the worship of the saints. The preceding chapters seem to serve only to open the way for this claim. I think this was my brother's object in writing the book. I do not hesitate to say that, as a whole, the book is a worthless thing, and will neither instruct nor edify those who read it. I cannot, therefore, agree with him in the suggestion that you read the book. I see no use in a waste of time, unless by so doing you may hope in some way to help others. This was my purpose in giving the book the careful reading I did.

I shall now take up my opponent's advance argument—if, indeed, such it may be called. He says his fourth argument is on Gen. 4: 21. We are told in this scripture that Jubal was the father of those who handle the harp and organ. It is not even hinted here that the instruments were used in worship in any form. This, however, makes no difference with my brother. He can guess that they were used in the worship and then assert that they have been in use ever since, and that by the authority of God. What a faculty some men have for guessing, anyway! Now this man Jubal was a descendant of Cain and a son of a man who had two wives. In this family polygamy originated. I wonder if my brother will take this, too, and base an argument in

its favor upon the passage. It certainly authorizes God's saints to practice polygamy now as much as it does to play the organ in the worship of the churches of Christ. If my brother wants to do this, I suggest that he move to Utah. There he may take both practices and not be molested, provided only that he does not seek a national office. This might get him into trouble. Do you say I am putting this too strong? I deny that I am. Polygamy originated in the same family that handled the organ. Later on, when David brought the organ into the worship, we find polygamy also and David practicing it. If there be an advantage belonging to either, polygamy has it, for Moses permitted a man to put away his wife and marry another; but nowhere, in all he ever said, did he tell any one God might be worshiped on the organ, and he was God's lawgiver to the Jews. He even forbids that anything be added to the law he gave. (See Deut. 4: 2.) While Moses gave a man permission to have more wives than one, Jesus says it is not right from the beginning. Moses did not introduce instrumental music; David did that; and God said by his prophet: "Woe be unto them who follow the example!" God says he will not hear the song sung in connection with the instrument. An amusing question propounded here by my brother is: "Did not God know that some would use the organ in this latter day? Then, why did he not speak out against it?" Sure enough! A sensible question that! In reply I ask: Did not God know that some people would count beads, burn incense, and even kiss the big toe of the pope in their religious devotions? Then, why did he not speak out plainly against it? Why did he not say: "Thou shalt not count beads, burn incense, and kiss the pope's big toe?" Can my brother tell why God did not take time to file his objections to these, with the hundreds of other unscriptural things now being taught and practiced by religious people in the name of Christianity? Since God has not said, "Thou shalt not count beads," will my brother be consistent and introduce this also into the religious exercises of his congregation? If he will not, will he please tell us why he will not? He will find it authorized in the verse next to the one in which he reads of instruments in the churches of Christ.

What he calls his "fifth argument" is on Rev. 14: 1-5. Here he thinks he finds literal harps in heaven. We shall examine this passage with some care. I think I could do no better than to quote from the pen of Brother O. A. Carr, who is the very embodiment of Christian conservatism and a man of deep and scholarly research. Note the following: "(1) The 'harping' in the verse is not translated from 'psallos,' but from 'kitharidzo,' from which is our word 'cithara.' The verb here in its participial form means 'harping;' but what of it? John does not even say that he heard the harping; but he compares the voice which he heard to 'the voice of many waters' and 'the voice of a great thunder,' and adds: 'And I heard the voice of harpers harping with their harps.' If we are to put musical instruments into the

church of Christ because John heard this voice, which was as 'the voice of harpers harping with their harps,' what about the 'many waters' and the 'great thunder?' He compares the voice he heard to these, too. (2) John says in this vision he saw harps; but what of it? Does it mean that there should be harps or instruments in the church? Does a symbol symbolize itself? John says he saw golden viols full of odors. Are we to have golden viols full of odors in the church? No. John says these are the prayers of the saints. (A symbol does not symbolize itself.) We are to have prayers in the church. So, too, a harp symbolizes joy, praise; and this is what we are to have in the church."

My brother says he can fellowship on earth in the church what he finds in heaven. Then he may go with the Methodists. His statement here is their own thunder. They say, like Brother Stark, that what we find in heaven we ought to bring into the church on earth. It is the same family (Eph. 3: 15); and now that all acknowledge that infant children are in the family in heaven, we must admit them into the church on the earth. Why not? Will my brother tell us why he will use the organ because he thinks he finds literal harps in heaven, but will shut out the infant whom we know is in the heavenly family? Shame on you, Brother Stark, for being so inconsistent! You seem determined to hang on to your unscriptural hobby, whether right or wrong, and make yourself so ridiculous in trying to defend it. After all, suppose it be a fact that there are literal harps and other musical instruments in heaven. They were used in connection with the song sung by "the hundred and forty and four thousand;" and unless Brother Stark can prove that he is one of that number, he would have no harp, for none but they could learn the song; and I think it is clearly intimated in Rev. 7: 4-8 that the "hundred and forty and four thousand" were of the twelve tribes of Israel—twelve thousand out of each tribe. My good brother does not belong to either of these tribes. So I shall have to inform him that if he hopes to get one of those harps, he will be disappointed. If he gets to heaven at all, he will have to stand with the innumerable company which no man can number. (Rev. 7: 9.) Again, if my brother should still insist that he, too, must have a harp when he gets to heaven and that he will be expected to play it when he gets there, I shall still have the advantage of him; for if God intends that we shall have an instrument there, since he does not permit us to have them here, he wants us to wait until we get there and meet our Teacher before we begin to learn to use them. But Brother Stark will not wait. He proposes to teach himself, or else practice under a teacher whom God has not authorized to teach him. So he will have been spoiled in learning, and will have to unlearn all he has learned here before he begins the study proper. I will have none of this trouble. So I shall be permitted to enter the advanced class at once, while Brother Stark will have to go to the foot.

So much for the web of sophistry our brother weaves on his harp-in-heaven argument. If this is all he has, I think he ought to throw up the proposition and quit. If he is determined to continue, I suppose he will keep on saying the same foolish things; for it seems to be the best he can do. He thinks that God wants us to bring the best music and offer it in praise to him; and he illustrates by the tastes of the cultured, refined, and educated young lady, who, of course, would prefer the outward show, when all sorts of instruments are used, to the plain, humble, unpretentious example set by the early Christians. I have no doubt that my brother feels just like he talks. This spirit is the very soul of "digressivism." To tickle the ears and please the fancy of the people seems to be their highest aim. Paul did not belong to their class. He said that his ambition was to please God, not men. I suppose if Brother Stark and his foolish young lady had been present when Samuel came to anoint one of the sons of Jesse to be the king of Israel, they would have been disappointed and, no doubt, displeased when the prophet refused to anoint one of the fine-looking fellows and called for the little shepherd boy, who was yet out in the field with his father's flock; but God answers them, saying: "The Lord seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart." (1 Sam. 16: 7.) Again, I suppose that if my brother and the same young lady had been present when the Pharisee and the publican prayed, they would, of course, have justified the Pharisee—a proud, boastful fellow—who was in every sense a "digressive." He brought the best he had to the Lord. He was glad to be able to say that he was not like other men; but he was an up-to-date man, not even like the "old-fogy" publican, who did not strike his nose, as it happened, but smote his breast and said: "Lord, be merciful to me a sinner." Yet the "old-fogy" Galilean, who is Christ the Lord, said the "old-fogy" publican went down justified rather than the "digressive" Pharisee. I think my brother certainly feels ashamed of himself. Surely his friends are ashamed for him. He shows a spirit so different from that of the Christ.

This is sufficient to show the unscripturalness and unchristlikeness of my brother's idea of what true worship should be. But I am not willing to allow that the best music is made where the organ is used. The rule is directly the opposite. Where any interest is taken in the song service, those churches that do not use the instrument always make the best music. I mention this fact only for the reason that some people, who do not know any better, talk about the poor singing where the organ is not used. This gives the "digressives" an argument they do not merit or deserve. So they sometimes feel complimented when they need not to; and the fact that I want to see honor given to whom honor is due is why I correct the mistake. Yet if all that my brother claims upon who makes the best music were true, it would still remain a fact that the New Testament commands us to sing,

not to play; and as long as that book remains unchanged, those who sing without the instrument worship God, and those who play on the instrument do not serve God, but themselves and others.

We come now to what he calls his "sixth argument." This is based upon 1 Sam. 10: 5, 6. It is where a company of prophets came down from the high place with a psalter, a tabret, a pipe, and a harp before them; and they prophesied. My brother has but little to say upon this passage; and after saying that little, he proceeds to abuse Brother Lipscomb in a very unbecoming manner. I am sorry he is so mad at Brother Lipscomb. It is altogether useless. He is not in Brother Lipscomb's way; nor is he liable to get in his way. All the wind he spends in this direction is lost entirely. Again I ask him to let others not concerned in this discussion alone and come to the question. But back to the passage. Is there anything in this scripture telling how to praise God in the church of Christ? Not a word. In the first place, as Adam Clarke says: "These were called 'prophets' for the reason that they were scholars under Samuel, who was, perhaps, Israel's only prophet at that time." Our brother's idea that these young men were prophets in the full meaning of the term, that they spoke by the Spirit of Christ, is farfetched, indeed; in fact, it is simply not true. Another thing he cannot show is that these young men called "prophets" had themselves any musical instrument at all. The instruments went before them. But suppose they did have; what authority is there in the gleeful, joyous march of a company of schoolboys, over a thousand years before Christ was born, for the worship of God in the Christian dispensation? There is about as clear authority in this passage for the organ in the church to-day as the old Hardshell found in the book of Numbers for the Sunday school, when he joyously read: "And Balaam rose early in the morning, and saddled his ass, and went with the princes of Moab." "There," he exclaimed, "I have found it! Let the heathen read it. You see, Balaam saddled his ass and started to Sunday school." Brother Stark's reasoning is no better than, if as good as, this of the old Baptist.

What my brother calls his "seventh argument" is on 2 Kings 3: 11-13. Here is where the prophet called for a minstrel to make music in his presence—for the purpose, no doubt, of quieting his spirit and preparing his mind, which had been agitated by the words of the two opposing kings. Besides, the voice of God or the Spirit of inspiration did not come upon him until after the minstrel had played. So this is not a very strong authority upon how to worship God in a Christian assembly. It was upon the occasion of the utterance of a prophecy by an inspired prophet, and was even then no more a part of what he said by the prophecy than is the act of standing up, sometimes practiced by the audience just before the sermon, a part of the sermon. One was to prepare the mind for the receiving of what followed; the other, to rest the body for the moment, that the sermon may be the

more enjoyed. Away with such nonsensical bosh as my brother here offers for argument! But we shall notice all he says, for it is the best he has to offer. Of course if he could do better, he would do it.

It is certainly a very fortunate thing for my brother, taking his speech as a specimen of his information upon the Bible, that God does not now destroy his people for lack of knowledge. (Hos. 4: 6.) If he did this in a temporal sense, he would long since have been gone from this country. He would not be here now to be haunted by Brother Lipscomb's tract. He himself, and not Brother Lipscomb, would be the missing man.

My brother's reference to the dedication of the temple (2 Chron. 5: 11-13) is, of course, no example for Christian worshipers in churches of Jesus Christ; but if it were, it does not fit his case; for all the noise of the trumpets and other instruments was on the outside of the temple, and the glory of God did not come into the house until after the music ceased. There was, as Dr. Clarke says, but little harmony and no melody at all in that amount of noise. I feel sure that the most rabid "digressive" church would not put up with as much fuss made on instruments in its worship now. I am inclined to think that even Brother Stark would draw the line at that amount of racket in the church. After all, I ask: Who made the musical instruments here used? "Moreover four thousand were porters; and four thousand praised the Lord with the instruments which *I made*, said David, to praise therewith." (1 Chron. 23: 5.) Here David said "I made" the instruments used in the worship.

"And the priests waited on their offices: the Levites also with instruments of music of the Lord, which David the king had made to praise the Lord." (2 Chron. 7: 6.) But what prophet, priest, or king, inspired or uninspired, ever made a musical instrument of any kind to praise the Lord in the churches of Christ? Can my brother tell? Can he give the name of one such? He knows he cannot. If he could, he would, no doubt, be after that name instead of going to David, who made the musical instruments with which the Jews attempted to worship God. David also set up an altar in the temple upon which incense was burned. I wonder if my brother has one of the same kind now. Does he burn incense now, just as David and the Jews did then? If he does not, will he tell us why he does not? Can he use instruments of music in the church to-day because David used them in Jewish worship and refuse to do other things that David did at the same time and place, and still be consistent? I suspect that more of David's wives than one attended those festivities. Does my brother think, therefore, that he may have a number of wives, too? Why not take with us wives and concubines when we go up to the house of God? David did it. Shall we accept David, who was at one time a man after God's own heart, as our director in the praise service of the church of Christ and refuse his example in other things? Does my brother say that

God does not indorse David's action on the marriage problem? Sure enough. So also does God say: "Woe to them that . . . invent to themselves instruments of music like David!" He says he will not even listen to the songs if the instrument is used as an accompaniment. (Amos fifth and sixth chapters.)

I come now to his last—and, I suppose, what he considers his strongest—argument. It is based upon 2 Chron. 29: 25. He and his friends may think it uncharitable in me to take from him every scripture upon which he relies and turn against him all the logic of all the arguments he offers, but I cannot permit him to make one point in favor of his unscriptural claims. *Not one shall he have.* I can and do sympathize with him as much as it is possible for one who is in the right to sympathize with him who is altogether wrong, but loyalty to the truth demands that I leave him absolutely no ground to stand upon. But to the passage. Upon the first reading of it, one might think that God actually commanded the using of the instruments here named; but by careful discrimination in the light of other scriptures, it is easily seen that this idea is not in the verse. We have already seen (from 1 Chron. 23: 5; 2 Chron. 7: 6) that David made the instruments used in Jewish worship. Moreover, we all know that Moses, God's lawgiver to the Jews, never hinted an authority for the use of instrumental music in the worship of God; but God did by Moses appoint the Levites to serve in the tabernacle. I call attention to Num. 1: 50: "But thou shalt appoint the Levites over the tabernacle of testimony, and over all the vessels thereof, and over all things that belong to it." Now from these scriptures it is clearly shown that God commanded the placing of the Levites in proper order and that David commanded the use of the instruments which he made. This impression is confirmed by the reading of the Syriac and the Arabic. I will quote these as given by A. Clarke, with his entire note on this verse: "Moses had not appointed any musical instruments to be used in the divine worship. There was nothing of the kind under the first tabernacle. The trumpets, or horns, then used were not for song or for praise, but, as we use bells, to give notice to the congregation of what they were called to perform, etc. But David did certainly introduce many instruments of music into God's worship, for which we have already seen he was solemnly reproved by the prophet Amos. (Chapter 6: 1-6.) Here, however, the author of this book states that he had the commandment of the prophet Nathan and Gad, the king's seer, and this is stated to have been the commandment of the Lord by his prophets; but the Syriac and Arabic give this a different turn. 'Hezekiah appointed the Levites in the house of the Lord, with instruments of music, and the sound of harps, and with the hymns of David, and the hymns of Gad the king's prophet, and of Nathan the king's prophet: for David sang the praise of the Lord, his God, as from the mouth of the prophets.' It was by the hand or commandment of the Lord or his prophets that the Levites should

praise the Lord, for so the Hebrew text may be understood; and it was by the order of David that so many instruments of music should be introduced into the divine service. But were it even evident, which it is not, either from this or any other place in the sacred writings, that instruments of music were prescribed by divine authority under the law, could this be adduced with any semblance of reason that they ought to be used in Christian worship? No; the whole spirit, soul, and genius of the Christian religion are against this; and those who know the church of God best and what constitutes its genuine spiritual state know that these things have been introduced as a substitute for the life and power of religion, and that where they prevail most, there is least of the power of Christianity. Away with such pretentious baubles from the worship of that infinite Spirit who requires followers to worship him in spirit and in truth, for to no such worship are those instruments friendly!"

Brethren and sisters of the church of Christ, do you not wonder that Dr. Clarke, a Methodist, seems to respect a proper division of the word of truth more than Brother Stark, who is supposed to know all about how to rightly divide the word? But so it is.

In answering my brother's argument based upon the Old Testament Scriptures, I have confined myself to the passages themselves, and have shown clearly that he does not understand his own proof texts. Now I am going to take them all from him in another way. Since this debate is to be published, and, I trust, read by many of our "digressive" brethren, I desire to be so plain in my work that they themselves cannot help seeing the truth in the case. They may understand, however, that I do not hold all responsible for the sayings of my opponent. I have said frequently that he is the only man who will affirm his proposition. The "digressives" themselves do not agree upon what relation instrumental music sustains to the worship. The opinion generally held to is that to use the instrument is not worship at all, but only a convenience. Upon this I shall read from H. L. Calhoun, in his discussion with M. C. Kurfees, pages 10, 11: "It will be admitted that the New Testament nowhere mentions the use of an instrument in connection with the singing in the church. This fact settles beyond all dispute that the use of an instrument in connection with the singing in the church cannot be an act of acceptable worship, and that condition which it fails to fulfill is the only condition which differentiates an act of acceptable worship from an act of worship which is not acceptable. The use of instruments by the Jews was acceptable worship, for they were under the Old Testament, which directed them to use instruments; but people to-day, living under the New Testament, have no direction given for their use as worship. Hence the only possible ground upon which any one can seek to justify the use of an instrument in connection with the singing in the church is that of convenience, and not worship." Thus

Brother Calhoun, though a leading "digressive," knows too much to try to defend the unscriptural practice upon the grounds advanced by Brother Stark in this discussion. But I am now going to admit, for the sake of argument, that which no man can certainly prove, and that is that God did authorize by commanding it the use of instruments in his service in the days of David and throughout the Mosaic dispensation. Let it go at that, and still we ask: What of it? Are we still living in the Jewish age? Has all of our preaching and debating on how to rightly divide the word of truth been for naught? Did we mean it? Or, if we did, have we forgotten it? Does not my good Brother Stark teach that the church of Christ was set up, established, on the first Pentecost after the resurrection, and that Isaiah prophesied that which came to pass at Pentecost when he said the law should go forth from Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem? (Isa. 2.) Has he forgotten that John (1: 17) said: "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ?" Then, why does he go back to the law to find directions for the worship in the church of Christ? Let him hear Paul's reply: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. . . . Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free." (Gal. 4: 21-31.) Can my brother not see that he virtually claims the bondwoman for his mother? He is certainly a child of the bondwoman, and not of the free. By relying upon the words of David for his authority in Christian worship, he seeks to be justified by the law, and Paul plainly says in this he shows to have fallen from grace. (Gal. 5: 4.) All of the shedding of tears and pathetic references to his mother, wife, and children serves him no purpose here. This was only an effort to excite your sympathy in his favor. It is catching at a straw in a dying hour. No one wants to tear out the leaves of the Bible by challenging the genuineness or the authenticity of any part of it. All the "higher critics" among us stand on his side of this question. None of them are with me. Neither Brother Lipscomb, myself, nor any of us belong to that class. My brother's insinuation is a cowardly subterfuge. We all believe the whole Bible to be of God. But this does not alter the fact that the law of the Jews in the time

of Moses and David is one thing, and the law of the Spirit found in the gospel is quite a different thing.

I wish to read again from Paul to the Galatians: "But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith. And the law is not of faith: but, The man that doeth them shall live in them." (Gal. 3: 11, 12.) Again: "But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." (Verses 23-25.) Brethren, do you feel surprised that there has arisen an occasion for a discussion between two Christian preachers upon the proper division of the word? Well, it is, indeed, surprising. You would scarcely think it reasonable. It is because my brother has turned aside. He may not have forgotten that he was purged from his old sins, but he has evidently forgotten what purged him. The brethren who stand with me upon this question are not to be blamed. The "digressives" only have denied the faith, and are trying to put upon us a yoke which Peter said no man could bear. We who stand firm are still calling, as the fathers did, for New Testament authority on all items of faith, practice, worship, and duty. "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God," was that which gave shape and power to the preaching of the pioneers of our reformation and plea. While we know that the things written before were written for our learning, we know that our learning and profit come only from the study of Old Testament characters through New Testament teachers. We can go no farther than that which the New Testament indorses—thus far, and no farther. I am ashamed of the man who attempts to go beyond this limit.

Before I close I want to mention the fact that my brother makes precisely the same argument from the Old Testament in favor of instruments in the worship that the Methodists do in support of infant baptism and church membership. He finds that the instruments were used in the time of David. The Methodists do the same for the baby. He shows that it was included in the Abrahamic covenant; that David left them in the church; that he taught others to do the same; that God said: "Let the little ones that have not known anything be brought in." They show that this covenant which included the infant was to last for a thousand generations. They then ask: "Since God put the baby in, who has the right to take it out?" This is my brother's question precisely. He says he finds the instruments in the temple in the days of David, and now he asks: "Who has the right to take them out?" The two arguments are exactly alike. If there be an advantage to either, the Methodists have it; for Christ did bless the children and say: "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." But no New Testament writer ever hinted at any commendation of the organ in the worship. For my part, I can truthfully say that I can look upon the act of the

Methodist preacher sprinkling a baby with a much greater degree of forbearance than I can a congregation of disciples trying to worship God by machinery, and this all do who use the organ or other man-made instruments in the worship.

Brother Stark says that Christ worshiped in the temple during his life where the organ was used all the time, and that he never uttered one word against it. Who told him that the instruments were used in the temple in the time of Christ? I deny that they were, and challenge him to try to prove it. I deny that Christ ever in his life heard one instrumental tone in the temple worship. If my brother thinks he did, that it was in the worship in the time of Christ, let him come up with the proof, and I shall help him examine it. If he cannot prove it, then let him not draw on his imagination again and repeat the baseless assertion.

Brother Stark's sweetest morsel is his question: "Where has God said: 'Thou shalt not bring an organ into the sanctuary, or church?'" I answer this by asking a similar question: Where has God ever said: "Thou shalt not bring the babies into the sanctuary, or church?" This is child's play. It is his business to show where God said, or even intimated, that it should be used in Christian worship. Where is the passage so teaching? Will he bring it out? When he tries to find it, I promise him that I shall be ready with the reply exposing the foolish and futile effort. I am confident in what I promise, because *I know he will never bring forward the text.*

In conclusion, I shall give my brother a slight foretaste of what I have in store for him. I am under no obligation, as far as my real duty is concerned, to do more than to answer his arguments. But before we are through I shall offer a line of arguments placing the instrument far beyond the reach of any hope of support. If I only show that it is not mentioned in the New Testament, I have gained the debate; but I will do more than this. Now, I want to say that when we do anything religiously it must be in the name of the Lord. "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord," says Paul. This is to do nothing religiously that God has not authorized in his word. If we go beyond that, we sin.

Let my brother and his friends read Lev. 10: 1, 2 (Revised Version): "And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took each of them his censer, and put fire therein, and laid incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he had not commanded them. And there came forth fire from before the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord." Let them also read 1 Cor. 4: 6 (Revised Version): "Now these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and Apollos for your sakes; that in us ye might learn not to go beyond the things which are written; that no one of you be puffed up for the one against the other." Read these, my brother, and cease that continuous cry for something you will not believe though one declare it unto you.

STARK'S THIRD SPEECH.

Mr. Chairman and Brethren in Christ:

A few things in my brother's speech I will notice before proceeding with my argument. Like the former one, it is a bundle of assertions from beginning to end. He can continue the debate in his own way, and the audience can judge of his success. Though I give passage after passage from the word of God, he crosses lances over none; and instead of showing where I am mistaken in exegesis, he makes a few unwarranted assertions and considers the whole matter settled by his *ipse dixit*. I shall not repeat what I have said, as the reader of the book can turn back and compare it with my brother's statement about it.

On the division of the Dunkards, are not those responsible who insist upon an unscriptural practice—who forbid others by laws of their own from doing what the law of the Lord permits? But the old fogies might say: "If we permit them to dress in modern style, it would be to gratify the flesh, and would tend to fleshly service; and if they are allowed to wear clothes cut and fashioned as they please because it is not condemned by the law of God, it would permit others to bring in sacrifice, infant baptism, and the burning of incense." If to shut out these things we must prescribe the style of music without scriptural teaching, can we not also prescribe the style of dress without a word from the sacred oracles and set up a human law to govern all both in dress and music? If a woman who must pray with her head covered can select the kind of hat she pleases and choose the style she likes because the Lord has made no restrictions, without danger of bringing in "infant church membership," etc., why can she not sing in harmony with modern style and common, everyday life, not forbidden in the Holy Scriptures, without danger of introducing such terrible things as the brother suggests in his bugaboo argument?

My brother does not seem to understand the proposition. No wonder he wants me to define it. I affirm that the word of God authorizes the use of instruments of music for praise in the church of Jesus Christ. If the word of God authorizes their use, what if they do bring in infant church membership, sacrifice, etc.? What has that to do with this debate? Will he correct God. If God's word authorizes sacrifice, shall we reject it for fear it will introduce instrumental music? "What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common." Does my dear little brother object to what God authorizes for fear of consequences? He says that no other man among us would affirm the proposition I do. Has he forgotten that he debated the same in substance, with

Brother Braden? Brother Braden simply stipulated that "authorize" should not be construed as to mean a command, but, rather, "permit." Unless my brother has a most excellent memory, I do not think he can tell what proposition he debated with Brother Braden. He so seldom touches his proposition I do not wonder he forgets it.

My brother says: "The question with the Dunkard is: What was the practice of the church before the division, and what is the practice now?" This he applies to our people on the organ question. Well, what has always been our practice as a people? On what is our bond of union based? Is it not that we will speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent? On this we were united for years; but in process of time some Cainite introduced a creed without scriptural authority, saying: "Thou shalt use no organ in the church of Christ nor arrange any missionary cooperation." This divided the church. Who caused the division but those who broke their pledge and introduced a law on which the Bible is silent?

Again I ask: If Lard and McGarvey are authority with him, why does he not accept their wisdom? The fact is that he has no respect for them except when they agree with him, and then he will tell of their wonderful goodness and wisdom and learning. But he says the society is not the same as it was when Campbell lived. Well, these men, with all their goodness and learning, have stood by it all the way down—Brother Lard till he died and Brother McGarvey still living. If they are authority with the dear brother on one subject, why not on both? If it is not the same, the principle is the same. If right in its organization, it is not wrong in its continuance.

The trouble with my brother is that he assumes to be the judge of everything, as is seen when he takes God's place and ere the final day tells just how much good Brother Lipscomb has done and how little I have done in comparison. Jesus warns against our judging each other; but he probably did not know the amount of wisdom my little brother would possess, or he might have made an exception.

How does my brother know the difference in the society of then and now, since he was never in one of its conventions? Did you ever hear of such astounding wisdom and prescience? I half believe my dear brother will say almost anything he wants said.

Concerning Brother Lipscomb, in his tract on "Instrumental Music," if he does not say that David was not a prophet speaking by the Holy Spirit, but that he was in opposition to God in trying to build up a kingdom to which God was opposed, and was thus fighting against God, and if he does not take the position of the destructive critics on the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, then I have read in vain, and his brother, Granville Lipscomb, criticised him foully in the Gospel Advocate.

Again he refers to Amos 6: 1-4: "Woe to them that . . . invent to themselves instruments of music like David." There must be some-

thing wrong either with the head or the heart of a man who will make such an assertion as that after his attention has been called to it. To justify his statement he refers to Amos 5: 21-23. God says: "Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols." Why? Because they "are at ease in Zion" and "are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph." I would not talk of debating were I no better exegete than that. Show it to the Sunday-school boy. He will have no difficulty with the passage.

If Brother Meeks is not wanted to preach in many places, I suppose he has been slandered in the Gospel Advocate, as I have been, without a chance for reply or denial. He is said at home to be a good and pure man and preaches Christ crucified and the whole of the word of God; but he does not join in the tirade against organs. Because he does not train in that clique, therefore this slander must go forth in our book from a man who never saw him or knew him, but who can say anything about anybody he wants said. I would not notice this but for the slander on Brother Meeks. But my dear little brother must fill out his time some way.

I can but accept what he says of my book as a compliment, coming from him. Too many men whose heads and hearts have been proven have spoken of it in terms so different. But what has that to do with this debate? What has polygamy to do with it? Who told him polygamy and music were parallel, in the divine mind? I suppose they have told it so much they think it is scripture. If polygamy is authorized by the word of God, it does not prove instrumental music is, and vice versa.

It would take all my time to notice half of his unwarranted statements. I am willing to let the public carefully read my arguments, and, when the dirt he throws has settled down, turn back and reread, weigh what I have said, and decide what is truth. If God authorizes the use of instruments in the church, I will not reject them for fear some one may bring in infants or something he does not authorize. Poor man! Can he not see the point? If God authorizes infant church membership, I will not reject infants lest organs shall be brought in. I am not responsible for the consequences of what God authorizes. He says he is not willing to allow the best music is where the instruments are used, but he says Brother Freed took instruments into his school to improve the music. He says: "The New Testament commands us to sing, not play." It does not command us not to play. He knows it does not. He knows that to play is as much in the word translated "sing" as is the voice, and his statement is *ad captandum vulgus*. If he knows half as much as he pretends, he knows that the Spirit of Christ in the prophets has defined that word to sing with instrumental accompaniment. What will the dear brother not say next? I suppose he will plead his weak conscience. Well, I begin to think his conscience must be weak.

In the dedication of the temple (2 Chron. 5: 11-13), with other incorrect statements, he says the glory of God did not come into the house until the music ceased. Let the reader turn to the passage and see how far we can depend upon the statements of my brother. No wonder he takes up the slanders published against Brother Meeks. Has he learned this from his numerous debates? If so, truth has had a poor advocate and our cause in Texas little assistance.

See what he says of Amos 5: "God said he would not listen to their songs if the instrument is used as an accompaniment." He gives the passage where it can be found. I cannot understand a man who depends so much upon the ignorance of his audience, and especially when he knows it will go into print. He says that Moses never, as lawgiver, hinted at the use of instruments of music in worship. Let the people read Ex. 15, where the praise was given in songs with accompaniment. It is generally admitted that Moses, as well as Miriam, took instruments in the praise offered. Does it require all this higgling to sustain their humanism—their creed?

My brother speaks of the division of the word, and wonders that there should be any discussion between Christian preachers on that subject. Does he call all the Old Testament the law? Has he failed to read my first argument from 1 Pet. 1, showing that the Spirit of Christ was in the prophets, who spoke as the Spirit of Christ moved them, and declared instructions for the saints—the same things that were afterwards preached by the evangels with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven? A man of so little appreciation of an argument seems scarcely capable of judging between Brother Lipscomb and me.

In the case of Nadab and Abihu, be it remembered that God had commanded them not to offer sacrifice and incense with strange fire, but to take coals from the altar, where, under the Jewish economy, the fire sent down from heaven was kept burning. They had broken, not an implied law, but one clearly announced. Were he more familiar with the law, he would not have attempted to palm off an argument from Lev. 10: 1, to the effect that they were slain for doing something God had said nothing about. They did what God had commanded them not to do. But what has that to do with the argument if I prove God has authorized instrumental music for his praise? It would only prove death to those who interfere and refuse to "let them praise God in his sanctuary" on instruments. (Ps. 150.)

Concerning 1 Cor. 4: 6, he says we must not go beyond what is written. Paul says that they should not think of men above what is written. He had to change the reading to get anything out of it. Is it possible he will resort to pettifogging in a religious discussion and attempt to make a point by a perversion of a sacred text? Did it read as he quoted, it would furnish little comfort for those who go beyond the law of the Lord and introduce things not written as a test of fellowship. Paul says of some not to be wise above what is written.

My ninth argument is from 2 Chron. 29: 25: "And he set the Levites in the house of the Lord with cymbals, with psalteries, and with harps, according to the commandment of David, and of Gad the king's seer, and Nathan the prophet: for so was the commandment of the Lord by his prophets." This was not done by David alone as king, but Gad and Nathan were with him; and God was behind the three, and by them gave commandment. The whole plan of the temple was given to David by God himself. (1 Chron. 28: 9.) David gave the plan over to Solomon as from God, and died, leaving God's plan and commandments with Solomon; and all was done in harmony with God's arrangement after David was dead. God planned it for his own glory, and not to enhance the glory of David's kingdom. Read 2 Chron. 3, 4, and you will know that Solomon did all things under the instruction of God, as did Moses in building the tabernacle. God by his prophets—David, Gad, and Nathan—planned the temple and its dedication service, and by his prophets gave commandment concerning it, and how the singing should be acceptably conducted. Solomon dedicated it, just as God had commanded him by his prophets, with trumpets and instruments of music and songs of praise. An orchestra and choir of singers lifted up their voice together as one sound, and God sanctioned it by filling his temple with glory.

Time passes on. Kings live and kings die. Some are good and some are bad. Three hundred years have fled, and the good king, Hezekiah, is on the throne. "He did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, according to all that David his father had done." (Read 2 Chron. 29: 1-11, 18-26.) It was the rededication of the temple. The programme was arranged; and the praise service was after the pattern of the first dedication, and was in harmony with what God had commanded concerning it by his prophets, David, Gad, and Nathan. God did not "permit it;" he commanded it. It was God's own arrangement and by himself appointed. With the obedient God needs to speak but once. Hezekiah had no idea God would change in what he had appointed without telling the world. What he favored once he favored all the time, and three hundred years after the appointment he faithfully carried out the divine programme. "So there was joy in Jerusalem: for since the time of Solomon the son of David king of Israel there was not the like in Jerusalem. Then the priests the Levites arose and blessed the people: and their voice was heard, and their prayer came up to his holy dwelling place, even unto heaven." (2 Chron. 30: 26, 27.)

The slanderer of God and David, in his booklet, says: "You find nothing said about instruments of music in the books of Kings." No; for they were history of the rebellious ten tribes, and minstrelsy is only mentioned in connection with Elisha, the prophet of God. So it is not mentioned in Chronicles with the rebellious kings of Judah, and they were many. Manasseh, who did evil in the sight of God, used no in-

struments of music in his praise. In fact, he had no praise to offer. (2 Chron. 33: 2.) Read the whole of his life. There is no instrumental praise there. Josiah "did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, and walked in the ways of David his father, and declined neither to the right hand, nor to the left." (2 Chron. 34: 2.) They used instrumental music in his reign. So in the wicked reign of Jehoahaz there were no instruments of music. Josiah "did that which was right, . . . and walked in the ways of David his father." How different this sounds from Lipscomb's booklet! Only the rebellious rejected instrumental music among the ancients. The fact is that those who would divide God's people do not want them now. God's prophets called for them even among the rebellious tribes. Can anything be stronger? "And these things were written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come." This is a stern rebuke to all heretics who deny the inspiration of such scripture as opposes their machinations, put up their consciences as the law of God's saints, and are opposed to instrumental praise. They discard the union of God's people, and would carry away ten tribes if they could to Samaria in rebellion and cause Israel to sin and forsake the temple and its service, like Jeroboam of old. They denounce David, the prophet, whom God loved and gave him and his seed the kingdom forever, all because they have no music in their souls. That which inspired Jeroboam to cause Israel to sin and separate from Judah and the true worship is the inspiring spirit of this rebellion in the church of Jesus Christ. I have known it from the beginning until now. Brother Lipscomb says: "In the books of Kings we read of no instruments of music in their worship." No; for we read of no worship then. In Samuel we read of David with his harp playing the evil spirit out of Saul, which shows that an evil spirit will depart if an instrument of music is well played in praise to God.

My tenth argument is from Rom. 15: 4: "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope." The things we have examined are a part of the things of which Paul speaks. In his booklet Brother Lipscomb finds much in the Old Testament for warning and as law for our guidance, but he may say that only illustrates the character of our unchanging God. From Moses' law he finds the following and uses it as law to us, applying the threatenings of the old dispensation to those who live under the new. See what he takes for a text: "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you." (Deut. 4: 2, R. V.; see also Deut. 12: 8-32, R. V.) If this is good teaching on the subject of which it speaks, coming as it does from the Old Testament, why would not the Old Testament be good authority when speaking upon acceptable praise and the subject of music? Strange logic this! You see, this writer goes back away beyond the prophets to the law

of Moses when it suits him to do so. Did you ever hear of such an author? He writes to show we are not under the Old Testament Scriptures, and then goes back to the first writer for a text and to find anathemas upon those against whom he writes. "Consistency is a jewel." If this writer goes back to the old law to know of God's judgments and applies that teaching to the subject under consideration, is it unfair for me to go to the "things written aforetime," by Paul's permission, to know what God will accept or reject in his praise? If Moses is still authority, why not David? If the "things written aforetime" were written for our learning under the gospel, what can we learn from them on the subject of praise? If the New Testament indorses the Old Testament, then the Old Testament becomes the New Testament teaching. If the New Testament declares the Old Testament to be authoritative teaching and refers us to it for instruction, then where the New Testament has given no advice and the teaching of the Old Testament is clearly defined, are we not authorized to go to the Old Testament to learn principles not fully stated in the New Testament? Since in the New Testament is given no definition to praise, it must be found in the things written before, and the passage at the head of this argument gives us license to go back for instruction. If we cannot go back and there is no instruction given in the New Testament, then we are left without teaching and have no guide but conjecture, and the conjecture of one is as good as another, and we must fall back on our bond of union: "Where God speaks, we will speak; and where God is silent, we will be silent." If led by conjecture, mine will be in harmony with my early training; and so will all others. Mr. Campbell, who was raised a covenanter, would conjecture an old Scotch song such as in heaven would make the angels snicker. Jenny Lind would conjecture the highest type of cultured song, led by her husband's piano. We would not harmonize if it were left to us. So if harmony is ever reached, it must be from God's revelation. If God has revealed nothing concerning it, then this is the only thing he has commanded us to do that he has not clearly defined. Can you believe it? If he commands baptism, he tells how it must be done; if faith is required, then faith is explained; and if the Lord's Supper is suggested, the Lord's Supper is explained. He says, "Praise him, all ye his hosts;" and if he has given no instructions, how will we know what to do? If left to conjecture, each will have equal rights; and one has no license to "judge another man's conscience." "To his own master he standeth or falleth." I may praise with an instrument of music, and you may not; but if I add a law saying, "Thou shalt," or you add a law saying, "Thou shalt not," then whichever makes the addition comes under condemnation, as taught in the text of Brother Lipscomb's booklet on music.

The New Testament tells us to sing, but nowhere defines what we do when we sing. Where will we find what to do? In the "things

that were written aforetime" it is clearly set forth. Things clearly defined in the Old Testament need not be repeated in the New Testament unless a change is made. The New Testament gives no definition of praise or song. None doubt it is required and is comely among the saints. If God has defined it, we must look to the "things that were written aforetime." If God has not defined it, we are left in the dark; and no one has a right to lay down a law to his brethren and assume to tell what any must do and what they must not. I have no right to say you shall play on a harp to his praise, and you have no right to say I shall not. Where God is silent, we are both pledged to be silent; and where he has not spoken, we have no right to speak. I am sorry these brethren have broken their pledge before God, and are trying to build a sectarian device on an opinion, without a solitary passage of scripture to sustain it. No man has a right to lay down a law for his brethren and say how I shall or how I shall not praise my God. If God has spoken, let him be heard; if God has not spoken, let all men be silent.

If God has told us how to sing, it is not found in the New Testament teaching. If the word is defined, it is in the things before written for our learning. If Brother Lipscomb can go to Moses for instruction concerning God, his will, threatenings, and judgments, I, too, can go back to the prophets and Psalms. If in the Old Testament he finds examples of faith, should he complain if I go there to find examples of praise? None surely should complain if I follow their example. They cannot preach New Testament faith without going back to Old Testament examples; nor can I teach New Testament praise without going back to Old Testament song. If a man lays down a law what his brethren shall do and what they shall not, he makes himself a pope in the kingdom of Christ. If God tells us to dance and does not tell us how, the Shakers would say, "You must dance as we do;" the Druid would want all to dance in his way; the Sioux Indian would say, "Let us howl when we dance;" the sweet little miss just out in long dresses would say, "Let us hug when we dance;" on the dark continent they would beat the tom-tom; the darkies would "pat juber;" the Frenchman would touch the violin's chords; Brother Lipscomb would say, "Hoe it down without music, for music is sinful;" and the boys of his school would say: "Let us swear by King David." No harmony could be attained if left to ourselves. Surely what God has taught us to do he has told how to do it; and if we would come into harmony with each other, we must come into harmony with God. If in the New Testament we are not taught how to sing, we will certainly find it in the "things written aforetime" for our learning, that through patience and study of the Scriptures we may have hope. The only Scriptures they then had was the Old Testament. Of these Paul said to Timothy: "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteous-

ness, that the man of God may be perfect." Will we submit to their reproof? Will we go to them for correction in praise and right doing? Does my brother say they are silent? Will he repudiate them, introduce a law of his own, and assume to know what God likes and dislikes without the revelation of the Son? "No man knoweth . . . who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him." The Son is the word made flesh. Not by the impress of the Spirit, but by the revelation of the word, is the Father known. By the word inspired men have spoken by the Holy Spirit. On that side we hear much about God which the Son has never revealed. If my brother gets his speeches from the word of God, he will not make any on his side of the question. "To the law and the testimony. If a man speak not according to these, there is no light in him." Where God has not spoken he has given no light. Jeremiah says: "Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls." Who told the opposition "God disapproves?" In all the passages written for our learning, not a hint of disapproval is found. God did not simply "tolerate it;" he commanded it by his prophets and put it into his temple. Thus I have the New Testament indorsing the Old Testament, which makes the Old Testament the New Testament teaching on that subject. Could anything be made plainer? All admit it is taught in the Old Testament; and when the New Testament indorses the Old Testament, the argument is complete.

My eleventh argument is from 1 Chron. 15: 16, 28: "And David spake to the chief of the Levites to appoint their brethren to be the singers with instruments of music, psalteries and harps and cymbals, sounding, by lifting up the voice with joy." This tells how the singers sung in praising God. To sing meant to lift up the voice with joy, accompanied with the music of instruments. This is repeated in verse 28; and so on in the whole Bible God always defines the word "sing" in the same way. It is continually repeated, and shows just what God means when he tells us to sing. It is God's definition of the word, as clear as he defines baptism or faith. (Ex. 15: 1, 20.) They all sung with a timbrel and pipe, and those that had none kept step to the sounds. The original words translated "sing" is the same in both passages; and if Miriam took harps, the men took harps also. The evidence is plain that both used instrumental accompaniment. The Holy Spirit speaks plainly when it speaks. When it says they sung, it tells how they sung; as when it says they were baptized, it tells how. (Rom. 6.) This was hundreds of years before David. David was not responsible for all the accompaniments to song. It was not all to give grace and glory to the kingdom. Four hundred years before David, Moses and Miriam sung God's praise with timbrel and pipe. So, also, Jephtha's daughter sung in the days of Judges, ere the kingdom was thought of. O, must such slander and profanity be

CENTRAL CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
OF THE BIBLE

resorted to to sustain a hobby so puerile? Surely one who has studied the Bible with care and for fifty years preached the gospel of Christ ought to know better, unless God has sent upon him a strong delusion that he should believe a lie because he received not the love of the truth, but ran greedily in the way of Balaam for reward.

My twelfth argument is from Ps. 149: "Praise ye the Lord. Sing unto the Lord a new song; and his praise in the congregation of saints. Let Israel rejoice in him that made him: let the children of Zion be joyful in their King. Let them praise his name in the dance: let them sing praises unto him with the timbrel and harp. For the Lord taketh pleasure in his people: he will beautify the meek with salvation. Let the saints be joyful in glory: let them sing aloud upon their beds." This declares who shall praise the Lord. "Let the saints be joyful in glory." Sing "his praise in the congregation of saints." If there were saints among the Jews, it referred to them; if there are saints among the heathen, it refers to them also; and if there are saints in the new dispensation, they, too, are included. Wherever God's name is known and men are sanctified and called "saints," they are exhorted to praise God—praise the name of him who made them. Israel of the old covenant and Israel of the new covenant—the children of Zion—may rejoice in their King and sing praises to him with timbrel and harp. Wherever saints are found and the children of Zion have a King whose name is to be praised, to them this passage applies, and in it the children of Zion are called upon to praise their King. This could not refer to the old dispensation, unless David asked them to praise his own name. The children of Zion were to be under a King to whom praise was befitting. Could it be other than the known King of Zion, while the children of Zion are called upon to praise their King? All are to praise him alike. At home, on their couches, and where they congregate—in the church—they are to offer praise with the pipe and the timbrel and the harp. This makes no distinction between the saints of the two covenants. Both are to praise him in the same way—if, indeed, those of the old covenant are referred to at all. All the saints, wherever found, are to praise him the same way—with instruments of music. All the saints—all who are sanctified, wherever found and under whatever dispensation—are to praise him in the same way whenever they congregate. In the church—the *ecclesia*—they are told to give praise to their King and their God with pipes and with timbrels and with harps. If the saints congregated in olden times, the prophet may have spoken to them; and if they congregate under the new dispensation, it also has reference to them. Peter says the prophet spoke for us, by the Spirit of Christ which was in him, the same things which were taught by the apostles with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven. If in our day the saints congregate in the church—*ecclesia*—to praise our King, the King of Zion, it tells us to praise him with the timbrel and harp. Wherever the

saints are found, wherever they congregate—in the church or at home—they are told to praise their King, to praise his name as the King of the children of Zion. "Let them praise his name on the pipe: let them sing praises on the timbrel and harp." Are you a saint of the children of Zion, with your King on the throne—a King whose name is worthy of all praise? To you it is spoken. If you refuse to hear, it is rebellion against God. Mark well that this teaching is for congregational worship, in the congregation of the saints—the gatherings of the children of Zion. "Let them"—let them—do not stand in the way; do not file an objection or interpose a weak conscience—let them praise his name with timbrel and harp. If you are men of faith, step out of the way and stop your great noise, and let them praise their King as God has taught by his prophets.

If David, the man of God, was a prophet of God, then he spoke the same things as are taught by the "apostles with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven," as we have shown from 1 Pet. 1: 10-12; and by the prophets God has commanded me and all others to "*let them sing praises unto their King in the congregation of the saints upon timbrel and harp.*" Who, then, is dividing the church of God with an opposition most devilish? Talk of God's disapproval of David's music! God commanded it by the Spirit of Christ in his prophets, and by faith David obeyed. By the same Spirit he has commanded me when the saints gather—"congregate"—to *let them* praise his name and the name of our King with timbrel and harp. Have we turned our face hellward through unbelief, rejecting his commandment to let the saints praise his name in the manner he himself has prescribed? Talk of the organ dividing the church! It never did it. It is the devil in the men who must rule or ruin. Jesus says such had better be drowned than to cause offense among the saints. I told you of the woman in Bloomington, Ill., who pushed the organ downstairs and destroyed the property of others on account of her weak conscience. But they are not all that way, thank God. In a town in Ohio lived a dear old brother. He was the only one in the church opposed to the use of an organ to help in God's praise. The young people were going elsewhere from under gospel teaching on account of the poor singing, and all thought it would be best to use the organ, without prelude or interlude. When the song started with the organ, the dear old brother lost his head, caught his hat, and left the house. All mourned over the offense and pain it had given him, and it was decided for the old brother's sake they would use it no more while he lived. It was noble in those young people, since he was the only one opposed to its use. The next Lord's day the dear old brother came in as he was wont. The singing began, but no organ was heard. The old brother arose and said: "Stop!" He asked why the organ was not used, and was told it was on his account, and for his sake they had concluded to give it up and sing in the old way. With tears on each cheek and with a

voice tremulous with emotion, he replied: "I thought that was it. I thought you had all given up to me. A pretty example I set before the young on last Lord's day. Am I a pope in the church, and must all bow to me? I came back to-day to confess my sin and to learn what humility means. Now, I want you to begin that hymn again and play the organ and put on all the stops, and I will sit here and teach my old carnal will to be quiet and learn that the Spirit of Christ is not found in such stubbornness. You have all borne with me long and patiently, and could I not bear with you the few days I have to live? Brethren, I want you to sing with the organ, and let me see if by the gospel of Christ I have learned to grant to others what I ask from them." Talk of the Spirit of Christ! That man had been at the Savior's feet, and knew what was meant by worship. With a will like a sinner, he could love like a saint. No wonder the people all loved him. He loved the people; God loved him. If I but reach heaven and the spirit world is amid the stars, and God gives me angels' wings, I would fly from Jupiter to Uranus to meet the dear old saint. He stood for Christ, and had no weak conscience to plead. About all the gospel some people have learned is the power of their conscience to lord it over God's heritage. But the goodness of that congregation was not all in him. Think of a large congregation all yielding for years to the whim of one old fogey for love's sake and for peace in Christ Jesus! Conscience is not all on one side. How many of us have seen the church dying for want of a little civilization infused in place of a barbaric old fogysm, with neither sense nor scripture to support it! I remember well when we went to an old barn of a church, with big windows and no curtains, seldom swept, and never dusted; drawled out our songs; broke the loaf and *took the bottle*, thinking a decent communion set would be sacrilege; and went away, thinking we had crucified the flesh. We made things as disgusting as possible, and then wondered why people did not come to church. Come to church! Why not make the Lord's house like home when the family gathers? What God touches is always beautiful.

In this beautiful psalm, did David write in spirit, as Jesus said of him, or, like the devil, did he do it in opposition to God, as David Lipscomb teaches? Let us read some things said of David by the Holy Spirit. Peter says: "The Holy Spirit by the mouth of David spake." (Acts 1: 16.) "For it is written in the book of Psalms." (Verse 20.) Peter thought the book of Psalms all right and worthy of our attention. Speaking of Jesus, he refers to David, saying: "For David speaketh." (Acts 2: 25.) "Let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulcher is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." (Verses 29, 30.) "I will give you [Jesus] the sure mercies

of David." (Acts 13: 34.) "In another psalm" (verse 35)—as if it were proper to quote from the Psalms. The Holy Spirit to the apostles after Pentecost did not hesitate to indorse the book of Psalms and David as a prophet. Indorsed by God as a man after his own heart; indorsed by Jesus Christ, with frequent reference to him and his sayings as the end of all controversy; indorsed by the Holy Spirit, who was to lead the apostles into all truth, in that he was declared to be a prophet of the Most High, in whom was the Spirit of Christ (1 Pet. 1: 11), and who spoke as moved by the Holy Spirit, I would take him to be pretty good authority for New Testament teaching. Some people in "dividing the word" give the best pieces to the devil. What the Holy Spirit indorses the Holy Spirit teaches.

If David wrote in spirit, of whom was he writing? Mark well the language: "Sing unto the Lord a new song." Is it under a new régime that a new song is required? Will not the song of God's goodness and power in the deliverance of his people from bondage, their sustenance forty years in the wilderness, the driving out of the nations, and the fulfillment of his covenant with Abraham—all so clearly set forth in the songs of David, sung with such pathos and beauty—answer for his praise? God's mercy and loving-kindness had been so fully rehearsed by the sweet singer of Israel. What more is to be told that a new song is required? Was something new and grander to be enacted that would need to be clothed with new rehearsals and drawn in pictures more vivid? "A new song." Did David in his prophetic vision realize that the half had not been told? For the half had not been done. As a prophet, was he inquiring and searching diligently of that salvation which Peter said he was not permitted to know, while prophesying of the grace of God and the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow, unto whom it was revealed that not to themselves, but to us, they did minister? Enough was seen by the man of God to impress the prophet that a new song would be required—the song of the Lamb in connection with the song of Moses. Surely when he so often spoke of a new song, he must have had visions of new glories and beauties untold, which could not be reached when singing of God's works by Moses in the deliverance of his people of old.

Again, he says it is to be "in the congregation of saints." Under the old dispensation there were holy men, but all holy men are not sanctified men. To be sanctified is to be set apart to some purpose. Some were set apart to some purpose clearly defined. The whole nation were set apart for the retention of the "oracles of God" which were committed to them, but God had never given to them the name of "saint." "A chosen generation," "a royal priesthood," "a peculiar people" were to be raised up and sanctified in Christ Jesus, who, on account of this special sanctification in Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit, would be called "saints." The Jews were sometimes called

"God's sanctified" in contrast with the Gentiles; but they were never called "saints" in the same manner as by a name given them, as were those sanctified in Christ Jesus, and especially distinguished by that name. Writing to the church at Rome, Paul says: "To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called saints." This was the name given them. Many Jews were in Rome, but they were not among that number called "saints." By that name were the children of God in Christ Jesus especially designated. To them he writes: "Unto the church of God at Corinth." Who are they? "Them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called saints." "To be" is not in the Greek manuscript. Not "called to be saints," as Calvin would have it, but named "saints" as a title from God. "Saints" was the name by which they were known. To the Galatians he writes to the church of God, as he does his second Epistle to the Corinthians, "with all the saints which are in all Achaia." To the Ephesians he writes to the saints and faithful in Christ Jesus; and so, also, to the church at Colosse. James writes to the twelve tribes scattered abroad, thus declaring the saints to be of the Israel of God. He could not see the great difference, the obedient and God loving and by God acknowledged as his own, though they were his by a different covenant, for he counted the saints as in some way associated with the twelve tribes. He was not so afraid of Judaism as are some of the "antis," who do but little preaching beyond "be ducked or be damned." In the South I have heard little preaching outside of "first principles." Our people need to get out of a great deal of their narrowness before they can see all the wonderful beauties of the wonderful book. Paul says, "All Israel are not of Israel;" and, "He is not a Jew who is one outwardly: but he is a Jew who is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart in the spirit, whose praise is not of men, but of God."

God said: "I will make a new covenant"—with a new people? No—"with the house of Israel. It shall differ from the old, in which the laws were engraven on stone; but in this I will write them upon the heart and put them into the mind, and they shall know the Lord, from least to greatest." He took away the legal enactment written on stone, which was a ministration of death, and gave them a ministration of life. "The light is the life of men." It was a ministration of light. Negative commands for restraining the flesh give place to heavenly teaching for the culture of the spirit, and principles take the place of rules, and the mind controls the fleshly impulses. When David said, "Sing unto the Lord a new song," it was because new things were to be developed. A new era was to begin. New cause for praise was to be manifested to those he calls "saints" as especially sanctified in Christ Jesus. In the assembly of the saints let them sing praise to their king in a new song. God has made that people his Israel, saying: "Let Israel rejoice in him that made him: let the children of Zion be joyful in their King." What King? Was it some vagabond

king before the captivity, or was it the King of all kings? Let Zechariah (9: 9) explain: "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass." This applied to Jesus, and explains who the King is and who are the children of Zion. It certainly refers to the saints under the gospel reign of heaven.

A more clearly defined parallel passage is found in Ps. 2: "Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder and cast away their cord from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel. Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him." In both psalms the King is referred to; and in one he is defined as the Son, whom God has set upon the holy hill of Zion, in whom the children of Zion rejoice. This honor have all the saints, and David says to them: "Praise ye the Lord." Praise him as God. "Praise him in his sanctuary." That sanctuary is the church—"the congregation of saints." "Zion's children may be joyful in their King"—the King God has set on the throne of David, upon the holy hill of Zion. "Let the saints be joyful in the glory of his reign."

The Psalms begin with prophecy concerning Christ and his kingdom and the triumphs of his name, and end with the same grand prophecy, counseling the children of Zion—the subjects of his government—to give praise to his name. The King must be the Son; for God would counsel praise, glory, and honor to be paid to no other. Then the two last psalms are prophetic; and Peter tells the teaching is the same as that given by the evangelists of the New Testament with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven, for the prophets spoke by the Spirit of Christ which was in them. (1 Pet. 1: 10-12.) Then this ends the controversy with the believer, as we are told by the Spirit of Christ how to praise God in his sanctuary—"in the congregation of saints." Wherever the saints assemble, wherever the Lord's sanctuary is found, there this teaching applies. Read the last psalm with heart humbled and head bowed and uncovered, and know

that it applies to the church—the congregation of the sanctified in Christ Jesus, the sanctuary of the God of hosts, the Redeemer's kingdom.

Let my brother cross lances here with more than assertion. If this is prophetic of Christ, whose name is to be praised, it certainly tells us how to render that praise—with psaltery and harp, with stringed instruments and organs, etc. The most ridiculous thing in scripture exegesis is giving Ps. 149, 150 to the Jews only. Is praise more comely under the old dispensation than under the new? Are the Jews, and Jews only, called upon to praise God for his mighty acts? It was great and wonderful to take the poor, enslaved Hebrews and lead them out of bondage the most terrible, and divide the Red Sea for their passage, and feed them with heavenly manna, and give them water from Horeb and flesh from the desert winds, and bear with their ignorance and faithlessness and oft rebellions, and lead them to a goodly land, and drive out the nations whose cup of iniquity was full, and give them a land flowing with milk and honey, and bear with their folly and ignorance while spending centuries in their life craining and better education in the welfare of being. There is something grand in the gratitude of David as he contemplates all this, which he pours out in songs the most wonderful and brings into requisition everything he can touch into life to give praise and majesty and glory to the Most High. I cannot conceive of a man so groveling and inappreciative when he reads the wonderful outbursts of grateful praise from the poems of David, giving honor and glory and power and might and dominion to Him whose goodness and mercy endureth forever, with nothing like it in all the world, that his own heart is not touched into gratitude sublime, while emotions of worship fill his own soul to its depth. Compare it with the productions and compositions of men of stuffed brains, of our selfish modern scientists, and say that all this is for the glory of an earthly kingdom! I cannot think of such a man as ever having had a lofty, noble, and unselfish thought.

But if the goodness of God to them could call out such exalted praise from the shepherd king, what should be the exalted conception of the divine majesty and of his goodness and mercy when we consider God's gift of his Son—a jewel the most precious of heaven sent down to this earth to take our poor, fallen nature in his covenant grasp, with all the weakness and follies of frail humanity, and carry it through all the tears and sighs and earth woes of our painful struggle, and never let go till through the dark valley he carried it to the rest land and the sunlight, and through death placed our poor, stumbling nature in high exaltation on the throne of the universe, and became to us a merciful High Priest in the presence of God, to make for us intercessions continually, having had such associations and experiences with us in our stumbling life that he can be touched with the feelings of our infirmities? O, if David would use everything he could touch into

sweet minstrelries to give praise to God for what he saw of his wonderful goodness and mercy to his children of old, what ought we, with ten thousand times more of his loving-kindness to behold, to use in giving him praise, extolling and glorifying his adorable Godhead? When we enter his courts with "a new song" and his sanctuary for praise to his name, we should have something more than some old wheezy tune sung in a manner so uncultivated that the kids hide their faces and snicker at the ill-bred performance we often call singing. For shame! Has God no sanctuary now? If so, we should heed the admonition given in the "things written aforetime" for our learning, wherein his prophet David, a man after God's own heart, tells us when we enter his sanctuary, wherever that sanctuary is found or under what dispensation it is reared, we should bring all our powers into our praise service; and with "a new song"—the song of the Lamb—added to the song of Moses, we should "praise him in the firmament of his power. Praise him for his mighty acts: . . . praise him with the timbrel and dance: praise him with stringed instruments and organs. Praise him upon the loud cymbals: praise him upon the high-sounding cymbals. Let everything that hath breath praise the Lord." Let everything that can be touched into harmony praise the Lord; for he is good, and his mercy endureth forever. I can but think with all the surety of the sacred writings that this is prophetic of the present dispensation; but certain I am that whenever and wherever God has a sanctuary, whoever is permitted to enter it is by David, the prophet, taught to praise God for his wonderful works on stringed instruments and organs.

Such are the teachings of the word of God by the prophets, "who spoke by the Spirit of Christ which was in them" of the coming King of Zion and prescribed such praise from the children of Zion to their King in the congregation of his saints and in the sanctuary—the consecrated place of worship—where his saints gather; and God has never changed that order, and it is certainly binding upon us now; and he who changes such an order without authority from the Eternal is an adversary of God, taking his place in the temple of God and assuming to change times and laws and to set up authority God has not authorized.

I am conscientious on this subject, but it is not what Paul calls a "weak conscience"—a mere prejudice; but it is based upon a clear "thus saith the Lord," and no special pleading will get rid of teaching so plain. David must be impeached, the man of God discarded, and the prophet put in antagonism with God, of whom God said: "He is a man after my own heart." All this pettifogging must be resorted to in order to do away with the plain teaching of the word and build up a sect in the church and divide the people of God. In my early years I began the defense of the word of God as my life work, and to my last year on the earth I shall continue the defense, and my old

bald head shall go down into death with my face to the foe; and when I meet David in the skies, I shall expect to find him with the harp he smote with such a master hand on earth, leading the choruses of the saints who have washed their robes white in the blood of the Lamb. It will be the same David whom God loved and on whose throne he placed his own Son forever. Destroy the throne and authority of David, and you have dethroned Christ, for his kingdom is the kingdom of David forever.

WARLICK'S THIRD REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My opponent seems very much out of humor this time. I am more and more amused at him as the debate progresses. If he were not so much my senior in years, I would feel called upon to reprove him sharply for getting so angry and showing it so plainly. I wish he would govern his temper; but I am not so desirous that he refrain from getting mad as that I shall leave off exposing his amusing contradictions, the sophistry of his argument, and his misuse of the word of the Lord: It is my privilege and duty to expose him in his effort to sustain by the Bible an unscriptural proposition; and though he may growl, grumble, and complain, I shall go right on with the work. I shall not be intimidated by his little, low, mean thrusts at his opponent and all others who stand firm for the truth. It is the habit of the "digressives," like all other sectarians, to get mad when you point out to them their errors or question their right to do as they please religiously.

My brother has at least one element of a successful debater who has a bad cause to defend. He knows how to pass by unnoticed everything in his opponent's speech which he knows he cannot answer. Not one argument made in my last speech did he undertake to handle. It can be for no other reason than because he felt unable to meet the arguments. He repeats only what we had from him before—that is, that I am full of assertions. I suggest that he allow those who hear and those who may read the debate to determine such things.

He seems still out of humor with Brother Lipscomb and with me because I said Brother Lipscomb knew so much more than either of us and that he had done so much more for the cause of Christ than my brother. He asks: "How does he know?" Why, have I not read the papers? Does he forget that we may in this way learn all about what others have done and are doing? Who in this way may not find out who the useful and prominent men in any church are? I seriously doubt whether Brother Stark in all his life put together has done as much for the cause as Brother Lipscomb has in any one year of his life as a Christian; and as far as a knowledge of the Scriptures are concerned, I knew when I read Brother Stark's book that he was not overburdened with Bible knowledge. This is also clearly shown by the fact that he affirms the proposition we have for this debate. His own side will say this, for no one else among them will affirm it

worded as we have it. He thinks Brother Clark Braden's affirmative in our debate was, in substance, the same. In this he is mistaken. Brother Braden affirmed that the instrument *was only an aid, and not any part of the worship*. He said those who said it was a part of the worship were "fools." His proposition stated that it was an aid to the singing, and that the singing was the worship. Of course Brother Braden failed to prove his proposition, yet he did much better toward it than my Brother Stark is doing in this case.

A further reference to Brother Meeks and the Henderson affair was unnecessary. All know that that brother has not been misrepresented. Brother Meeks will not say that he has always stood on the organ and society questions just as he does now. The brethren have learned where he stands, and for this reason faithful churches whose members were once glad to have him come among them do not want him now. Why is this? Have the churches changed? No; it is because Brother Meeks has changed. Then, why cry "misrepresentation" and "slander." It is not manly to do this.

It is really becoming monotonous to hear repeated so often the charge that those of our people who oppose the use of instrumental music in the worship are responsible for the division among us. There is really no excuse for one's making so groundless and unreasonable a statement as that. Surely my brother is only joking. In charity I shall try to feel that he is joking, anyway. His own illustration from the Dunkards convicts him. Of course that faction among them who have introduced a new law, custom, or practice are responsible for the division which now exists on account of it. On items of worship our people were a unit until the organ was introduced. The first one brought into the worship by the disciples was in the year 1869 in the Olive Street Church, St. Louis, Mo. It resulted in a division in the congregation, and was removed by a committee composed of Isaac Errett, Robert Graham, J. K. Rogers, and Alex. Proctor. It was not hard to remove then. The "digressives" were not so void of the Spirit of Christ as they are now.

Just here I want to give you some quotations from the sayings of some of the wise men of our reformation on the subject of the organ. I give first the testimony of the humble and pious W. H. Hobson: "I can but express the conviction that my good brethren who have favored the organ in worship have made a fearful mistake; that with the lost simplicity in our worship we will experience a loss of spirituality and genuine devotion. We have a feeling that amounts to conviction. No gain can compensate a loss like this."

In 1867 Dr. H. Christopher said: "I cannot see in all my horizon one fact, argument, reason, or plea that can justify us in using musical instruments in the worship of the church. It is an innovation on apostolic practice. This cannot be controverted."

C. M. Willmeth, in the Christian Preacher; said: "Instrumental music

will carnalize any church, destroy spiritual worship, and finally the said church will go into worldly captivity, where the image of Christ is entirely lost."

Benjamin Franklin said: "There is no provision for the use of instruments in the divine law prescribing the worship. This is not denied by any one. No one attempts to find any provision or authority for it there. It is simply not in the new covenant. The first account of the use of the organ is from the pope, and not from the Lord; from Rome, and not from Jerusalem; from man, and not from heaven. This ought to end the matter with us."

Mrs. A. Campbell, in "Home Life" of her husband, says: "I believe the organ to be a grievous innovation in the Christian Church that our Heavenly Father does not approve of. I think it will be discovered by the more reflecting brethren themselves; and only a return to apostolic worship in our churches can be acceptable to the great Head of the church, who has not on record his sanction to add to or take from his institutions, ordinances, or forms of worship."

I. B. Grubbs, in a letter to J. W. Perkins, said: "I regard it an abominable innovation that does no good at all, but a great deal of harm. Sooner or later it turns the worship into an entertaining performance. The meanest thing connected with its introduction in almost every place is the unchristian spirit that attends its advocacy. When people go crazy over it, they do not hesitate to rend a church and retard for years the prosperity of the cause."

A. Campbell said: "To the really spiritually minded it would be like a cowbell in a concert."

Brother Stark says that if the Bible authorizes him to use the organ in the worship, he should not refuse to do it just because some one else will contend for infant church membership and still others want to burn incense as a religious rite. Of course not; but where is his authority? When he goes to give it, we find that it is precisely the same argument; that he relies upon the same books in the Bible as those used in the defense of infant membership, the burning of incense, and also a plurality of wives for one man. By parity of reasoning they all stand on the same platform. Does my brother use the instrument now because David used it in his day? I answer: David also brought infants into the church, David burned incense, and David had a number of wives. Why does he want to hold with David on the music question and repudiate him on the others? In his own language I ask: "If David is good authority on the organ, why not on infant church membership?" Will he answer? Was not David a man after God's own heart as much in the latter matters as he was when playing on the instruments which he himself invented? But he says: "What if the use of the organ in worship does admit the incense and bring in the babies? What of it?" I am glad he says this. In doing so he admits that he cannot answer the objection; and,

in substance, he says that he will submit to infant membership, burning incense, and even to polygamy, before he will give up his "infamous box." Shame on you, Brother Stark! I wish you loved the word of the Lord well enough to throw down your unscriptural proposition, discard all humanisms, and stand for the truth.

I feel sorry for my brother in what he says is the meaning of Amos 5, 6. He says a child can see that he is correct. The truth is that he is stranded on Amos; and I am sure that no one but a child or one who, like my brother, is childish would ever think of such a childish, foolish, and nonsensical construction as that which he puts on the passage. He may squirm and complain all he pleases. The language of Amos is too plain to admit of doubt. "Woe to them that . . . chant to the sound of the viol, and invent to themselves instruments of music like David!" (Amos 6); and in chapter 5 he says God will not listen to the songs if the instrument be used. There is no use to dodge, my brother. It is too plain. If my good brother would appear honest and altogether honorable, let him acknowledge his mistake here. He does himself no credit by contending.

He seems to have less to say about Brother Lipscomb in the third speech. I am glad of this. Brother Lipscomb should not have been mentioned in this discussion unless all that he said on the subject had been given. My brother is manly enough, however, to virtually admit that his former speeches do misrepresent Brother Lipscomb. He now says that Brother Lipscomb does not deny the divinity of any part of the Bible, as the "higher critics" do, all of whom stand with Brother Stark on the music question. None of them are with Brother Lipscomb and myself. That side has all the "higher critics," I am glad to say. The truth is that the tendency of the drift in that direction, one of the first steps in which course is the advocacy of the organ in the worship, is to dispute the right of God to rule by his word; and, instead, they set up for themselves a government controlled by "sanctified common sense," they call it. This tends to destroy confidence in the truth and weakens the faith to the extent that they soon deny that part which does not suit them, and at last they become "higher critics," or some other kind of skeptics. Better be content with a "thus saith the Lord" in all things and stay on the safe side.

My brother says that we are as free to choose our own method of worship as we are to select the style of clothing we wear, and that while the women must pray with their heads covered, they are at liberty to select the covering. I shall show in my negative argument that he is wrong in his promise, but I will give the argument a slight touching up now. The cases are not similar, much less parallel. God has nowhere said anything about the style of our dress; so we are left free in such things; but he does tell us just what kind of music we shall make in his worship. He tells us to *sing, not to play on a man-made instrument; to make melody in the heart, not on an organ.*

God says the woman should have her head covered when she prays. This, my brother will admit, forbids her uncovering her head when she goes to pray. Can he see the analogy? If it be not right for the woman to pray with uncovered head, since God says she should be covered, then by what course of reasoning does he reach the conclusion which justifies his playing the organ, making melody on the instrument, when God expressly says that we should *sing, make the melody in the heart?* If he refuses to see and accept this, it is because of an obstinate, stubborn will. But he says that I know the instrument is in the word "sing;" I know no such thing; neither does he. I know it is not, and so does he. When he reaches this point in his argument, we will give him all he wants on it. I will be with him in his sixth trial and will not forsake him in the seventh. For the present, however, we shall pass it on.

My brother thinks I should not claim to know anything about the missionary society, since I do not attend the conventions; but may I not know of their work, anyway? Do they not publish their by-laws and constitution? I do know something about them—more than my brother seems to know, at least more than he seems willing to tell. I asked him how old their charter was, and he is silent. I might have asked him: Are all the delegates sent by the churches to the convention members of the society? Are they allowed to vote in its deliberations? How much money does it take to belong to it? How much is required for a life membership? If Jesus Christ was on earth in person, I fear he could not join it. He was too poor. He did not have the *fee*.

But back to the question. My brother tells you that I said Brother Freed permitted the instrument to be used in the college at Henderson to improve the music there. I said no such thing. I said the best singing was most generally found where they did not use the instrument. In the Nashville Bible School, where they do not use it, their singing is far superior to the singing in Brother Freed's school, where they do use it.

Brother Stark says I do not know what a proper division of the word is. Well, I should hate to think that I did not and that he did. He seems to think that only the Ten Commandments of the old dispensation were abolished. The Seventh-day Adventists say that only the Ten Commandments were continued. Who is correct? I answer: Neither. The old dispensation, in all its features, was done away. Christ took away the first that he might establish the second. Christianity is no patch, made of cloth partly old and partly new; nor is it new cloth put on to an old garment or new wine put in an old bottle. The garment, cloth, wine, and bottle are all *new*. Actually my brother seems to know as little about the division of the word as the ordinary sectarian preacher, and he seems to have less regard for it than many I know among them.

Those things written in the Old Testament for our admonition are

those things only which may be seen through the New Testament teaching. Nothing taught in the Old Testament not specifically mentioned in the New Testament is in any way binding upon us. For this we, as a people, have always contended. The most unlearned among us are supposed to know it well, even before they become members of the church. Instrumental music, though mentioned in the Old Testament, is not specifically emphasized in the New Testament—*yea, it is not even hinted at in the New Testament; therefore it belongs to the relics of an abrogated age.* It does not stand among the things written for our admonition, especially not in the sense contemplated in my brother's contention. Here is his trouble: He thinks that New Testament commandments are to be obeyed in the light of Old Testament explanation. He says the New Testament commands us to sing, but does not tell us how to do it. We learn how from the Old Testament. This my brother thinks is very strong argument. To those who *think* it is very silly. But let us try its strength. The New Testament commands us to sing, but does not tell how to do it. David tells how. He even shows us how He sang in connection with the organ; so we should do the same. Take another case. The New Testament commands us to pray, but does not tell us how to do it. Daniel tells us how. He shows us how. He prayed three times a day before an open window with his face toward Jerusalem. I wonder if Brother Stark thinks we should pray that way now because Daniel did in the olden time. Does he answer: "No. We must pray with the spirit and with the understanding now, and give no attention to Daniel's custom?" I answer: Just so: and we must sing with the spirit and with the understanding also, and *sing*, make melody in the heart—not on an instrument, like David tried to do. Well, for further amusement at our brother's expense, let us take another example. Paul, in Romans, commands the Christian to offer the body a living sacrifice; but he fails to tell just how to do it. The Old Testament, however, is very plain on how to offer the sacrifice. The living victim was brought to the altar and there slain, its blood spilled, and its flesh offered. Now we have it. Let my brother, if he would be consistent, offer his body in sacrifice by killing himself. This would be obeying a New Testament command in the light of Old Testament explanation. Such nonsense! Brother Stark, I am ashamed of you.

The attempt to correct me on the matter of the dedication of the temple is all lost. Read the passage, and you will find that the instrumental music was all on the outside of the house. You will also see that even the priests did not stand to minister after the glory of God had filled the house, much less the players on the instruments.

On the case of Nadab and Abihu, if my brother will read the passage in the Revised Version, he will find it just as I gave it. They were condemned for doing that which God had not commanded, not that which he commanded not. The passage from 1 Cor. 4: 6 was also from

the Revised Version, and reads just as I quoted it. Those who go beyond what is written are condemned here. I suggest that he get the Revised Version and read it. It will save him such mistakes and the embarrassment of having to be corrected in such small matters.

All that he has to say on Paul's language in Romans has been effectively answered. Only those things written in the Old Testament repeated in the New Testament are for our learning. Instrumental music does not belong to such things; therefore we do not need it.

On David's being authority in the church of Christ we have exploded, even reducing what he says on this to an absurdity. David burned incense, brought infants into the church, and had more than one wife; therefore he is no example for us.

I come now to what my brother numbers his ninth argument. Of course this is his numbering. Really he makes but one argument on all the passages he brings forward—only one thing repeated; so that when what he says on one passage has been replied to, all he has said or may say has been met. But we give him the benefit of the count, he seems to depend so much upon it. The passage referred to is 2 Chron. 29: 25. He used this in his last speech; and if he had read carefully my reply, he certainly would never have referred to it again. The reader is requested to revert to my last, or second, speech and learn the truth on the passage. I gave in full the comment of Adam Clarke on this verse. Dr. Clarke shows very plainly that the instruments were used by the authority of David. He shows the same to be true in 1 Chron. 15, 16. David invented the instruments and commanded their use, according to the correct translation of the passages. God, by Amos, corrects the mistake (Amos 6.) After all, suppose the passages did teach what our brother tries to make them say; does he not know that they are about nine hundred years too early for the law of worship in the church of Christ? I wonder that he does not try to build an ark. Noah did, and why not Brother Stark?

All that he says about the rebellious kings not using instruments is to no purpose whatever. It was put in only to fill time and space. If he thinks we may do everything taught and practiced by what he calls the "good kings" and "loyal tribes," why does he not do it? Why does he draw the line at everything except instrumental music? They burned incense, offered sacrifices and burnt offerings, brought their babies into the church, and practiced polygamy. Will my brother take these, too? Or will he presume to take just such things as suit his taste and repudiate the others? If he takes this privilege, will he deny it to others? Suppose his twin brother, the Mormon, was inclined to polygamy, the Catholic wished to burn incense, and the Methodist wished to bring the babies into the church; what would be his ground of objection? Can he tell? I insist that he cannot offer one demurrer. Then, why does he not practice all these things and be consistent once in his life, anyway?

His last and hardest effort is on Ps. 149, 150—the last two. He is certainly hard pressed and in great need of something upon which to rest his case, or he would not offer for arguments what he says on the Psalms. He thinks the language here is prophetic, and refers to Christ as King and the members of his church as subjects. He thinks that because David said, "Praise God on stringed instruments and organs," we may use the modern instruments in our worship in the church of Christ. Well, the same verses in the two psalms which say, "Praise him on the instrument," say: "*Praise him in the dance.*" Will my brother be consistent now and introduce the modern dance to keep time to his music? Again I ask: What shall we do with the command to take up arms and execute vengeance upon the heathen and punishment upon the people? (See Ps. 149: 6-9.) This Brother Stark says is a command to the people of God to-day. Just think of it, brethren! God's children commanded to take the sword and fight, when the apostle tells us that the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual! Does anybody believe it? Away with such insults to God! Of course the language has no reference to the Christian age, but to the days of David. It applies to the Jews and to their king, not to Christ and his church.

The brother's position upon the words "congregation" and "saints" is almost too foolish to deserve notice. He thinks these are preëminently New Testament terms. I wonder if he does not know that in our English Bible the word "congregation" occurs oftener in the Old Testament than in the New Testament, and that, besides the Psalms, the word "saint" is used and applied to God's people in the following books of the Old Testament: 1 Samuel, Job, Daniel, Proverbs, Hosea, and Zechariah. Actually there is no excuse for such an unnecessary blunder as this. I should not expect a child to make it. Brother Stark would be far from making such a mistake, except that, like a drowning man, he will catch at straws. He is so joined to his idol he seems determined to stay with it at all hazards. He deserves to apologize to himself for descending to such a low, ridiculous plane in the defense of his proposition. He ought to give it up and quit. May we not hope that he will yet repent of such conduct and return to the "old paths?" He says he is honest. Will he prove it by his acts?

I have now replied to every argument he has offered. I have taken every one of his scriptures from him and turned them all against him. The remainder of this speech shall be given to the introduction of counter argument. Hold me to my promise. I said I would show that the use of instrumental music in the worship of God in the churches of Christ is wrong and sinful. Watch me, and see if I do not make this promise good.

THINGS RIGHT IN THEMSELVES, BUT WRONG RELIGIOUSLY.

Washing the hands is not wrong, but it is right. It will be right to wash hands so long as it is right to be clean. Yet it stands among the things which our Lord condemns in the strongest terms. Why condemn it if it be no wrong to wash hands? The only answer is that those reproved were doing it in a religious sense, when God had not authorized it. From this we conclude that it is always wrong to do as religious service anything not commanded of God, though such things may not be wrong themselves. Instrumental music in the worship belongs to this class of things; and, therefore, to use it in the worship is wrong and sinful.

Eating meat is not wrong, but right. But suppose we eat meat as religious service; suppose we put it on the Lord's table with the bread and wine and eat it in connection with the observance of the Lord's Supper; would God accept the service? You know he would not; but why not? The only answer is that God has nowhere said we shall eat meat as worship in his name? God has not only not told us that we shall not eat meat, but he has said we may. The wrong, therefore, is in doing as religious service that which God has not authorized us to do.

Making music on an instrument is not wrong in itself, nor are we forbidden to play on the instrument; but we have no more right to bring it into the worship and use it the service of the church than we have to eat meat or wash hands as religious service, or to do any other unauthorized thing as worship. God has certainly not authorized it, any more than eating meat in worship or washing hands as worship. Therefore those who use the instrument in the worship are guilty of *will* worship, and the word of God condemns the practice. God has not only not authorized us to use the instruments in the worship in making music in praise to his name, but he has told us plainly to make music of another kind. So if we make music on the instrument in praising him, we fail to do what he commands, but we do something not commanded. Therefore we sin both in omission and commission. Better be content with what the Lord says do—sing, make melody in the heart to the Lord.

I wish now to offer an argument based on the age of instrumental music in the Christian church—I mean the church in a general or historic sense. No mention is made of its use even among the Jews for some centuries before Christ, and it is certain that no New Testament writer ever thought of its use in the church while the apostles lived. So we are forced to depend upon postapostolic history for its introduction. A.D. 670 is the first mention of its use in any history, and the best authority places its introduction about one hundred years this side of that date. It is certain that it was not used before the seventh century, and J. W. McGarvey says it required about eight hundred years to bring it into use generally even with those who began

to use it in the seventh century. From Brother McGarvey, as quoted by Kendrick in "Religious Issues," I give the following: "The evidence derives additional force from the consideration that although in respect to both faith and practice the churches fell rapidly into corruption after the death of the apostles, their practice in this particular was so firmly fixed that they continued to worship without the use of instruments of music for about seven hundred years. Nearly every item of the old Jewish and the old pagan ritual which now helps to make up the ceremonial of the Romish Church was introduced before the return to the discarded use of instrumental music. The first organ certainly known to have been used in the church was put into the cathedral at Aix-la-chapelle by the German emperor, Charlemagne, who came to the throne in the year 768. So deposes Professor Hauck, of Germany, in the Schaff-Herzog Cyclopedia. The same learned author declares that its use met with great opposition among Romanists, especially from the monks, and that it made its way but slowly into common use: So great was this opposition even as late as the sixteenth century that he says it would probably have been abolished by the Council of Trent but for the influence of the emperor, Ferdinand. This council met in 1545. Thus we see that this innovation was one of the latest that crept into the Roman apostasy, and that it was so unwelcome even there that a struggle of about eight hundred years was necessary to enable it to force its way to universal acceptance. The Lutheran Church and the Church of England brought it with them out of Romanism; all other Protestant churches started in their course of reform without it and so continued until the present century; while the Greek Church and the American Church, both more ancient than the Roman, still continue without it. To sum up this argument, you can now see that this practice is one of recent origin among Protestant churches, adopted by them from the Roman apostasy; that it was one of the latest corruptions adopted by that corrupt body; that a large part of the religious world has never accepted it; that though employed in Jewish ritual, it was deliberately laid aside by the inspired men who organized the church of Christ; and the several precepts of the New Testament implicitly condemn it."

No one will deny, or even discredit, the testimony here given; nor will any one at all conversant with the facts question the author's conclusions. It is well known that to condemn anything and everything which originated with the apostate Romish Church has ever been the cry of Protestants. This has been done, not only upon general principles, but, as Brother McGarvey says: "We know of nothing good coming from that source." Shall we discard all of the discoveries of the Dark Ages and return to New Testament faith and practice, or shall we be consistent and accept all innovations and unite with the Romish Church that gave them to us? If we take one, why not take them all?

I wish now to make an argument based upon the age of instrumental music in the worship among the professed friends of Christ and his

cause. In all of our debates with the pedobaptists on infant baptism we have been able to show, and have proved, that it is not only a fact that no trace of the practice can be found in the New Testament, but that the world knew nothing of the practice of infant baptism until the beginning of the third century, when we have the first favorable mention of it by Origen. This argument we have considered good. We rely upon it. It is strong, even unanswerable. But what do we conclude from it? Why, that the practice of infant baptism must be wrong, being unscriptural; that, of course, if the inspired men who organized the first churches of Christ did not practice it, and if more than one hundred years this side of the death of the last apostle be the nearest approach we can make to their day with the practice, certainly infant baptism should not be taught and practiced now. Is this not a good argument? Are the conclusions not just and fair? If my brother has ever debated with the advocates of infant baptism, he has, no doubt, used the argument. He did it, fearing not the ability of his opponent to find one flaw in the reasoning. Now let us try the same logic upon the practice of instrumental music in the churches of Christ. The apostles and inspired men who organized the first churches of Christ no more used instrumental music in their worship than they practiced baptizing babies. The one is, therefore, just as unapostolic and unscriptural as the other. So we must come this side the death of the last apostle to find the origin of both. We then inquire: Which is the older? Answer: Infant baptism, by about four hundred years. Now, brethren, will we take our own medicine? If the argument is good in one case, it ought to be good in both. Do we condemn the Methodists and others for teaching and practicing that which cannot be traced in postapostolic history within one hundred years of the death of the last apostle, while we teach and practice in our worship another relic of the apostate Romish Church fully four hundred years younger than theirs which we condemn?

Take another illustration—the origin of sprinkling and pouring for baptism in the Christian age. In our debates with those who advocate this "mode," as they call it, we show that the New Testament idea is to immerse, not to sprinkle. We also show that the first person to have water sprinkled or poured on him for baptism was Novatian in the year 251. Not an earlier case is on record. We show this to be about one hundred and fifty-five years this side the death of John, the last apostle. This we take as conclusive evidence that the practice is of human, and not of divine, origin; and so it is. But apply the same argument to the use of instrumental music in the worship of the church, and what do we have? More than five hundred years' difference in the age of the two, and the margin is that much in favor of sprinkling and pouring for baptism as against the man-made method of worshiping God by machinery in the use of the instrument employed to praise him with. Shall we condemn the Meth-

odists and others for practicing that which they cannot trace nearer than within one hundred and fifty years of the death of the last apostle, and hold on to a practice which we cannot trace to a period nearer than about six hundred years this side the death of the last apostle? Why will the "digressives" among us be so inconsistent as this? Do they not know that when the people come to give the matter any thought, they will be condemned for their inconsistency? In the name of that God whom we all profess to serve, brethren, why will you not desist and return to New Testament faith and practice in all things? Let us hope that you may do it before it is too late for you.

It is sometimes claimed that the liberty we have in the gospel permits us to choose our own methods of worship and just what we shall dedicate to God in worship. I wish to notice this claim just a moment. God does not allow us to choose what we shall worship, or how we may worship, or what we shall dedicate to him in worship. If we may bring in the instruments and offer them to God in worship just because we fancy them, because they suit our taste, when Jesus Christ never appointed them in his worship, then others may bring in the play, the dance, or anything and everything to suit the tastes of all and offer all to God in worship. In this way we would cut ourselves loose from all divine legislation in matters of divine worship and delight our souls in a religion of our own make. If a man may be the author of any part of his worship, he may be the author of it all; for if he may be the author of one part, he may be the author of another part; and, of course, this will give the right to arrange the whole system. This would be will worship, and the Bible condemns that in the strongest terms. Instrumental music for the churches of Christ is not chosen of God. He does not authorize its use in his worship in any sense. It is chosen of man, and is used only because it seems to suit the fancy of some. It is, therefore, will worship or self-chosen worship, and is condemned in the Bible. The items of religious service prescribed in the Scriptures of the New Testament, which alone contains the Christian's law of worship, consisted in the following list: In reading the Scriptures. (Col. 4: 16; 1 Thess. 5: 27; 1 Tim. 4: 13.) In prayer to God. (Acts 3: 1; 1 Thess. 5: 27; 1 Tim. 2: 8.) In exhortation. They discoursed one with another. (1 Tim. 4: 13; Heb. 3: 18.) In partaking of the Lord's Supper. (Acts 20: 7; 1 Cor. 11: 17-34.) In the contribution, or fellowship. (Acts 2: 24; 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2.) In singing psalms, hymns, spiritual songs, making melody in the heart to the Lord. (Matt. 26: 30; 1 Cor. 14: 15; Eph. 5: 19; Col. 3: 16.) In praising God in song, as well as in other ways, they offered the fruit of their lips. (Heb. 13: 15.)

CAN WE ADD TO ANY OF THESE ITEMS WITH GOD'S PERMISSION OR CONSENT?

If we read or speak in an unknown tongue, we do not edify, says Paul, and the time is lost. If we do not pray with the spirit and with the understanding, it is vain; we ask amiss. We are under rule in regard to the collection and disbursement of the Lord's money. In the song service we are expressly commanded to *sing*, not play; to make the melody in the heart, not on an instrument. If we add the instrumental music to the song service of our worship, we are guilty of offending in one point; and upon the same ground we may change by adding to, or in any other way, either of the other items of worship, and so spoil the entire service, ruling God entirely out of his own house. *Better do all things according to the pattern shown to us in the Book.* Let us add nothing to it and take nothing from it, then God will be worshiped in spirit and in truth. This will honor him, respect his will, and save our souls in the end. But if we add to this plan by using instrumental music, we virtually say that God is not competent to arrange his own plans; that we know better what is required to please him than he knows himself; and in so doing we exalt our own judgment above the expressed judgment and will of God. We should remember that "God's ways are not our ways, neither are his thoughts our thoughts; for as the heaven is higher than the earth, so are God's thoughts higher than our thoughts, and his ways than our ways." (Isaiah.)

I wish now to call attention to the fact that we, as a people, have from the first of our distinctive work exalted New Testament authority in all things. We have taught the world the lesson of how to read the Bible to understand it. We have said from the first that the cross of Christ separates between the law and the gospel. I wish to quote upon this point from an older man than myself—one who has been identified with the work much longer and who is in every sense a representative man among us. I refer to Prof. O. A. Carr. He says: "While we have always been clear on the distinction between the religious appointments of the former ages and those under Christ, still some, in their effort to justify the organ in the church, have contended that the Psalms of David are authority in Christianity. This is most unfortunate. The very essence of our plea is: 'This is my beloved Son: *hear ye him.*' There could be no meaning in this if, after we do hear Jesus, we are at liberty to hear David or anybody, save Jesus, as our teacher. He has delivered his instructions through his chosen apostles and prophets. To hear them is to hear him, as Jesus himself said. We hear David only as Jesus presents David to us."

On the all sufficiency of the New Testament in all matters of faith, practice, worship, and duty I read the following passages, which I shall offer with but little comment. When our Lord promised to send the Holy Ghost to the apostles to inspire them, he said: "He shall

teach you all things." (John 14: 26.) Again: "He will guide you into all truth." (John 16: 13.) The New Testament contains the preaching of these apostles under the influence of the Spirit here promised. In this teaching, therefore, we have all things necessary for instruction in every item of faith and practice; but in all the apostles taught under the influence of the Holy Spirit they never once authorized the use of instrumental music in the church of Christ. Being guided by the Spirit into all truth and leaving the instrumental music out, it follows that it does not belong to the truth of the gospel. "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." (Rom. 10: 17.) "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." (Rom. 14: 23.) From the first of these references from the apostle we learn that nothing not clearly taught in the New Testament can be done in faith. Instrumental music being nowhere taught in the New Testament, cannot be used in the worship of the saints. If it cannot be used in faith, to use it is sinful, since "whatever is not of faith is sin." "We walk by faith, not by sight." (2 Cor. 5: 7.) "Without faith it is impossible to please him [God]." (Heb. 11: 6.) Having seen that no one can use instrumental music in the worship by faith, and seeing that it is by faith we walk, and that without faith we cannot please God, it follows that those who use the instrumental music do not please God in their worship. Christians must not go beyond what is written. (1 Cor. 4: 6, R. V.) He must not go on, but must abide in the doctrine of Christ. (2 John 9, R. V.) We must walk after the Spirit, not after the flesh. (Rom. 8: 1-6.) We must speak only as the oracles of God speak. (1 Pet. 4: 11.) Paul tells Titus to speak those things which become sound doctrine (Tit. 2: 1); and to Timothy he says: "What you have heard and seen in me, commit to others." Neither Timothy nor any one else ever heard Paul defending the use of instrumental music in the worship of the saints, nor did any one ever see him worship where it was used. Therefore the doctrine of those who undertake to defend it is neither sound nor apostolic. "According to his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness." (2 Pet. 1: 3.) If there were not another passage in the entire New Testament besides this one, it alone is sufficient to condemn as wrong and sinful anything not taught in the New Testament. We have seen already that instrumental music is nowhere authorized in the New Testament; therefore its use does not pertain to life and godliness, but to use it is wrong and sinful. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. 3: 16, 17.) We have already seen that that part of the Scriptures belonging to the child of God in the Christian age is the New Testament, and that the New Testament nowhere furnishes us with authority to use instrumental music in the worship of God. It follows, therefore, that to use it is not a good work; and if not a

good work, it is an evil work, and, therefore, sinful. God, to show his entire satisfaction with his will as expressed in the New Testament, just before he would have John close up the book, had him write: "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." (Rev. 22: 18, 19.)

In the light of these passages and in the face of such threats, how can any one afford to tamper with God's institutions, his methods, his plans, his systems of government by which he would control his people in all their work in his field? If God has a right to say whom we shall worship, he has the right to say when and how we shall worship. But some one will say: "This is not sufficient freedom. God's subjects should have some liberty." I answer: Herein is liberty and freedom in the true sense. If God allows me to choose my own way and method in which to serve him, then he puts a responsibility upon me which would place me in bondage. The responsibility would be too great for me. I can scarcely please myself; and I am sure I should not want the task of determining, weak and fallible as I am, just what God delights in as worship to his great name. Since God does not place such a burden upon me, but has plainly told me in his word just what I am to do to please him, I feel free, and not hampered. I shall stand, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ has made me free, and not become entangled in any yoke of bondage nor assume a responsibility I do not have to take. I have no desire whatever to share honors with God. If I, by a humble, trusting, and faithful obedience to him, am permitted to pass through the gates of the celestial city, I shall be satisfied. To reach this end I know that I must continue in the attitude of a servant, and not as one in authority. If it was the desire of the Lord and Master to do only the will of the Father (he said of himself he could do nothing; his meat was to do the Father's will, not his own; and all of this that he might please the Father and finish the work), surely it is no small thing for me to desire to do only those things that are pleasing in God's sight; and to do this I must walk by faith, and this is to walk in the light of the word. Whatsoever I do in word or deed, I must do all in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. (Col. 3: 17.)

I shall next offer some very plain and eminently scriptural objections to the use of instruments in the worship of God in the churches.

1. They always cause division in the congregation where they are introduced. Churches that would otherwise cooperate in the Lord's work will not, but stand apart, refusing to have fellowship with one another on account of the instrument. Even preachers in the church

of Christ who would but for the organ be friends and fellow-workers in the cause of the Lord are to-day enemies to each other. This is, indeed, a bad state of affairs; but there is no use to try to cover the facts.

2. They pander to the world and degrade the true worship of God, making the church service more like the theater than a place of spiritual worship. On this account people often go where they are used simply to be entertained.

3. They are made a test of fellowship by those who use them. They bring in the organ and say to all who oppose: "You get out if you cannot worship with the instrument. Submit to it or stay out. You cannot worship here without worshiping with the instrument." They have been known to lock the meetinghouse to keep those who oppose the organ from even going into the house for worship.

4. They cultivate choir singing. The whole congregation does not sing, because they cannot decently praise God in song. Congregational singing was the order in the days of the apostles. The instrument interferes with this privilege.

5. They make confusion by drowning the voice, so that you cannot always hear the words of the song; and so one of the scriptural objects of the singing is lost. Paul says we should teach one another when we sing. (Col. 3: 16.)

6. Their real use being to draw, to attract, makes their greatest value depend upon the improvements made by man. This calls for the best—and, of course, the costliest—machine. This is extravagance.

7. They cultivate an aristocracy in the church, contrary to the spirit of true Christianity. The poor often remain away on account of them.

8. They are earthly, sensual, and devilish. (James 3: 17.)

9. If they are good for one, they are good for all; and the more, the better. The more instruments we have, the better the service. Then each member should have one or more instruments; in fact, each one might have all he could use or play. This would, of course, produce more or less confusion. Yet I insist that nothing short of it is consistent.

10. If the instruments be used simply to draw, to attract, then why stop with the instrument? Why not open the flood gate and let in everything that may have this effect—the negro minstrel, for instance—a splendid attraction, indeed? Why not?

11. All of the reasons hitherto given for the use of the instrument are of the flesh and are for its satisfaction. Paul says that those who live after the flesh shall die. (Rom. 8: 13.)

12. Man is the author of the use of instrumental music in the worship. It came from the pope, not from God. Those who worship with it follow the traditions and doctrines of men. Christ says such worship is vain. (Matt. 15: 9.)

13. The purpose always in bringing the organ into the worship is

not to please God, but to please men. Paul says: "Do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ." (Gal. 1: 10.)

14. "By their fruits ye shall know them" are the words of Jesus. The fruits of the organ's history is enough to condemn it. It has certainly not been that of *goodness, gentleness, meekness, faith*. Its works are all of the flesh. (Read Gal. 5: 19-26.)

I wish now to make an argument on items of worship belonging to former dispensations and possibly transferred to succeeding ones. Every Bible reader understands that there are three dispensations taught in the Bible—the patriarchal, from Abel to Moses; the Jewish, from Moses to Christ; then the Christian, or gospel age, which is to last forever. When the priesthood was changed from the family to the national, there was a change also of the law; when the priesthood was changed from the Levitical to Christ, there was made also a change in the law. Suppose that in the last decade of the patriarchal age and the first few years of the Jewish age A, B, and C lived. They have been informed that a change in the law is soon to occur, and that some of the items of worship belonging to the patriarchal age may be transferred to the succeeding one. Each has a preference for certain items of their worship, and each one hopes that his preference will be respected; that the item he prefers will be transferred by Moses to the next dispensation. A is favorable to the prayer service of the then existing age, and hopes it may be transferred to the next. B is partial to the singing, then a part of their service; and he asks that this item be brought over. C is very much in love with the family order of the priesthood, and he is hoping there will be no change made in it. After the smoke of Sinai has cleared away, they find themselves in the new dispensation. A is rejoiced to find that prayer is again an item of worship, and B is made glad when he finds that he is again authorized to sing the praises of God; but C is sad when he knows that another order of priesthood is established, and that the family order is no longer legal—that it has been left behind with other items of an abrogated age. Though disappointed, he must content himself with the new order. Time rolls on. Fifteen hundred years have passed. Another change in the law is soon to take place. The harbinger announces the near approach of a new kingdom. Christ himself appears; and in view of the change soon to be made, when, instead of worshipping God in Jerusalem, God's people shall worship him in spirit and in truth, he says to his disciples: "Whatsoever ye bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." A, B, and C hear the words of Christ here uttered. Each one has in mind an item of worship belonging to the Jewish age; and, of course, each hopes that the item in which he takes the greatest delight will be transferred and bound in the Christian age. A prefers the prayer service; B is in favor of the sing-

ing; C says, "I have always been in love with the instrumental music which David employed in the worship and which he recommends to others. I certainly hope that the apostles will authorize its use in the worship of the Christian age."

That no mistake may occur in the work of the disciples, Christ promises to send them the Holy Ghost to guide them into all truth, thus making their work infallible. The day of Pentecost is fully come, and the Holy Spirit descends. The apostles begin the work of binding and loosing. A rushes in to see whether the altar of prayer has again been erected; and finding that it has, he devoutly thanks God for its privileges. B is wondering whether he may again praise God in song, when out upon the midnight air, ringing clear and distinct, he hears the sound of human voices. It is Paul and Silas singing praises to God in the jail at Philippi. So B is grateful and happy. His faith is strengthened by reading from Paul the admonition to sing with grace in the heart, to sing to make melody in the heart. But C—poor, unfortunate fellow!—he waits to the close of the sacred canon, to the last work of John, the revelator, on the isle of Patmos, to find that no mention is anywhere made of instrumental music in the worship of the saints. It was left behind with the burning of incense and burnt offerings of the law. If he reads anything about the use of instrumental music in worship, he must consult the Old Testament, the language of David; but the law under which David lived and worshiped is abrogated. So, disappointed, despondent, dejected, he turns from New Testament precept and example, saying: "I prefer David to Christ, anyway; and, therefore, I shall play the organ, anyhow; for David did it, and he was a man after God's own heart. So I am going to worship like David did, though it be not indorsed by Christ or practiced by the apostles."

C represents Brother Stark and all the "digressives" who quote David as authority on the items of worship belonging to the Christian dispensation. I challenge my brother to answer the argument, or even show a disposition to want to do so. Just as those Jews who turned from the national back to the family priesthood after Aaron was chosen were rebels in the sight of God, so those who to-day turn from New Testament authority to the psalms of David for their law in the churches of Christ are rebels in the sight of God; and except they repent, I fear it may not be well with them in the final day.

STARK'S FOURTH SPEECH.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My thirteenth argument is from John 14: 26: "*But the Comforter, . . . he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.*" Also John 16: 13: "*When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come.*" He shall speak what he has heard. From whom did he hear it? Did he hear it from Christ? The Spirit of Christ was in the prophets, and the Holy Spirit will speak in harmony with the Spirit of Christ. (1 Pet. 1: 10-12.) David was a prophet; and the Spirit of Christ was in him, and it testified the same things that were spoken by the apostles for us with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven. What the apostles indorsed was apostolic teaching. By the Holy Spirit they indorsed David and quoted him on the subject under consideration. Paul quotes Ps. 18: 49 in his Roman letter (Rom. 15: 9) and applies it to this dispensation. In that quotation he used the same word David used as given in the translation. Paul studied, and must have used it with David's meaning. David defined the word to sing with instrumental accompaniment. (Ps. 33: 1-3, and in other places.) Paul quotes from David what to do, and David explains how to do it. Thus the Holy Spirit refers back to David's teaching with a full indorsement. Can anything be plainer? Could the Holy Spirit more clearly teach the use of instruments in the praise of God? Again, David tells how we may sing "a new song:" "Upon a psaltery and an instrument of ten strings will I sing praises unto thee." (Ps. 144: 9.) In Ps. 92: 3; 98: 1-2 he clearly refers to the new dispensation, as also in Ps. 149, as I have shown. It is also prophesied in Isa. 42: 10, clearly referring to the new dispensation, when they will sing "a new song;" and David tells how, saying: "Let them do it with stringed instruments and organs." James also by the Holy Spirit said: "Is any among you merry? let them *psallo*"—sing a psalm. Hymns were used on melancholy occasions, for dirges, etc.; but psalms, with instrumental accompaniment, were used for praises, celebrations, exaltations. It was a hymn they sung at the last supper and at the Philippian jail. The scholarship of the world says hymns were for dirges and psalms for praise. You cannot have a psalm without an instrument. *Psallo* means to sing with instrumental accompaniment.

Paul by the Holy Spirit quotes from David, which gives the indorsement of the Holy Spirit to the things David said and David's definition, since they gave no change in the definition from the one David gave. It must have been the same as the one used and defined by the prophet. Thus the Holy Spirit by the mouth of James, an apostle of our Lord, said: "Let the merry sing with instrumental accompaniment." Psalms are for the merry; hymns, for the sorrowful.

My opponent says: "They shall not." Brother Lipscomb says: "They should not be fellowshipped in the church if they dare to *psallo*." Where are the men of faith? Not in that crowd. Could anything be more plain? I trow not. The Holy Spirit refers back to David's teaching with approval, and then, without any change of interpretation, uses the word *psallo*, which God's prophet defined to sing with instrumental accompaniment, and said to those being taught by the Holy Spirit: "Let them *psallo*." God could not make it plainer without repeating himself continually.

Again, Paul said by the Holy Spirit: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs." (Col. 3: 16.) The psalms here spoken of refer to the psalms of David, or to uninspired psalms, or else the passage has reference to the manner of rendering their song service. It cannot refer to uninspired psalms, as they are used for admonition, which is the first step in discipline, and they are now lost. If it referred to any psalm extant in composition, it must have been the psalms of David, the sweet singer. If to them it referred (and much of the pious scholarship of the world so hold), then the psalms of David are, by the authority of the Holy Spirit, to be used in teaching in the church of Jesus Christ, and are thus indorsed for teaching by the apostles with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven to guide them into all truth. If they are to be used for teaching on other subjects, why not also on the subject of praise? This indorsement of the psalms makes the teaching of the psalms the teaching of the Holy Spirit. All I have quoted from Psalms on the subject of praise is, therefore, the teaching of the Holy Spirit, which Jesus promised his apostles should guide them into all truth. Thus we have the authority of the Holy Spirit for using these psalms of David for teaching and admonishing the saints of the new dispensation. Could anything be clearer to the unprejudiced? It seems as if the discussion might close here. It certainly must unless my opponent takes the position that "psalms, hymns, and songs" refers to the manner of rendering the praise service. Certainly my brother ought to see, unless his brain is muddled by the foginess of some would-be leaders of a faction, who have neither the force of Luther, the brains of Calvin, the piety of Wesley, nor the force, brains, and piety of Campbell to place them in the lead of anything worthy to be led. Talk of debating without being able to make an argument or answer one! The fact is that there are

no arguments on that side, and the arguments on this side are unanswerable. In scriptural exegesis my brother has attempted none, for there is no scripture for his side. I have lived long enough to know the inwardness of this whole faction, which appeals to the close-fisted old fogies to foist themselves into the lead. Too bad! To the lead! It is the breeching they wear mostly; and to whatever this octopus fastens, it is dragged downward if their strength is sufficient, and the good name of every preacher who wishes to see the saints move forward in every good work is slandered, that they may lighten his influence for good. It has been so of Brother Meeks, of Henderson, and also of myself, publishing in the organ of their heresy slanderous reports, made out of whole cloth, casting all denials into the wastebasket. "Ichabod" is written against them and their purposes and foul means.

My fourteenth argument is from 2 Tim. 2: 15: "*Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.*" This has been a favorite text among our people, and we have based our argument upon the type of the golden candlestick in the sanctuary of the temple at Jerusalem, which is claimed as a type of the church. This, we have argued, represents the word of God, by which the church is fully lighted, getting no light from without. As proof of this we have gone to Zechariah 4, where in a vision the prophet saw the candlestick with seven branches, with two olive trees, one standing on either side thereof; and the question between him and the angel was as to what it meant, and the angel said: "This is the word of the Lord unto Zerubbabel." This Zerubbabel was claimed to be a representative of the church of Jesus Christ, and the candlestick is the word of the Lord to the church of the Messiah in its completeness. The two olive trees, which supply the oil for the lights, are declared to be the two anointed ones which stand before the Lord of the whole earth, which would be the authors of the Old and New Testaments, who furnish the materials for the lights in the sanctuary, or church, of God. The division of the candlestick represents the division of the word—the Old Testament—into history, law, and prophecy. History covers the past, laws are for the present, and prophecy refers to the future. This history was the history of God's people according to the flesh, from the beginning down to the coming of the Messiah; the law was for the government of his people till its work was fulfilled; the prophecies were for the instruction of God's people according to the flesh in righteousness and duties pertaining to their wellbeing till the promised King should be seated on the heavenly throne. The four evangelists, in their biography of Jesus, make the center pedestal upon which the middle lamp was supported, and to which were attached the three on either side. As those on the one side represent the lights of the Old Testament, so those on this side represent the lights of the New Testament. The book of Acts is the history of the beginning of God's

spiritual people, the Epistles contain the law to that people, and the prophecy concerning them and the second coming of their Savior is found largely in the book of Revelation.

In the foregoing I have not misrepresented the view of our people as preached by our brethren in Christ. This candlestick, with its lamps, was placed in the sanctuary of the temple, which was the type of the church; and in this division I am in harmony with my brethren. It takes the light of the seven branches to give the light of life to the saints of the Most High, and all are needed for that purpose. There is not a preacher who does not go back to the Old Testament to find examples and cases of divine acceptance and judgments of God upon the ungodly. Indeed, upon every subject, except that of praise, is God's will and character sought from the writings of the Old Testament, not once supposing that what was once acceptable to an unchanging God would now be condemned, when he had given no hint of any change in the divine mind. Even the most persistent hobby riders will go to Amos 6, and, by a most faulty exegesis, seek to find condemnation of instrumental music from the Old Testament; but when they find it is in favor of their use, like all the other scriptures, it is set aside for being in the Old Testament. Brother Lipscomb uses it to prove God's displeasure, but denies the Old Testament when it tells of God's approval of such music. Did I not know the waywardness and stubbornness of the human will, I would think the heart of a man so strangely inconsistent as black as the lower regions.

Note that the author of the booklet I have so often referred to finds his text in Deuteronomy, where God says nothing shall be added to or taken from the law God has commanded, and then himself adds a law which God has not spoken, saying, "Thou shalt not have any instrument of music in the temple of God," and makes this law of his own a test of fellowship among brethren. Thus that sect is built on Christ and Lipscomb—mostly Lipscomb, who takes from the book God has given as a light to his church the books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Psalms.

Jesus speaks of "the law, the prophets, and the psalms." In all our preaching we all go to them on all subjects, except that of praise. The Old Testament has always been considered a part of the candlestick. After this division of the word, what authority have any for going into the sanctuary and blowing out half the light God has placed there, because, forsooth, it shines too brilliantly against their hobby, showing the deformity of their unauthorized fogyism? If the Old Testament is good authority in its examples of faith and trustful obedience and of the judgments of God against the disobedience of Nadab, Abihu, and others, why is it not equally as good in its examples of acceptable praise? But it is said that if instruments of music are admitted, then sacrifice, infant baptism, polygamy, etc., will demand admission. Does that mean we must reject things authorized for fear things un-

authorized will come in? Could any one find a tittle of the argument for infant baptism I have already presented on this subject, I would adopt it in an hour. Let God be true, no matter what the consequences. No fear but it will be right.

Let me suggest that none in the division of the word claim the prophets are a part of the law that is done away. Paul, in Heb. 9, tells what is done away, and explains that the priesthood being changed, there must of necessity be a change of the law; that Christ having once purged our sins, sacrifice is no longer needed. But since God has not made them parallel, what authority has any man for saying music and polygamy are parallel in the divine mind? What monstrosities these "antis" are in assertions! Have they never learned that the law written and engraven on stones could be done away without any infringement upon the prophets? Talk about division of the word, when we know not the difference between the law, the prophets, and the psalms! Who told them so many things they assert without a shadow of proof? Assertion seems their prominent characteristic and scriptural exegesis the exception. It is a fact that they have not one passage of scripture to "exegete" on. Nothing in the world to practice on! I never knew one to bring out a single passage from the Old Testament or the New for proof, except Amos 6: 1-4; and a Sunday-school boy twelve years old could but see that passage approved instrumental music. Some consider my brother considerable of a "blow," but I will not consent for him to blow out half the lights in God's sanctuary. Thus from the New Testament I have sustained the authority of the Old Testament on this subject. What shall I need more? None doubt but the Psalms teach us to use musical instruments in the Lord's sanctuary. Is not that sufficient?

My fifteenth argument is from Eph. 5: 19: "Speaking to yourselves [others] in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord." Notice, this is not worship, but teaching. Here are three words used by the apostle. Each has a different meaning in Paul's mind, since he makes a clear distinction between them. In 1 Thess. 5: 23 he says: "I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless." Can any doubt but there was a distinction between "soul" and "spirit" in the mind of Paul? So in the connection of psalms, hymns, and songs in this passage, none can doubt that there was an unequivocal distinction between a song, a hymn, and a psalm. What is that distinction? "*Song* is from *odee*—an ode, a poem, a song; chiefly lyric," is Pickering's definition. Grove defines it: "A song, ode, verse." *Hymn* is from *humnos*—a hymn, a song. Pickering defines *humnos*: "A hymn; a song in honor of God. or a song of heroes; a dirge; a melancholy strain—one not sung to the charming music of the lyre." It is a melancholy song without instrumental accompaniment—a dirge sung by the human voice alone. It means a song hummed by the human voice. To sing it with instru-

mental accompaniment makes an ode a psalm. You cannot have a psalm without an instrument. "Take a psalm," says David, "and bring hither the timbrel, the pleasant psaltery, and the harp." This tells how a psalm is rendered and how we make a joyful noise unto the God of Jacob. Would we sing a dirge, we would hum it, as Pickering defines it; but if we would come into his presence with joy, we will come with an instrument of music. To take a psalm we must have instrumental accompaniment to the voice in singing to the God of Jacob. No definition could be more lucid. It is God's definition of a psalm and how to sing it, just as he defines baptism as a burial. (Rom. 6: 1-3.) All words used in heavenly teaching are so clearly defined there need be no mistake. Take faith. It is the evidence—conviction—of things not seen. Repentance is also set forth as a reformation of life. So to sing is clearly defined: "Sing praise upon the harp to our God." Whatever God tells us to do, he tells us how to do it, and somewhere in his revelation he gives an example of how it is done. Thus the word "psalm" is fully explained by the Spirit of Christ in David, the prophet, who spoke as moved by the Holy Spirit. Hear him: "Praise the Lord with harp: psalmo unto him with the psaltery and an instrument of ten strings." (Ps. 33: 2.) Here God defines "sing," and says it is done upon an instrument. Again: "I will also praise thee with the psaltery: . . . unto thee will I psalmo with the harp." (Ps. 71: 22.) Here the same word occurs as is used by Paul, and is defined as being done with instruments of music. It is God's definition of the word we are after. Has he not clearly defined it? Paul read both the Hebrew and the Greek translations. *Psalmo* in the Greek was a translation of *zamar* in the Hebrew, and by the translators of the text they have the meaning of *zamar* to *psalmo*. All this twaddle about modern Greek is thus cut off. Paul knew the meaning of both; and when he used *psalmo*, he used the word which is translated *zamar*, which always meant to play with an instrument or to sing with instrumental accompaniment. Gesenius, in his Hebrew-English Lexicon, says: "*Zamar*—to touch; to strike the chords of an instrument. Hence, to sing; to chant, as accompanying an instrument, to or in honor of a person; to celebrate." Paul must have used *psalmo* with the scriptural meaning before him, for he held David as divine authority and his writing as "scripture given by inspiration of God." Such an inspired definition of *psalmo* ought to end the controversy; with all men of faith it will. You can find nothing stronger in the Bible on baptism. It is the Holy Spirit in Paul indorsing the "Spirit of Christ" in David, which Peter says taught the same things by the prophets as are taught by the apostles with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven. (1 Pet. 1: 11.) To reject the teaching of the prophets is to reject the Holy Spirit's testimony by the apostles. Must we defend God's word at every step in this discussion? I always thought my brethren believed the word of God, but I begin to doubt it. Paul says we shall speak to "others" with psalms

as well as hymns and songs, and God defines a psalm as singing with instrumental accompaniment.

To make this doubly sure, I wrote to the professors of Greek and Hebrew in both Eureka College and Drake University, not knowing how they were or on which side of this controversy they stood, and was answered by Alvin E. Evans, of Eureka, Ill., and Dr. Clinton Lockhart, of Des Moines, Ia. I did not ask for their opinion, but for the best authorities from the college libraries upon this subject. Their answers are not the opinions of cranks on a hobby they are riding, but they give the profound study of the best scholarship. Their answers are harmonious, giving reference to the same authorities. I will publish what they find in their own language, after giving a careful study of the best scholarship, which, I think, will offset the dogmatism of Brother Lard and the unauthorized assertions of Brother McGarvey:

"DES MOINES, IA., September 20, 1903.

"J. Carroll Stark, McMinnville, Tenn.

"DEAR BROTHER: Answering your questions concerning the Greek and Hebrew word for 'sing' and 'play,' I beg to submit the following:

"Question 1: 'Can you tell me the passages in the Septuagint where *psalmo* occurs and the Hebrew of which it is a translation and the definition of the same?'

"Answer: In the following passages *psalmo* is a translation of *zamar*, which means to play an instrument or to sing with instrumental accompaniment: Jud. 5: 3; 2 Sam. 22: 50; Ps. 7: 17; 9: 2, 11; 18: 49; 21: 13; 27: 6; 30: 4, 12; 33: 2; 47: 6 (four times), 7; 57: 8, 9; 59: 17; 61: 8; 66: 2, 4 (twice); 68: 4, 32; 71: 22, 23 (tells how); 75: 9; 98: 4, 5; 101: 1; 104: 33; 108: 1, 2; 105: 2; 135: 3; 138: 1; 144: 9; 146: 2; 147: 7; 149: 3; 92: 1. To play is a translation of *nagan*, which means to strike strings, to play on an instrument, but does not mean to sing. (1 Sam. 16: 16, 17, 23; 19: 9; 2 Kings 3: 15; Ps. 33: 3—second verb.) [A careful study of this will explain the meaning of *psalmo* better than Sophocles or McGarvey.—STARK.]

"Question 2: 'What are the meanings of the following Hebrew words from the best Hebrew lexicons?'

"*Shir* everywhere means simply to sing, to chant. The noun from *shir* and *shirah* means a song, a hymn. The finite verb meaning simply to sing is nowhere translated *psalmo*, but the participle once (Ps. 68: 25) is so translated. *Zama*, found only in the piel form *zimir*, means to touch the chords of an instrument, to play, to sing with an instrument, and, when done in honor of some person, to celebrate.

"Question 3: 'What words in the Greek and Hebrew are used which are translated *sing* in the following passages?'

"1 Chron. 16: 9: First verb—Hebrew, *shir*; Greek, *acido* (imperative, *atsati*). Second verb—Hebrew, *zamar*; Greek, *hymneo*.

"Ps. 149: 1: Hebrew, *shir*; Greek, *aeido*. In verse 3—Hebrew, *zamir*; Greek, *psallo*.

"Ps. 147: 7: First verb, *anah* (meaning to chant, to sing, to speak, to answer). Second verb—Hebrew, *zamir*; Greek, *psallo*.

"Ps. 108: 1: First verb, *shir* and *aiedo*; second verb, *zamar* and *psallo*.

"Ps. 98: 4: Hebrew, *ranan* and *zamar*; Greek, *aeido* and *psallo*.

"Question 4: "Take a psalm." What word is used in the following for *psalm*?"

"Ps. 81: 1: Hebrew, *zimrah*; Greek, *psalmos*.

"Ps. 95: 2: The same.

"Question 5: 'Please give me standard authorities on *psallo*—the best.'

"There are none better than the following, which I quote in full:

"Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon (Seventh Edition, revised): '*Psallo*—to touch sharply; to pluck, twitch, pull; to pluck the hair; especially of the bowstring, to twang it, to send a shaft twanging from a bow. A carpenter's line is twitched and then suddenly let go. Mostly of the strings of a musical instrument, to play a stringed instrument with the fingers, and not a plectrum; later, to sing to a harp. (Septuagint—Ps. 7: 17; 9: 11; Eph. 5: 19; 1 Cor. 14: 15.) In the passive of the instrument to be struck or played, to be played to on the harp.'

"Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (the latest and largest New Testament lexicon in the English language): '*Psallo*—from *psao*, to rub, wipe; to handle, touch; to pluck off, pull out the hair; to cause to vibrate by touching; to twang; especially to touch or strike the chord; to twang the strings of a musical instrument; to play the harp, etc. Septuagint, for *niggan*, piel form of *nagan*, and much oftener for *zumner*, piel form of *zamar*—to sing to the music of the harp.'

"Robinson's New Testament Greek Lexicon (next to Thayer in the estimation of most scholars): '*Psallo*—to impel, to touch, to strike, to touch or strike the chords, to play on a stringed instrument simply as an accompaniment to the voice.'

"Pickering's Greek Lexicon: '*Psallo*—to touch gently; to touch or play on a stringed instrument; to cause to vibrate; to play; celebrate with hymns; to pull or pluck, as the hair.'

"Donnegan's Greek Lexicon: '*Psallo*—to touch and cause to move or cause to vibrate; to touch, as the string of a bow, and thus discharge an arrow, or the strings of a musical instrument, and play (with cithara understood); to play on the harp.'

"Harper's Latin Lexicon (the best in use in this country) defines *psallo* as transferred from Greek to Latin—'in general, to play upon a stringed instrument; especially to play upon the cithara; to sing to the cithara. In particular, in ecclesiastical Latin, to sing the psalms of David.'

"Webster's International Dictionary (the latest and largest) defines *psalm*, from *psallo*—'to pull, twitch; to play upon a stringed instrument; to sing to the harp.'

"Funk and Wagnalls' Standard Dictionary (latest edition) in the same way defines *psallo*—'to play a stringed instrument.'

"Expositor's Bible (one of the latest large commentaries) on Eph. 5: 19: 'Tindly writes: "Singing and playing,' says the apostle; for music aided song; voice and instruments blended in His praise whose glory claims the tribute of all creatures; but it was the heart, even more than with the voice or tuneless strains, that melody was made."

"Meyer's Commentary on Eph. 5: 19: 'Properly, *psalmos* (which originally meant the making of the cithara sound) is a song in general—and that, indeed, as sung to a stringed instrument; but in the New Testament the character of the psalm is determined by the Old Testament (so called) preëminently. This means that psalms in the New Testament means the same as psalms in the Old Testament.'

"Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges (an extensive and recent commentary) says on Eph. 5: 19 (note by H. G. C. Moule): "Making melody"—literally, playing instruments (*psalloutcs*, *psalm*). This seems to assume the use of lute or flute on such occasions. Both the voice and instruments were literal and external on such occasions; but the use of them both were to be spiritual, and so in the heart.'

"Alford's Greek New Testament on Eph. 5: 19 quotes in Greek and approves the words of Gregory Nissenus (A.D. 370): 'The psalm is a musical term when it is struck upon the instrument according to musical words.' He also quotes approvingly from Migne: 'Psalm is the melody of the musical instrument.' He translates *psallo* in this passage 'playing.'

"Bishop Ellicott's Commentary on 1 Cor. 14: 15, though holding that *psallo* 'here probably is used without any reference to an instrument,' still defines the term 'properly to touch the chords of the lyre with the fingers.'

"Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, article 'Hymn,' distinguishing psalms and hymns as used by Paul, says: '*Psalmos* is, properly, a song with musical accompaniment, and doubtless includes the Old Testament psalms. *Hymnos*—a song in praise of God or of famous men, as in Acts 2: 24-30.'

"Young's Analytical Concordance defines *psalmos*: 'A song of praise (on an instrument).' Also in the article 'Melody' this work defines *psallo* for Eph. 5: 19 'to play on a stringed instrument.'

"Question 6: 'With Sophocles' Greek Lexicon before you, what references to scripture does he make in his definition of *psallo*, and what reference does he make to its use in the classics, and what is his standing as a lexicographer in the schools?'

"The following is Sophocles' article on '*Psallo*' in full *verbatim*: '*Psallo*—to chant, to sing religious hymns. (Septuagint—Jud. 5: 3;

Paul, 1 Cor. 14: 15; James 5: 13; Laod, 15; Pallad Laus, 1082; A. Leout Cypr., 1688; D. Stud, 1713, B.)

"You will note that in the Bible he refers only to the Septuagint once—Jud. 5: 3; to the New Testament twice—1 Cor. 14: 15; James 5: 13. This is a very meager reference list, and it does not at all do the Septuagint justice either in definition or reference. The reason, doubtless, is that the period of Greek literature for which Sophocles gives the meaning of words does not extend back beyond B.C. 146; and the Septuagint was made previous to that time, completed by B.C. 170, or possibly a little later. Sophocles is not strictly an authority on the Septuagint. This very fact discounts his definition of New Testament words, since he does not take adequate account of the fact that New Testament writers used in a large measure Septuagint words in Septuagint senses, which was natural, because the Septuagint was their Bible, and, like us, they ought to use Bible words with Bible meanings. On this account Sophocles is not nearly so good on New Testament words as Thayer or Robinson; for while the New Testament was but a fragment of Sophocles' study, it was the special field of the other two; and, therefore, the New Testament received by them a far better treatment.

"I trust in the above I have with some measure of carefulness answered your questions. Since I observe that your inquiries point chiefly to the meaning of *psallo* in the Septuagint and New Testament, it may be appropriate to point out briefly the method by which unbiased scholarship must determine the significance of this word. In the Septuagint the meaning is assured by two considerations. (1) The classic use of the word before the time of the Septuagint was limited to the idea of touching, striking, or twanging some kind of instrument, whether with or without the human voice. (2) Numerous passages in the Septuagint in which instruments are mentioned in connection with the word clearly demonstrate that the older meaning is still retained; and, while not always are the instruments specified, yet the word is not used in passages in which instruments may not have been employed. In the New Testament the following considerations must be duly weighed: (1) The New Testament writers certainly used the Septuagint as their common Bible, and must have followed very largely the uses of Septuagint words. (2) If there were no apparent influences to change the meaning of this word before the days of the apostles, reason requires that it be understood as in previous times, and we do not know of any such influences; but, rather, since in Jerusalem and in the cities throughout Palestine, where synagogues could be maintained, the harp and other instruments to which the word usually applies were cheap and easily available in synagogue worship, the influence must have favored the retention of the old meaning. (3) The account of worship in the church as given in the New Testament, while it does not specify the use of instruments, does not forbid them,

does not suggest anything inconsistent with them or exclusive of them; but, rather, by the imitation in church worship of that followed in the synagogue, it is implied that the same principles obtain. (4) The context of the word in the New Testament passages is not unfavorable to its original meaning, and hence New Testament usage does not require a new definition of the term. (5) In one passage the word is clearly used in the sense of playing on an instrument, and the heart is the instrument mentioned. (Eph. 5: 19.) While this establishes Paul's use of the word in the older sense, the mention of the harp does not exclude the use of ordinary instruments, seeing their music is not subversive of heart melody; and this is proved by the steadfastness and devotion of the heart in connection with the use of *psallo* in the Psalms (9: 1, 2; 27: 6, 8; 57: 7; 105: 2, 3; 108: 1; 138: 1). The idea of the instrument being thus established in Paul's usage of the word in one place, it cannot be successfully denied in other New Testament passages.

"Question 7: 'What are your degrees from educational schools?'

"My degrees are A.B. and A.M. from Kentucky University and Ph.D. from Yale University. My present position is professor of Semitic and biblical literature, Drake University; author of 'Principles of Interpretation' and two other works, 'History of Interpretation' and 'Messianic Prophecy,' almost ready for the press.

"Trusting all this may to some extent serve the cause of Christian scholarship, I remain, Sincerely and cordially,

"CLINTON LOCKHART."

The above does not seem to harmonize with Brother Lipscomb's statement that no man of scholarship has ever connected *psallo* with instrumental music. The fact is that no man of scholarship has failed to do so except Sophocles, and his failure shows him to be a crank on that subject.

I will also give the study of Alvin E. Evans, professor of Greek and Hebrew in Eureka College, which will be read with interest by those who delight more in truth than hobbies:

"EUREKA, ILL., May 6, 1903.

"My Dear Brother:

"I judge from your last note that I must have misunderstood your previous letter. You spoke of sending a book, the last chapters of which you wished me to read particularly and let you know what I thought of it in connection, as I supposed, with the words which you wished me to define. I had been waiting for the book to arrive in order to comply with your request.

"I quoted to you the definition of *psallo* from Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon (unabridged), Eighth Edition. This is recog-

nized authority the world over for classic Greek. All others, as you mention, except Grove and Pickering, have yielded to it in the schools. The best authority for New Testament Greek is Thayer's New Testament Greek Lexicon, translated, revised, and enlarged from the German edition of Grimm's Wilkes' 'Clavis Novi Testamenti.' These are the authoritative works, so far as dictionaries go. Thayer, recently deceased, was professor of New Testament Greek in Harvard University.

"The Greek word for *psalms* in Eph. 5: 19 is *psalmois*—a noun in the dative case formed from the verb *psallo*. 'Singing and making melody'—*atdoutes kai psalloutes*.

"In Ps. 98: 5; 147: 7, *psallate* (aorist imperative of *psallo*) is used in the Septuagint Version. The Hebrew word is *zamar*. In the latter passage two Hebrew words are used—*anah* and *zamar*.

"*Psallo*, an extended form of *psao*—to touch, rub lightly, wipe, rub smooth; from root *psa*—(1) to touch sharply; to pluck, pull, twitch; to pluck the hair. Especially of the bowstring, to twang it. (2) Mostly of the string of musical instruments; to play a stringed instrument with the fingers. Later, to sing to a harp. (Ps. 7: 17; 9: 11.) In passive, of the instrument to be struck or played and of persons to be played to on the harp.'

"This is complete from Liddell and Scott. You will notice how this dictionary interprets *psallo* in the psalms above referred to.

"The following is from Thayer's New Testament Greek Lexicon: '*Psallo*—to pluck off, to pull out, to cause to vibrate by touching, to twang, to play on a stringed instrument, to play the harp; Hebrew, *zamar*.' No other meaning is here given.

"T. K. Abbott, formerly professor of biblical Greek, now of Hebrew, Trinity College, Dublin, in the International Critical Commentary, says: '*Psallo*—the plucking of the strings—is used by classical writers to mean the sound of the harp, and hence any strain of music. It occurs frequently in the Septuagint, not always of sacred music—e. g., 1 Sam. 16: 18, of young David playing on the harp.'

"W. T. Davidson, in Hastings' Bible Dictionary, says: 'The usual name for Greek *psalmos*, in Hebrew *urizmor*, by its derivation indicates that which is to be sung to a musical accompaniment, and in practice is used only of religious song. *Psalmos* properly is a song to the accompaniment of a stringed instrument.'

"G. T. Moore, now of Harvard University, in the International Critical Commentary, says: '*Zamar*—*psallo*, to sing with the voice or lyre.'

"Gesenius is the best Hebrew authority at present: '*Zamar*—to play on the harp, to chord; hence, to celebrate. *Anah*—to cry or shout, to sing.'

"I may have omitted something you would have had discussed, but will hasten this off. There is no scholar that takes the position you

suggest—that *psallo* is not connected with and refers not to instrumental music.

"I shall be glad if I have been of some slight service to you.

"Very truly yours, ALVIN E. EVANS."

Having thus given undisputable evidence of the meaning of Paul's language, can there be any doubt that the Holy Spirit of the New Testament did fully indorse the Spirit of Christ in the prophets of the Old Testament in their teaching of how we shall praise God in his sanctuary, the church of Jesus Christ? In this argument I have found the scholarship of the world, the Holy Spirit in the apostles, and the Spirit of Christ in the prophets to all harmonize in teaching the use of instrumental music in the praise of God in his temple, the church of Jesus Christ.

I would suggest that in the convocation of God's people the Lord designed their coming together to cultivate love and sympathy and to cultivate the most tender emotions and greatest harmony. Such was the design of the meetings of Israel in their weekly and yearly convocations, and such is the design under the Christian dispensation. They come together, not for crucifixion and disgust, to be humiliated with every performance, but for exaltation and "joy in the Holy Spirit." All their meetings should be orderly and rapturous, and the highest culture and the most pleasing associations should be sought. The teaching should be the most concise and convincing; the speaking, the most trained; the greeting, the most cordial; the welcome, the most friendly; the singing, the most cultivated and entrancing, that all the meetings of the saints may be of the most rapturous and joyfully remembered.

The Spirit of Christ in David said, "Make a joyful noise unto the God of Jacob" when you sing; and the Holy Spirit in Paul said: "Make melody in the heart to the Lord." It is no place for jars and discords. One may go a while to triumph over the sects and to hear the denominations whipped, but he will soon tire of it and find no pleasure in the house of the Lord. To keep us there and to hold the young under the restraints of the gospel and the aged under the benign influence of the purity, piety, and sweetness of the Spirit of Christ, everything in the service should be harmonious, melodious, exalting, entrancing, ennobling, and full of rejoicing. The house should be clean and beautified; the light should be mellowed by stained glass; the paper and painting should be properly blended, as God paints the rainbow for human delight; the speaking should be tender and touching; as well as instructive; buttercups and daisies and roses and pinks and forget-me-nots, the beautiful, etc., should be placed in all places conspicuous; and the singing in the song service should be such as made the temple of old to the Jews a place of delight. But there is no command for all this, and the Holy Spirit did not teach it on Pentecost—

nay, verily; it was left as a freewill offering to the house of the Lord; and if attended to, how much better would be the attendance of those within and without! In our present regime some old fossil gets up and starts the tune in his nose and grates it off to the words:

"We speak of the realms of the blest,
That country so bright and so fair,
And oft are its glories confessed;
But what must it be to be there?"

The dear Lord deliver us! Then let the elder get up and give the faithful an hour's lecture on those who are absent and tell us not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together, and then take the *bottle* and give thanks. I do not wonder the house of the Lord is the place of martyrdom for many. I am glad I have found God does not demand it, but permits us to sing his praise in strains melodious that will make melody in our hearts to the Lord. You may preach to the people to come and be crucified; but when you go in with your sanctimonious face, you will find the crowd will not be there. When people are disgusted, the whole effort to improve them is wasted. You cannot build up a church that way.

To build up his school and get the students out at the morning hour for worship Brother Freed puts a whole orchestra into the chapel, and they all come out and join in the praises, and are better all the day for it. Why can he not see it in the church? Things must be in accord. If any lead in prayer, they should lead well; he who preaches should preach well; and the singing should be such as God ordained in his temple, that all things should "*be done decently and in order.*" Whatever God touches is beautiful, from the rainbow in the clouds to the up-jump-johnnies on the hillside; and when he arranged the song service of his temple, it was entrancing.

Here I am willing to rest the argument. If any one will not accept the plain teaching of the sacred oracles I have given, he would not believe though one arose from the dead. Of such we might say: "Ephraim is joined to his idols; let him alone." Other proof I could give, but no other proof is needed. Here we close the argument.

How different are my opponents from Paul, who, in his defense, did not set aside the law and the prophets, as do my "anti" brethren, but said: "After the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and the prophets!" These say: "Believing nothing written in the law or the prophets."

Leaving my arguments, I will now refer to some of the follies of that side. They say God has given a prescribed form of worship to which we must comply, and instrumental music is not in the form prescribed. This form they find scattered through the Bible in say-

ings as follows: "Praying always with all prayer." This puts prayer into the prescribed form. "Singing and making melody"—placing singing into the form. But we have shown that this singing, etc., includes instrumental music. What right have they to assume that this refers to the human voice only, when all authorities are against them, as I have clearly demonstrated? "Forsake not the assembling of yourselves," etc., gives church meetings in the form. "This do in remembrance of me" puts in the Lord's Supper. "Go, . . . preach the gospel" puts that into the form of worship. "Exhort one another" makes exhortation a form of worship. Has the world a parallel in teaching? They also mention such other sayings as may suit their desires. This they call the order of worship prescribed. If to "pray always" means only in the congregation, how do they apply this "only" to congregational worship alone? Should we exhort each other to love and good works only when assembled? Do we sing praises only when we meet? Is not the same singing enjoined in the home circle as in the assembly? Have we no praise for God in our homes—"upon our beds," etc.? Can you expunge instrumental praise from the great assembly and permit it in the home gathering? Or do you sing to the devil all the week and to God only on Sunday an hour at church, and then go home and with the neighbors join in songs after dinner with instrumental music? Do we preach only in the sanctuary of the Most High or, like Paul, from house to house? Was his gospel preaching different from house to house than when in the church—the assembly—as their singing is declared to be? For these dear brethren all delight in instruments in the home worship, if singing is worship. If to sing is worship in the church, it is worship at home or in a jail, wherever they sing. This is a cheap way of sustaining a stubbornness unpardonable as in King Saul with the Amalekites. They claim singing is worship when done in the assembly, but out of the assembly it is not. Is a child of God out of the church when out of the assembly of the saints? Is a man in the temple of God when at home or in his closet? Will one kind of praise be accepted in one place and not in the other? The idea that a saint may play an instrument, sing to it, dance, revel, etc., at his home, but cannot do it in the assembly, is preposterous; and that he worships nowhere but when the saints are gathered comes from the enemy of souls. If from the heart I sing spiritual songs out of the assembly, it is an act of worship as much as when done in the assembly. Why should it not be? But God has prescribed no form of worship. Worship has no form, and can have none, any more than there is a form to love. God is love, and you cannot make an image of him. Is it a form of love when the child climbs into its mother's lap, nestles into her arms, and lays its head upon her neck contentedly? If so, the child, to love, must have that form, and no other. Change the form, and you change the thing itself. Is it not, rather, an act of love spring-

ing from the soul within? The act is not love, or whoever imitates the act must love. When a mother puts her arms around her child and looks down deeply into its eyes and covers its cheeks with kisses, is that a form of love? If that is a form of love, the other is not. Love cannot have a multitude of forms, but it may be shown by innumerable acts. Kisses are not love, else Joab loved Abner when he smote him. They are no forms of love. They are acts of love when hot; but cold, they are like cold griddle cakes. You can have no form of love. Like worship, it is an emotion. You can have no form of an emotion. Both love and worship are of the heart, in the spirit; and when there is an overflow, it is known by the act it produces; but the act may be hypocritical, with no love or worship. Make a set form for these emotions, and the power is gone. The spontaneous acts of love are but the bursting of the overflowing heart into life, which would become monotonous if one is drilled to do them. The outcroppings are in no two alike, but from the outcroppings we judge of the heart's emotions. We might as well talk of a form of sorrow or of joy as to talk of a form of worship. Prayer is not worship, else the Pharisee worshiped in the temple. It is not a form of worship, but the worshipful will surely pray. Worship is of the soul. It is an emotion; and it, like every emotion, will be shown by acts. Hate, pity, veneration, admiration, gratitude, adoration, etc., belong to the emotional. You may have acts of any, but you can have no form of either; and the acts may be various, but a form can be single only. When David was filled with gratitude, veneration, adoration, admiration of the highest order, he would "take a psalm" and call for the "harp and the psaltery," by which he would touch every feeling into life and love and beauty, and sing: "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge." (Read Ps. 19; also read Ps. 23 and others.) When the same feeling filled the soul of Jude, who could not sing like David, he expressed the worship of his heart in words equally sublime: "Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Savior, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and forever. Amen."

These were not forms of worship, but the outbursts of the soul the most devout and worshipful. The Bible speaks of no form of worship, but speaks of duties to be performed, such as praying, singing, exhorting, assembling, preaching, giving, etc.; but none of these are called "worship," though any might come from worship if done from the heart for the love of God. The distinction between worship and service is clearly drawn in passages many. Service is not worship, but all unselfish services comes from the worship of the soul. There may be a set form of service, but there can be no set form of worship. Praise is not worship; but we praise that which we worship, and that

praise may indicate the worship of the soul. Praise may have a form by which it is rendered in speech or song or strains musical. God says of some: "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men." This does not call the teaching of human commandments "worship," but says that your heart's adoration will all be in vain if you teach the commandment of men, saying, "Thou shalt not have an organ in my sanctuary—a command which God has not given.

Again, we read: "The people worshiped God, but served idols." Their worship was not accepted, yet it was distinct from their service. There can be no law of worship—no form laid down. Worship is in the soul, and breaks out in songs, in ascriptions, in praise, in service, in contributions, in sacrifice, in honor of Him we adore, and for the glory of his name.

Again, it is said that instrumental music is fleshly and belongs to the works of the flesh. Paul catalogues the works of the flesh (Gal. 5: 19-21) as "adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revelings, and such like." These are the works of the flesh. Who said David's strains on musical instruments in praise of God were like these things Paul here enumerates—like drunkenness, idolatry, incest, etc.? Some men are so wise above what is written? When the sweet singer touched the harp into the most pleasant minstrelsies and sung, "Praise the Lord, for he is good: and his mercy endureth forever;" or, "The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want;" or, "Sing unto the Lord a new song, and his praise in the congregation of saints," and such songs as the devout of all ages have loved to repeat, do they tell us it was like adultery, fornication, idolatry, etc.? It is strange what liberties some men take with things hallowed. No wonder they make David a devil and tell us he antagonized God all his life. That such minstrelsy is the fruit of the highest cultured spirituality is demonstrated from the facts, as we have shown, that when the minstrel the prophet called for played the harp, the Spirit of the Lord came upon the prophet, and he gave the three kings a most wonderful prophecy. When the orchestra at the dedication of the temple, composed of all manner of stringed instruments, pipes, and one hundred and twenty trumpets, accompanied the voice of the singers, with one sound to be heard, the glory of the Lord filled the house. I have also noticed other cases, as the changing of Saul into another man. When wrath, malice, hatred, strife, etc., as Paul enumerated the works of the flesh, filled King Saul with an evil spirit and by intrigue he sought the life of David, the sound of the harp of the shepherd boy drove the evil spirit from him. The "antis" are filled with wrath toward their brethren, envy of the popularity of other papers, sedition, strife, and heresy, building another church on a foundation of their own, and denouncing societies, where

saints unite to send the gospel to the world, in which the contributors meet once a year to talk over the matters and see if the board, the secretary, and the treasurer have carried out the wishes of those who contribute. They then get up a society of their own, where the board, the secretary, and the treasurer are all represented by a man—one man of their own—who is responsible to nobody, as in the case of their missionary work. No wonder they are doing nothing in that work but blocking the wheels of those who would do something. Their attempt is naught but a farce—a disgrace to our brotherhood in the South. If with their sedition, strife, variance, etc., rankling in the soul, they could but hear some David play and sing God's praise with instrumental strains, as did King Saul of yore, I think it would cast the devil out and change their work so fleshly to greater spirituality. Could they be made to see there is more that is fleshly and carnal in their seditions, variance, and strife, a thousand times, than in our God-appointed music, it would be well.

WARLICK'S FOURTH REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am no little surprised at my brother in the way he proceeds in his fourth speech. No doubt you are almost, if not altogether, astonished at him; and I am sure those who read the discussion will be made to wonder why he makes no reply at all, not even so much as a reference, to my third speech. Now I wish to say in all candor that when my good brother claims entire honesty in what he maintains, and when he says with the confidence of one who seems certain that he has established any part of his proposition, he will excuse me if I say I seriously doubt him and declare that I believe that he knows he has failed. He certainly knows that I thoroughly exposed his exegesis of the passages from the books of Chronicles, showing at the dedication of the temple that he did not even tell the truth about when and where the instrumental music was; that from a correct translation of the passages, as shown by Adam Clarke, whom I quoted in full, David, and not God, made the instruments of music; and that God by Amos pronounced a woe against David for it. On his passages from the Psalms I showed that none of them referred in any way to us; that when he went to the psalms of David for the Christian's rule of worship, he betrayed a lack of knowledge of how to divide the truth, and logically forced himself to accept the consequences of his argument, and, therefore, go with the Methodists to practice infant baptism, with all the evils therewith associated; for David certainly brought infants into the church, as he did musical instruments into the service. Does he imagine that people who think will excuse him when he passes all this in silence, and repeats the bare, baseless, unscriptural, if not infidel, assertion: "I have demonstrated that instrumental music may be used in the worship by the authority of the Most High?" I know he has done no such thing; you know it; and I believe he knows it, too.

In my third speech I exposed the nonsense and ridiculous absurdity of his position on the word "saint," declaring, as he does, that it refers only to New Testament people. This is an important point he emphasizes in his book, although what he says is really silly. I took it up and showed him his error. By his silence in his next speech he confesses that he is wrong on the point, and yet he has not the courage to confess it. Can a man who thus deals with argument hope to command the respect of any constituency? Why, he really is a bias-

phemer. Only those who, like my brother, have lost all respect for the word of God and for his people—if, indeed, they ever had any—have a heart to use such language as: “*Be ducked or be damned.*” Does he ask us to be affected at his show of regard for God’s word until he repents of such wickedness and prays God for pardon, making amends for such infidelity? His plea for mercy and cry for sympathy because of his age is a worthless plea. The fact that he is old and has been in the church so long makes his slanders against God’s word and his people all the worse for him. It might be excusable in a young man like myself, but with him it will be thought next to unreasonable. “*Be ducked or be damned!*” This is the devil’s thunder used against the people of God, and a professed friend who borrows and uses it forfeits all just right to any claim of respect from Christians. But this is the spirit of “digressivism.” Those who have drunken deeply into that fountain and have become leaders among them really seem to take delight in making fun of God’s word. In conscience I am almost prepared to say that their leaders are but another school of infidelity. If my opponent was competent in other ways, he would stand in their front ranks; for he is certainly not wanting in their chiefest characteristic. If what he says in this debate be an index to what is in his heart, I verily believe that he would rejoice to see the pure word of God cast down to the ground again, the saints once more destroyed, and all mankind left to human wisdom as a guide in all religious practice.

My good brother’s argument from the candlestick vision of Zech. 4 is about as clear as mud. It is even too silly to be allowed in such speeches as he makes. I wonder if he does not know that the prophets of the New Testament are entirely distinct from the prophets of the Old Testament. When he says that any part of the Old Testament not quoted and particularly emphasized in the New Testament is in *any sense whatever* a law for the members of the church of Christ, he should not be excused; for he certainly knows better. The truth is that those passages of the New Testament which are quoted from the Old Testament are authority in the work and worship of the church only for the reason that we find them in the New, and not because they were in the Old. The fact that they were in the Old Testament does not add to their authority with us one particle. This distinction has been held out prominently by our people from the first of our work in the reformation until the digressive spirit started among us, giving shape to a new sect, whose chief purpose seems to be to slander God, dethrone Christ, and blaspheme the worthy name by which God’s saints are called. They heap unto themselves teachers, having itching ears; they turn away their ears from the truth, and return unto fables. Replying to what Brother Stark says about the psalms being no part of the law that was done away, I call attention to the following scriptures: “Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods?” (John 10: 34.) “Ye are gods”

can be found nowhere, only in the psalms of David, and Jesus said it was law—your law. “The people answered him, We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth forever.” (John 12: 34.) “Christ abideth forever” is found in the psalms of David, and the people said it was the law. “But this cometh to pass, that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their law, They hated me without a cause.” (John 15: 25.) “They hated me without a cause” can be found nowhere only in the psalms of David. Christ calls the psalms “your law” and “their law,” and the people called it “the law;” and Paul said the law was taken out of the way and nailed to the cross.

Because the preacher in preaching the gospel sometimes quotes from the Old Testament simply to show what has been God’s method of dealing with men in all ages, it is not to be concluded that he thinks the old law is still in force, and that the whole thing is indorsed and of authority in the church to-day. Paul quoted from heathen poets. Does my brother think Paul, therefore, indorsed those poets as authority for the worship in churches of Jesus Christ? Pshaw! Brother Stark, is it possible that you cannot see how ridiculous you make yourself? My brother thinks if Paul quoted David as authority on any one thing, by so doing he indorsed and advised the churches to use instrumental music in their worship just because David used it. Why stop at the instrument? If to quote a passage from David means that David’s teaching on other matters nowhere mentioned in the New Testament is authority in the church to-day, it means also that all things whatsoever David taught and practiced must be done by Christians in the church of Christ; and this, as I have shown, commands us to burn incense, bring babies into the church, and practice polygamy; for David taught and practiced all these. My brother asks: “Why quote David as authority on one thing and refuse to indorse him as authority for praise in the church of Christ?” I insist that he answer his own question and tell us why he quotes David as authority for the practice of instrumental music in the worship, but refuses to take David as authority on the burning of incense, infant church membership, and the practice of polygamy? Shall I have to repeat this exposure another time before my brother can see his predicament, or does he see it already, but for a want of self-respect he will chew the same old rag over and over again and again?

Much of what my brother says in regard to having everything clean, decent, and in order when we meet for worship is good; I recommend the advice to even himself and his brethren; but when he says that those who do not use the instruments in worship and who do not worship God by machiney are starving to death and driving the people away from the service, he speaks that which he does not know and testifies to that which he has never seen, unless he has lived always in the backwoods, where the people are not used to having organs in their homes. In such places the organ may draw the people.

To a number of persons J. S. Meyers, a "digressive" pastor of Fort Worth, Texas, wrote the following question, which was published with the answers. The question is self-explanatory. I give it with the answers as published in the Dallas News of April 27, 1903:

"QUESTION.

"What change ought the church to make in its worship and methods of work in order to be more attractive to and better meet the needs of the people?"

"ANSWERS.

"Banker: 'I know of no better change to be made than to go back to the old-fashioned gospel preaching. I am not a believer in the modern method of lecturing in the pulpit instead of sermonizing.'

"Educator: 'Paul said to Timothy: "Preach the word."'

"Attorney: 'Teach more old-fashioned, pure religion from the Bible only, with less playing to the galleries. Let those charged with teaching religion tell the truth, regardless of consequences.'

"Business Man: 'Out of a large experience in church work and many years of observation I have reached the conclusion that there is nothing that will draw a larger crowd more regularly than the old Jerusalem gospel. "Christ, and him crucified," is a greater attraction to the average citizen than all the *choirs, stereopticon lectures, and special features that you can introduce*. The people know enough, but they must be impressed with the value of doing; and even music and special entertainments are not likely to work upon the heart. Social features to hold the young, special entertainments without pay, congregational singing, and the plain gospel will bring a crowd.'

"Minister: 'The methods of work in the church should be so changed in worship as to enlist every member in the service—first, by *congregational singing*; secondly, by responsive teachings of the Scriptures; thirdly, by having at least four persons to lead in short prayers.'

"Physician: 'Simplify its forms and modes. Impress upon members the unchristianity of snobbery and exclusiveness. Simplicity in all things, and less style.'

"Government Official: 'Do away with church refrigerators. Bring members and people closer together—not as to conduct, but let the church touch the world on all sides. In worship, *less of form* and more of consecrated effort. Raise the service to a point of usefulness.'

"College President: '*Lay aside so much formality*.'

"Lawyer: 'Make every poor man and his children feel at home in church work, and do not constantly urge that in one form or another they must pay for it in money. This they cannot do.'

This testimony is sufficient to show that the people are rapidly growing tired of the formality with which much of the worship of modern times is burdened. The people are starving to death spiritually, and

are crying out for a return to the ancient order of things. When all human devices and devilish practices are expunged from the worship, interest in the worship will be restored, and the people will be regarded as being really in earnest; for the religion of our God will be, as at the first, a real spiritual life, and not show and pomp. When these conditions return, those who worship will worship in spirit and in truth. Then there will be no instrumental music in the service; but, according to the New Testament pattern, the music feature of the worship will be *singing*, not playing on a man-made machine in giving praises to our God.

I come now to my brother's weak, childish, silly, and extremely ridiculous argument on Eph. 5: 19 and the meaning of the Greek word *psallo*. Those who know anything about the matter know too much and have too much pride to ever hint at such an idea as that *psallo* in the New Testament has the meaning of to sing with the musical instrument. As J. W. McGarvey says, only the smatterers in Greek ever say such things. I have never seen one yet who would even quote their own authorities correctly. I shall show this to be true of the two little fellows whose letters our brother gives us. I have examined the books to which they refer, and will declare they have misrepresented the authors. My brother, not knowing but what they have told the truth, has accepted what they say, puts their bare, unsupported statements into his speech, and then exclaims: "*This is what the scholarship of the world says!*" Two little school-teachers, who are either too ignorant to handle their own books or else not honest enough to state the facts! I have in my library some of the lexicons and other books from which these would-be scholars quote, and I went to the public library of Dallas, Texas, and examined others; hence I here declare that they have not correctly represented a single author to whom they refer. In Liddell and Scott's Lexicon the meanings of *psallo* are many. Primarily, it means "to pluck, to twang." The thing plucked may be the hair. If my brother should insist upon this definition, I wonder how he would have bald-headed men obey the command to *psallo*. The thing twanged may be a bowstring. I wonder if my brother wants this definition. If so, then the savage Indians used to *psallo* more than any others. In this way they *psalloed*; and this, I suppose, was praising God. The twanging may be a carpenter's line or plumber's cord, when the line was chalked, pulled back, and then turned loose so as to make a mark. I wonder if this is to praise God, too. It is as much as to use a musical instrument in the New Testament worship, where the word means to sing religious songs, and not to play on an instrument.

I shall now give you Thayer's definition of *psallo*. This is the best New Testament lexicon extant. Even the two little school-teachers from whom my brother quotes admit this. Of this I might boast if the witnesses showed any signs of competency to judge of such mat-

ters. After saying about what he is represented as saying, in giving the meaning of the word in the classics, he gives the New Testament definition as follows: "In the New Testament, to sing a hymn; to celebrate the praise of God in song." Not even a hint at a musical instrument in his New Testament meaning! Dr. Thayer translates the Greek phrase in 1 Cor. 14: 15 with a comment as follows: "I will sing God's praises, indeed, with my whole soul stirred and borne away by the Holy Spirit; but I will also follow reason as my guide, so that what I sing may be understood alike by myself and the listeners." Now I ask: Did these two little school-teachers know better than what they say? If they did, they ought to be ashamed of themselves for imposing as they have upon my unsuspecting brother; and if they do not know better, then our good brother is left in the lurch, for these two little weaklings are his only dependence. He quotes no others. Poor man! I am sorry for him, but he should not be so easily deceived.

Robinson's Greek Lexicon gives a definition of *psalmos*: "In the New Testament, a psalm, a song in praise of God." Why, in reason's name, did the little fellows cut this out?

Green's Lexicon defines *psallo*, "In the New Testament, to sing praises," giving passages in the New Testament where the word occurs. *Psalmos*, in the New Testament, he defines: "A sacred song, psalm." There is no musical instrument here. Greenfield says the same.

Bagster's Lexicon defines *psallo*: "In the New Testament, to sing praises." He then gives references in the New Testament where the word occurs. *Psalmos*: "In the New Testament, a sacred song, psalm."

The truth is that the lexicons all agree that the New Testament meaning of the word is to sing, and that without the instrument. Prof. E. A. Sophocles, who examined all the Greek literature from a period before Christ of one hundred and fifty years down to more than a thousand years this side, did not find the instrument idea in a single passage. The only meaning he found to the word was: "To chant, to sing religious hymns." In the face of such evidence as this, the man who says that *psallo*, in the New Testament, ever means to use a musical instrument is to be pitied rather than censured. He is really so ignorant that we ought to feel sorry for him.

I want to expose some more of the misquoting and misrepresenting of authors that I find in the letters of the two little school-teachers referred to. I regret to say that I find them incorrect in every quotation I have examined.

Webster's International Dictionary, to which one of them refers, defines *psalm*: "A sacred song, a poetical composition for use in the praise or worship of God; to extol in psalms; to sing—as, psalming his praise." No instrument in this!

Funk and Wagnalls' Standard Dictionary, another book to which they refer, defines *psalm*: "To celebrate, extol, or praise with psalms,

songs, or hymns; to sing psalms." *Psalmody* they define: "The use of psalms or hymns of praise in divine worship; psalm singing." No instrument in this!

Why do our little teachers leave these definitions out? The answer is easy. But Brother Stark is deceived, just the same. I suggest, my brother, that you get at least one dictionary and read it, and do not depend altogether upon the bare statements of incompetent men.

But I must proceed with this exposure. In the definition of *psalmody* the Standard Dictionary says: "The art, act, or practice of singing psalms, hymns, as a part of worship; to hymn, celebrate in psalms." In this definition they show to find no difference in the religious significance between psalms and hymns. This will expose Brother Stark's effort to find a distinction between *hymno* (hymn) and *psallo* (sing) as found in the New Testament. So he is wrong here, just as he is on everything else.

I will now read from Harper's Latin Lexicon, which is also misrepresented. In his ecclesiastical definition he defines *psallo*: "To sing the psalms of David. (1 Cor. 14: 15)." Under his general definition he gives no reference to the Bible. *Psalmos* he defines: "A psalm, the psalms of David." He does not mention the instrument.

Is it not strange that these two astute gentlemen deliberately leave out of their quotations the author's definition of the word where it relates to the very matter upon which information is sought—that is, the New Testament meaning of the word *psallo*? Stranger still it appears to be when they do it in every case. Take Young's Analytical Concordance: In it we find the very opposite of what they represent. Young defines: "(1) Psalm (when it means to sing)—a song of praise, *zamar* (1 Chron. 16: 9; Ps. 105: 2); (2) to sing songs of praise, *psallo* (James 5: 13)."

Meyer's "Commentary" is also not correctly represented. On Eph. 5: 19 he says: "*Psalmos* (which originally means making the cithara sound) is a song in general—and that, indeed, as sung to a musical instrument; but in the New Testament the character of the psalm is determined by the psalms of the Old Testament (so called)." In commenting on 1 Cor. 14: 15; James 5: 13, speaking of the two words *hymns* and *psalms*, he says: "According to Harless, the two words are not different as regards their contents; but *psalmos* is the expression of the spiritual song for the Jewish Christian; *hymnoie*, for the Gentile Christian."

So it turns out that Brother Stark's evidence in favor of the absolutely false statement, upon which he is deceived, of course—to wit, "The scholarship of the world is all on my side of the question"—is based upon two letters from two little school-teachers, who are either not competent to read their own authors or else they are too dishonest to deserve the respect of anybody. I make this statement, of course, supposing that Brother Stark did not deceive them in his letter of

inquiry. Since he does not publish his letter to them, of course I cannot be certain as to this. I wish now to state that which everybody competent to judge of such matters knows is true, and that is that the scholarship of the world stands unanimously opposed to my brother's idea of the New Testament meaning of *psallo*. Not one scholar will support his foolish claim. His being deceived in this matter is no excuse for him. The facts are too easily obtained. He can know them if he will. The truth is that no such idea was ever dreamed of until recently. The discovery was made then by drowning men, who catch at straws. Seeing that evidence as found in the New Testament is against them, they think to add to the plain word of God, and such addition is made between the lines.

I wish next to read from different translations of the New Testament. I wish to see if any one of them even hints at the musical instrument in connection with the translation of the word *psallo*. The word occurs five times in the New Testament, all in the following passages: Rom. 15: 9; 1 Cor. 14: 15 (twice); Eph. 5: 19; James 5: 13. It is not necessary to read all the references. One will be sufficient. Take Eph. 5: 19 as an example. If the instrument be in the word itself, surely we shall find it in some translation of a passage in which it occurs. All know the instrument is not in the King-James Version; so we pass that and examine the Revised Version. I read: "Speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord." Living Oracles: "Speaking to one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord." Green's Two-fold New Testament: "Speaking to each other in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and tuneful with your heart to the Lord." Wesley's New Testament: "Speaking to each other in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your hearts unto the Lord." Emphatic Diaglot: "Speaking to one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making music in your hearts to the Lord." Catholic Translation: "Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual canticles, singing and making melody in your hearts to the Lord." Bible Union (Baptist): "Speaking to one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord." Syriac New Testament (Murdock): "Converse with yourselves in psalms and hymns, and with your hearts sing to the Lord in spiritual songs." Anderson's Translation: "Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord." This is sufficient to show that to sing, and not to play, is the New Testament meaning of *psallo*. He who talks otherwise is without excuse.

Having seen that the lexicons, commentaries, translations, and, in fact, all standard works, are a unit in cutting out the instrumental-

music idea as the New Testament meaning of *psallo*, I wish now to add the testimony of some of our purest, wisest, and best scholars. I do this, not because I think the books from which I have quoted need such support; I do it to stop the mouths of gainsayers. Some little smatterer in Greek has published the statement that *psallo* in the New Testament means to sing with instrumental accompaniment; and every little, two-by-four, one-gallused, sore-toed, spiritual-quack of a "digressive" preacher has swallowed the falsehood, and they are singing it all over the land where they go doing their malicious and wicked work. I hope in this way to assist in putting the foolish and ungodly men to silence.

I quote first from O. A. Carr, in a letter to myself under date of January 31, 1898: "As in the Old Testament the word *circumcision* was used to mean that which was outward in the flesh, but in the New Testament the very same word is used in contrast with its Old Testament use and refers to that which takes place in the heart, so the word *psallo* in the old covenant—literally, to twang, or pluck a string—got to mean to play a musical instrument, designating the instrumental accompaniment; but in the New Testament the very same word is used in contrast with its Old Testament use and refers to that which takes place in the heart."

In the Bible Index of March, 1893, Robert Beatty said: "When Jesus orders how a thing is to be done, by that order he forbids all else. The Spirit said, 'In psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, . . . with grace in your hearts' (Col. 3: 16); and, 'Offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually'—that is, the fruit of our lips (Heb. 13: 15). This orders the singing to be done by making melody in our hearts, and is to be done by our lips, and not on a musical instrument, which has neither heart, spirit, understanding, nor lips."

In a letter under date of December 1, 1903, to J. W. Perkins, W. H. Krutzing said: "*Psallo* includes a musical instrument, except when used with the dative of person. When used with dative of person, it means to sing a song or psalm without an instrument. It is used five times in the New Testament, and does not include a musical instrument a single time."

"HENDERSON, TENN., May 27, 1903.

"Elder Hall L. Calhoun, Cambridge, Mass.

"DEAR BROTHER: Is there anything in the meaning of *psallo* and *psalmos*, as used in the New Testament, to authorize the use of instrumental music in worship?
Faithfully, A. G. FREED."

Calhoun's answer: "I think not."

I wish to read two letters from that very cautious and humble man of God, I. B. Grubbs. To J. W. Perkins, under date of March 18, 1893, he wrote:

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

The second letter is as follows, dated September 17, 1903:

"J. S. Dunn, Midlothian, Texas.

"BROTHER DUNN: Your letter of the 10th came a day or two since. You ask about the meaning of the Greek word *psallo*. Your question is: 'Can we get instrumental music from this word?' It is only ignorance that would lead any one to think that, as used in the New Testament, this word countenances the use of instruments in Christian worship. While the word originally meant to strike, or twang the strings of a musical instrument, it had, like many terms, outgrown this original sense, and cannot have this meaning in the New Testament. What sense would be conveyed by the expression: 'Play on instruments in your hearts to the Lord?' Or what meaning could be gathered from the direction: 'Speaking to yourselves in twanging the strings of an instrument?' (Eph. 5: 19.) The use of the word first applied to playing on an instrument, then to singing with an instrument accompaniment, then finally the composition that had been so accompanied. David's poetical compositions are properly called 'psalms;' and the singing of these in the synagogue, *where instrumental music was never used*, was properly called 'psalming.' In singing psalms, when we speak of the psalms of David, we have no thought whatever of musical instruments. What sense would there be in speaking of the instrumental *twangs of David*? If Paul directed that musical instruments be used in the worship, how came it to pass that he and all primitive Christians utterly ignored the requirement?

"Yours most fraternally, I. B. GRUBBS."

Philip S. Fall to Briney, in the Apostolic Times, said: "We have said from the start that the organ advocates have utterly failed to prove that *psallo* represents an instrument that was used in public apostolic worship; and, besides, 'singing and making melody in your heart' is not singing in a harp or making melody in a harp."

In a letter to J. S. Dunn in 1893 M. C. Kurfees said: "Sophocles and Thayer, in their lexicons, show clearly that in the New Testament *psallo* never had a meaning that will allow the use of a musical instrument. They define the word for this period by terms that not only leave the instrument out, but actually exclude the instrument."

Next I shall read the testimony of J. W. McGarvey in three letters.

"RUNGE, TEXAS, June 3, 1897.

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

McGarvey replied as follows:

"G. W. Bonham.

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

"Fraternally, J. W. MCGARVEY."

In the Christian Standard of 1895, page 1149, in answer to a query in regard to instrumental music in the church, McGarvey said: "If any man who is a preacher says that the apostle teaches the use of instrumental music in the church by enjoining the singing of psalms, he is one of those smatterers in Greek who can believe anything he wishes to believe."

The following is a letter to W. M. Thurman:

"LEXINGTON, KY., March 18, 1903.

"DEAR BROTHER: Answering yours of the 9th, no scholar has ever taken the position that the singing of psalms requires the use of a musical instrument. It would be as easy to show that the Greek word for baptism requires sprinkling. A few men among us who are over-zealous for the organ have so argued, but they are not sustained by real scholars. Fraternal yours, J. W. MCGARVEY."

W. B. F. Treat, in the Christian Leader of February 28, 1893, said: "As an evidence of the entire absence of trouble about the meaning of *psallo* in New Testament Greek, I refer to the fact that in the great nonsectarian lexicon of Sophocles, which intends to give the translation of the Greek language from the translation of the LXX. to the close of the Byzantine period (which includes all the Greek of Christ, his apostles, and of the patristic writings), we have no intimation of the use of stringed instruments. He simply defines *psallo*: 'To chant, to sing religious hymns.' The idea of instrumental music in connection with *psallo* does not occur to the mind of this great student in his examination of the literature of the entire Greek period of church history. That he is both honest and competent goes without saying."

I shall close this line of evidence with the testimony of the sainted F. G. Allen: "The lexicons are uniform, so far as our observations extend, in giving 'pluck, pull, twang'—as twanging a bowstring or carpenter's line to make a mark; plucking the hair, beard, the strings of a musical instrument, and the like; hence to play a stringed instrument with the fingers, etc.—as meanings of *psallo*. . . . Whatever *psallo* means must be present whenever the word is used. *Psallo* as frequently used when playing on a musical instrument is wholly absent. Therefore, playing on a musical instrument is not the meaning of *psallo*. . . . *Psallo*, unqualifiedly, does not mean to sing at all. It is just as destitute of singing as *baptidzo* is of water, and is equally as destitute of playing on a musical instrument as either one. It simply means to pluck or its equivalent; and whether this plucking is of the beard, the hair, the bowstring, the strings of a musical instrument, or something else, must be determined by other words, and not by *psallo*. It determines nothing as to that, no more than *baptidzo* determines the subject and element of baptism. The associated ideas of *psallo* are given by lexicographers just as they are of *baptidzo*; and if we accept them in that case, we are under absolute obligation to accept them in this. Now, what does *psallize* mean? To play on an instrument? No. No scholar will say unqualifiedly that it does. It means to pluck. It may mean to pluck a harp; it may

not. Whether this or that is *psallized* must be determined by qualifying words. The qualifying word shows *the instrument used in playing*. If you *psallize* with the *harp*, that is the instrument; if you *psallize* with the *heart*, that is the instrument; if you *psallize* with the *spirit*, that is the instrument. Therefore these were the instruments on which the Corinthians and Ephesians *psallized*. When one instrument is named, another is not meant; nor can either be in *psallizing* unless it is named, since it is not in *psallo*. When baptism is said to be with water, you cannot put in fire also, for the *water puts it out*. Just so when *psallizing* is said to be with the heart, you cannot put in the harp; and this is the only kind of *psallizing* found in the New Testament. Under the ritualism of the law, *psallizing* was with musical instruments when done in the praise of God; but now in contradistinction to that, it is to be done in the spirit, the heart, the understanding. There is no instrument in the word, as every 'scholar' knows, and none mentioned in the New Testament but those *internal* ones whose harmonious chords are to be struck to the praise of Almighty God. So far as singing is concerned, that is commanded in other words; and so far as *psallizing* is concerned, that is to be done *in the heart*. In addition to the foregoing, I append all the passages in the New Testament where *psallo* and *psalms* occur. Rom. 15: 9: 'I will confess to thee among the Gentiles, and sing [*psallo*] unto thy name.' 1 Cor. 14: 15: 'I will sing [*psallo*] with the spirit, and I will sing [*psallo*] with the understanding also.' Eph. 5: 19: 'Speaking to yourselves in psalms [*psalms*] and hymns and spiritual songs, singing [*aidoutes*] and making melody [*psalloutes*] in your heart to the Lord.' James 5: 13: 'Is any merry? let him sing psalms [*psal-eto*].' Luke 20: 42: 'And David himself saith in the book of Psalms [*psalmoon*].' Luke 34: 44: 'All things . . . written . . . in psalms [*psalmois*], concerning me.' Acts 1: 20: 'For it is written in the book of Psalms [*psalmoon*].' Acts 13: 33: 'As it is also written in the second psalm [*psalmo*].' 1 Cor. 14: 26: 'When ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm [*psalmon*].' Col. 3: 16: 'Teaching and admonishing one another in psalms [*psalmois*],' etc." (Old Path Guide, May, 1880.)

Before I pass from the word *psallo* I shall show up some of my brother's amusing self-contradictions. You have observed that throughout his entire argument on *psallo* he has maintained that the instrument is resident in the word itself. He says: "You cannot have a psalm without the instrument." Of course every one knows this statement to be absolutely wrong. The truth is that the instrument is not in the word at all. *Psallo* means "to pluck, to twang;" and it is hardly supposable that a man would need a musical instrument of any kind, and especially not an organ, with which to pluck his hair or to twang a bowstring; and yet he would need the organ for such a purpose fully as much as we need it for worship in the church of Christ.

This is the plainest nonsense, and yet it is just like my brother's argument throughout. Indeed, it is the best he has to offer us for argument. Let us go to the Psalms of David, where the word *psallo* is often used, and see whether our brother's statement has any semblance of truth in it. Take two of my brother's main passages. Ps. 81: 1, 2: "Sing aloud unto God our strength: make a joyful noise unto the God of Jacob. Take a psalm, and bring hither the timbrel, the pleasant harp with the psaltery." Here the psalm is first commanded to be taken, and then the instruments are commanded to be brought. Is my brother so blind as that he cannot see that the psalm is one thing and the musical instruments another; that the instruments are no part of the psalm? Take Ps. 98: 4-6: "Make a joyful noise unto the Lord, all the earth: make a loud noise, and rejoice, and sing praise. Sing unto the Lord with the harp; with the harp, and the voice of a psalm. With trumpets and sound of cornet make a joyful noise before the Lord, the King." The man who cannot see that the psalm in this passage is distinct from the instruments was born blind in one eye and has lost the sight of the other. He is not to be otherwise excused for such stupidity.

Other passages might be given; but these are sufficient to show that when Brother Stark says that you do not have a psalm without the instrument, he is as far from the truth as the Pharisees were when they said that Jesus Christ cast out devils by Beelzebub. I will affirm, with all emphasis, that the instrument is never resident in the word *psallo*, but that where the instrument may be used in connection with it they must always be expressed in language which cannot be misunderstood. David knew this; and hence when he would have the instrument used, he always said so. David was not such a fool as to say, "Take a psalm," meaning by the word to use the instrument, and then repeat by saying, "Bring the instrument also," as if any fool would not know that he intended that the instrument be used when he said, "Take a psalm," and that, therefore, he need not repeat it. I am prepared to show by Brother Stark's own words that he, too, knows this is true, and that he evidently did not mean what he said when he declared: "You cannot have a psalm without the instrument." He has repeated a number of times the very incorrect statement that David defines *psallo* to sing with the instrument. This we have already seen to be false. But I ask: Why does he refer only to those passages in his effort to prove this where the instrument is always mentioned? How does it happen that he never refers to places in the Psalms where David said, "Sing," but says nothing about an instrument? Is the instrument not in these passages also? It is if what he maintains has any truth in it. Ah, my brother knows that the instrument is not even thought of except where it is actually mentioned; and, therefore, he does not think of it, either, except in the passages where it is clearly expressed, being spelled plainly in so many

letters. Can my good brother account for this trap in which he is now caught? But I am not done with him on this. It is really funny to me to debate this question with my excited and angered friend. Brother Stark never refers to those passages in the Septuagint where the instrument is not mentioned, thus showing that he cannot find the instrument except where it is specifically expressed in plain words. Now it turns out that the word *psallo* occurs five times in the New Testament; and it is translated to sing, never to play. Indeed, the instrument is not even hinted at in either of the five passages where we have *psallo* in the New Testament. Now we maintain that Brother Stark, in his handling of the Septuagint on this word, convicts himself with knowing that the instrument is not in the word, and that it must be clearly expressed if used at all. Does he reply by repeating what he has affirmed and say: "I have said you cannot have a psalm without an instrument, and I shall stick to this statement?" Well, we shall see. On page 480 of Brother Stark's book I find the following statement: "Under the New Testament we are taught to praise God, but are not told how. We know not what would be acceptable praise until taught, and could come to no harmonious understanding or practice without such teaching. Where in the New Testament are we taught what is acceptable praise? Echo repeats the question. So also are we told to sing; but where are we told how to sing? That must be learned from the things written aforetime." There, you have it! We now have the good brother jumping both ways. In one breath he declares that the instrument is always in the word, whether expressed or not; in the next breath he affirms that this statement is false, and that though the word *psallo* does occur five times in the New Testament translated "sing," from its use here you cannot tell how to do what it says. Now, my brother, which one of these contradictory statements is correct? Which one of them tells what you really think about the matter? Or is it not a fact that you are inclined to be somewhat reckless and given to the habit of saying just anything that may happen to come into your mind when caught in a close place? Were you the country school-teacher of whom we have so often heard who said he could teach it "either round or flat, just according to the district?" Surely my brother, "thou art the man."

I really feel sorry to have to subject my good Brother Stark to such shameful expositions as this, but he only is to blame for his predicament. He once knew the truth and stood upon it, but in the short time of only two weeks' study he was induced to deny the plain word of God and give heed to seducing spirits—a call from a New York church. Now a man of so much caution and of so great an amount of precision and deliberate thought as to require the long time of two weeks (think of it—*fourteen long days!*) in which to change his mind upon so grave and important a matter as the subject under discussion, must not complain when his blunders and self-contradictions

are shown to him in after years. He took the two weeks in which to study the subject, and only two; and this after he received the call, he himself declares on page 475 of his book. My brother, let me beg you to return from your wayward course. You are not long for this world. You cannot afford to miss the promises. Then, why will you not cease to pervert the right way of the Lord? Let me exhort you to repent of your wickedness and pray God that the evil thoughts of your heart now held against God and his people may be forgiven you. May I hope that you will some day return to the "old paths, and walk therein?" I think, however, that it will require a longer time than two weeks for one whose heart, like yours, is so filled with hatred for the word of the Lord and with envy toward his people to make up his mind to return to the right way. I think it took the prodigal son longer to come to himself and return to his father's house than was required to depart from the old home. I suppose that he, too, thought he had a lucrative call to some city or town in the distance; and I think he took as much as fourteen days in which to study the matter before going. I think his going and what was afterwards said and written of him "was the result of that study."

I wish next to pay some respects to my brother's silly twaddle about the difference between worship and service. I exposed him on this in a former speech; but he pays no attention to what I showed to be the facts, and repeats what he had said before, just as if he thought he was right. Affirming, as he does, a false proposition, he seems to think that he must deny the truth on everything in an effort to defend it. To discuss with a man who will have no regard at all for facts, the testimony of authors, or regard for the word of the Lord is not so unpleasant; but it sometimes grows a little monotonous. Of course every one—except Brother Stark, perhaps—knows that in its relation to our duty to God worship is service and service is worship. To take part in the service when the saints meet for worship is to take part in the worship. This is so obvious it would seem to be a foolish thing to intimate anything to the contrary; but since my good Brother Stark thinks when we meet for worship on the Lord's day it would not be correct to say that we have come out to the service, I shall take some pains to explain. The schoolboy who could not understand that six times five is thirty and that five times six is thirty also was considered dull. His teacher was patient, however, and I shall try to be with Brother Stark. Webster defines *worship* as follows: "To perform acts of adoration; to perform religious service." Now, my good brother, can you read plain English? Mr. Webster defines *service* as follows: "That which God requires of man—worship, obedience." Can you understand this, my brother? Surely you can. Then do not be guilty any more of making yourself ridiculous by offering such silly nonsense for argument. It is true that all service is not worship; one may be compelled to serve another out of fear of pun-

ishment; but all worship is service. God commands us to sing. When we obey the command, we serve God. When we sing praises to God, we worship him. In serving or worshipping God under the law, the Jews were required to kill the animal and offer it as sacrifice to God; but this does not say that every time they killed a beast for any purpose they were in the act of worshipping God.

Brother Stark thinks that because Brother Freed worships God in song, every song sung anywhere must be in worship to God. So he says the singing done in song practice in the college is worship. He also says that if we sing with the instrument at home we worship with it there. If we do, it would be vain worship. The truth is that we may and do sing for voice culture and to learn the song to be afterwards rendered to God in the worship. This truth may be illustrated by the Lord's Supper. In taking the Lord's Supper we eat. Does it, therefore, follow that we worship God when we eat the common meal at home? Again, in taking the Lord's Supper we eat bread and drink wine. Does it, therefore, follow as a consequence that we cannot eat bread and drink wine only as worship to God? Pshaw! Brother Stark, I am ashamed of you. Are you not ashamed of yourself?

My good brother's statement to the effect that the faithful, God-fearing, and God-honoring disciples among us, who do all things according to the pattern (form) of worship God has given us in his word, do not believe any worship may be rendered except in the assembly, is a baseless slander made without any provocation. We may worship God anywhere, on land or on sea; but he who does worship must worship in spirit and in truth. This is to worship only as the truth directs; and those who worship God as the truth directs will never use instrumental music in the worship, either at home or in the church. All is the same. God will not accept the worship in either place if the instrument be used. Jesus says: "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men." We have shown clearly that the use of instrumental music in Christian worship is of no higher authority than man. God has not commanded or in any way authorized the Christian to use it in worshipping him. It is, therefore, of man, and not of God.

My brother offers as an excuse for his sin in using the organ that old and oft-exploded chestnut: "We may have in the church what we have in the home. We use the organ in the home; and why not, then, in the church?" I answer: That drunken, gluttonous faction in the church at Corinth had the same kind of a spirit and thought the same thing. They ate a full meal at home, so could see no reason why they should not eat a full meal when they took the Lord's Supper. Paul shows us just how to answer the "digressive" argument, for it is the same in both cases. He said: "What you do is not to take the Lord's Supper. Have you not houses to eat and to drink in? Why despise you the house of God and shame them that have not?"

He would say: "Go home and eat your full meal; but when you meet for the service or worship of God, you must do only and always just as God directs in all things." "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." This is to do by his authority, or just as he directs in his word. If Paul could come back from the confines of the death state, he would say to the modern "digressives," as he did to their predecessors: "What! have you not houses in which to play your instruments? or why despise you the house of God, and shame them that have no instruments? Go home and play your instruments. What you do is not to worship God at all; for though you sit down to worship, you rise up to play. Remember you not that God hath said, Woe be unto those who invent to themselves instruments of music? and, again, that he will not even hear the noise of your songs when the instrument is used?" The man (another "digressive") who said that because he had bacon and cabbage on his table in his home, he had a right, therefore, to put them on the Lord's table and eat thereof in connection with the Lord's Supper, and that he would compel all others to eat of the same or not eat at all, had the same spirit and just as high an appreciation for God's word as my good brother and those who talk and think like he does in this matter. It is certain that God will honor the service and worship of the man who adds bacon and cabbage to the emblems of the Lord's body and eats thereof at his table just as readily as he will accept of the service of those who add instrumental music to the singing of "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord." Those who believe the Bible and are satisfied with the Lord's will and way in all things will never be found guilty of doing either. They will not go on, but will forever abide in the doctrine of Christ. They will not go beyond what is written, for they are not anarchists in the church of God.

STARK'S FIFTH SPEECH.

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Having left all reply for two speeches, I will now attend to my brother's third reply.

His talk about my "anger" and "getting mad" is all said for effect. It is made out of whole cloth. There is nothing in it. It is said only for effect, and is exceedingly unbecoming. I have not been angry in the whole discussion, but I have often been disgusted at the quibbles and misrepresentation and weakness of my brother and the style he manifests in a religious debate. I would not deny the charge before the audience who heard it, but to have such a slander go into the book undenied is quite another thing. I presume he can get some of his "antis" to say I was mad, for they would testify to anything with regard to Brother Meeks and concerning my attempt to introduce an organ into the church at McMinnville and publish it in the Gospel Advocate, which refused to give me a chance to deny it. To say this statement is bare-faced and comes like a clap of thunder in a clear sky is all I care to say on the subject.

He will "leave off exposing my amusing contradictions." That is what this debate is for. Go on, my brother; but remember the Spirit of Christ is the spirit of truth. Expose my misuse of the word of the Lord. I will not "grumble, growl, or complain." That is what we are here for; but do not misrepresent me. His talk about my low, mean thrusts at my opponent is begging for sympathy. No, sir; we want him to "point out errors," not assert things erroneous. If I have "passed by an argument," it is because it is covered so deeply with assertion I could not find it. But I am not answering the argument he is going to make before the debate closes. I am making the arguments—affirming. In his last speech he said he was going to make some big ones before the debate is over. I am waiting for them. He said he was not making arguments, only answering mine; but now he complains because I do not answer his big arguments he is going to make. Does he not know that if I prove my proposition, if he makes an argument on the other side, it is false or God is false? Both sides cannot be true. But assertions are not arguments. Does he know the difference? I trow not. Is it an argument when he says Brother Lipscomb has done more good than he and I both, or an assertion? He says it is not an assertion, because he knows from reading. He says he learned I was not burdened with Bible knowledge from

reading my book. Is this one of his arguments he wants me to answer? Well, such men as N. E. Cory, L. L. Carpenter, C. J. Schofield, and a host of others say the book is scriptural. These men are far his superiors in thought and Bible knowledge. Please, my brother, do not make me responsible for your lack of comprehension.

Brother Braden affirmed the following, as he gives it to me. I will quote his letter:

"Warlick wanted me to affirm that '*the New Testament authorizes the use of musical instruments in the worship of God.*' I called his attention to the fact that things can be authorized in two ways. In commanding a man to erect a building, the government authorizes him to erect it by commanding it, and authorizes (sanctions) his using proper instrumentalities in doing the work. I said a man would be a fool who would affirm that the New Testament commands the use of musical instruments as worship."

I say: Amen. Brother Braden was right. But he goes on: "I did affirm that '*the New Testament permits (sanctions) the use of instruments in connection with singing as worship of God.*'" How much does this differ from the one I affirm? This shows my brother cannot state a matter correctly. I do not know whether it is constitutional with him or from habit. I will not tell here what Brother Braden says of him as a debater. Brother Braden knows an honest man in a debate.

Again he must crowd Brother Meeks into the book. Brother Meeks stands higher, except with the few cranks, than Brother Warlick ever will, except he repent. If he continues to bring his slanders of Brother Meeks into the book, I will record what Brother Braden says of him.

No doubt things he is incapable of comprehending look foolish to him. Let the reader turn back to my argument on who causes the division among us. Of course they would not divide if they could have their own way. The committee who advised the removal of the organ from the Seventeenth and Olive Street Church, St. Louis, were in favor of instrumental music, but, knowing the stubbornness and hatefulness of those opposed, advised putting it out at the time; but it was afterwards put in, and is now used by all the churches in St. Louis, with no discord. Who made the fuss at the beginning? It was evidently the fogies, who found that when it was used in the family of all the saints, it could not be kept out of the assembly. There was a time when these old associates of Brother Campbell, like myself, simply accepted his prejudice without examination; but most of them, except the most stubborn, who had committed themselves to an extent that they could not go back without humility, now stand on the scriptural side. My brother quotes from Brethren Christopher, Franklin, Hobson, Grubbs, Campbell, and others, who in the early years of our movement were prejudiced before the subject was studied; but these have mostly given it up and gone to heaven, and are among those

who now use them, unless they have "kicked up a fuss" and divided the saints up there. Brother Campbell's musical attainments are well represented in the passage he quotes, that "to the spiritual an organ in the church is like a cowbell in a concert." But what has the opinion of these good men to do with the question? I affirm: "The word of God authorizes its use for praise in the church of Jesus Christ." Then, what about the opinions of men on the subject? Does he not yet know the difference between faith and opinion? Does he introduce these opinions to offset faith? But he must fill out his time. I must beware, for every corner he gets into he charges that I "grumble and growl." Yes, I "grumble" that he answers my scriptural authorities with the opinions of men, thus making the "word of God of none effect by his traditions." If the word of God authorizes it, what have these men to do with it? I am not putting my opinion against theirs, but he is putting their opinion against the word of God. Notice, these men's opinions from whom he quotes, like himself, do not give a single passage of scripture in support of what they say. Why? Because there is not a passage to sustain them. Neither has made an argument on the subject, but, like my brother, simply make their assertions, thus speaking with authority where the Bible does not speak.

Again he brings up the consequences and "asserts" that to use instruments of music as David did would let in incense burning, infant baptism, polygamy, etc. It would if there was naught but his *ipse dixit* against these things. I am not here debating infant church membership; but if I were and could bring nothing better against it than he brings against instrumental music, I would admit it. He thinks he could not make an argument against it if instruments are admitted. Well, he cannot make an argument, anyway. He asserts without proof, and then calls up some big men to help him assert, and calls that "proof." Let the reader of the book look over the quotation given in his third answer from Campbell and others and see if there is a particle of proof introduced. Notice his quotation from C. M. Wilmeth in the Christian Preacher. He asserts, only asserts: "*Instrumental music will carnalize any church, destroy spiritual worship; and finally said church will go into worldly captivity, where the image of Christ is entirely lost.*" Quite a prophecy from an uninspired demagogue! Is it an opinion or is it faith he is preaching? But how true is it? I have had an experience of fifty years in the ministry. I have traveled in twenty-five or thirty States, have been familiar with our churches for more than sixty years, and I find that piety and devotion and fraternal sympathy preponderate in the churches where instruments are used; and additions reported by evangelists who use instruments in their song service are not only double, but more than triple—yes, I will say, more than quadruple—those reported by evangelists who do not use organs. They claim that more than half the churches in America are "antiorgan" and "antisociety;" and what

are the statistics by comparison? The Christian Women's Board of Missions, the General Christian Missionary Society, and the Foreign Christian Missionary Society raise between \$700,000 and \$800,000 for the work of missions annually. Judging from the reports I have seen in the Gospel Advocate, there is not to exceed \$2,000 or \$3,000, all told, raised by the churches under the leadership of these opposition preachers. Besides, the "digressives," as he calls us, support preaching at home usually twice each Lord's day, while the "antis" have preaching *semi* a great while, when some farmer preacher will come around and do it for nothing.

I must apologize for following my brother thus far away from the subject to answer his "arguments," as he calls them—his big ones.

Of Daniel's praying with his face toward Jerusalem and the temple he says: "I wonder if Borthor Stark thinks we should pray that way now because Daniel did in olden time." Yes, the saints are the temple of God; and if a man does not pray with his face in that direction, he does not pray toward God, for God dwells in the church as his temple; and if a man does not pray toward it, he has no promise of being heard. Did not Daniel pray with the spirit and the understanding? Was he different from us in that respect? Did not David sing with the spirit and the understanding, when Peter says the Spirit of Christ was in him?

On sacrifice the Old Testament is no plainer than the New Testament. Under the Old Testament they offered a burnt offering. Under the New Testament it is taught clearly that Christ was our sin offering, and the incense is the praise we offer to his name. The offering of the body is clearly defined as a living sacrifice, not "by killing himself." Is it possible my brother in this debate is arguing for the most ignorant of Bible readers? He says often when he refers to a position he has taken, "Read the passage;" but he does not tell where the passage is, and the reader must look the debate all over to find the passage. He asserts that in the dedication of the temple the instrumental music was all on the outside of the house; but he does not go to the passage for the proof, nor even tell where the reader can find the passage, but says: "Read the passage." If it were true that it was outside of the house, I see no point in that. When God heard it, he came down and filled the house with his glory. His coming was the result of the music. I care not where they stood. But it is not true, and my assertion is as good as his. No examination of a passage has any effect on him. He will offset it with a repetition of his assertions. I have met a great many debaters, but certainly he is the loosest of any.

But to the passage. "He set the Levites in the house of the Lord." (2 Chron. 29: 25.) What does "in" mean? Does "in water" mean close by, near, near to? Let the reader read 1 Chron. 25: 1 to see how men prophesy and 1 Chron. 23: 5 to see how they can praise God. I

called his attention to the scripture, and now with an effrontery which is brazen, without giving the passage, he says: "Read the passage." In the case of Nadab and Abihu he says, "Read the passage in the Revised Version," but does not tell where it is, lest one might turn to it. I myself have forgotten where the passage is, and could he expect all will remember it and turn to it? No; he depends so much upon the treacherous memory of his hearers. Nadab and Abihu were slain for offering strange fire. Will he tell what "strange fire" was? Will he tell what God did command? It would be useless to go over the ground again. He would offset a criticism with another bold assertion. I will not answer in his style, lest we shall repeat: "'Tis, 'taint; 'tis, 'taint." God said they should not offer strange fire. They did it, and died. They broke the command.

He says that he has exploded David's authority in the church of Christ, reducing it to an absurdity; that "David burned incense, brought infants into the church, and had more than one wife." Well, if the Holy Spirit in Paul quoted David as burning incense with approval, he would offset it by saying: "David had instrumental music; and, therefore, he is not authority on the question of incense." Paul says the incense we offer is the praise of our lips. So of David's infants. He says David brought infants into the church. David did not. God put infants into the covenant as the seed of Abraham, but they were not allowed in the service of the sanctuary. God has put "new-born babes" into the church of the Messiah; but they are spiritual babes, and are there to be fed, not to serve, till they are fed unto growth. Is it possible my brother has debated baptism till he has no conception at all of the Christian system? He says David made the instruments. "David invented them," etc. Yes; but was it by God's authority or in opposition to God? Moses built the tabernacle; Moses gave the law, and, therefore, it was in opposition to God. Noah built the ark; therefore God was opposed to it. David invented instruments of music; therefore God was opposed to them. Such logic! God appointed them all, one as much as the other. Again he dances around on infants, incense, and polygamy, as if to appeal to prejudice once more. Has God been silent on polygamy? Then, what right has he to lay down a law on that subject? If God is silent on incense, why is not my brother? If babies by God's covenant were branches of the good olive tree and have not been broken off, what authority has he for breaking them off? With him for an opponent I could prove that they should still be in the church of Christ. I do not believe he can tell why they are out. If he has no authority for putting them out, he had better bring them back till he finds it. I can find a plenty of it. If I put them out without any authority, I add my authority to the word of the Lord, and I am adding to the law, and stand condemned by the passages he has brought forward with such a brandishment of trumpets.

If he can find nothing in God's teaching against the "modern dance," he has no right to introduce a law against it and set up his authority where God has not spoken, lest he come under the condemnation of his own passages. Could I find no teaching against polygamy in the New Testament, I would have as many wives as I wanted, if I could get them. I might want but one. Some do not want any. If I can explain incense, I will burn it. My brother thinks because he can show nothing against incense, babies, and polygamy, no one can. Is he trying to get me off to debating these subjects? If there is no teaching against them, why does he not practice them? I would if I wished, and he would have no right to object. He claims music is worship. Does he place babies and polygamy in the same category? Take the wind out of my brother's speeches, and there would be little left. If a young sister wished to dance, what answer would he make without adding to the law of the Lord and himself coming under the condemnation of his own text? If I wish to burn incense and there is no teaching against it, then what? Will he make a law?

Of Ps. 149, 150 he says, "He thinks the language here prophetic," and asks: "What will we do with the command to take up arms and execute vengeance upon the people?" Ps. 2 speaks of the same things—the fight with the heathen, etc.; and the New Testament says it is prophecy. The apostle speaks of our being soldiers and in a warfare, but says the weapons are not carnal; and the prophet explains that God will smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips he will slay the wicked. Cannot my brother apply this to Ps. 149, 150? I wish I could get him out of his ruts into a wider conception of gospel teaching. Could I hear him and a sectarian debate and hear them say, "'Tis, 'taint; 'tis, 'taint," my old wrinkled face would blush the rest of my life. He says this applies to the time of David and the Jews and refers to their king. To which king? Was he exhorting them to praise himself and to be joyful in David? If not, who did he refer to? Who were they to praise as their King? The one who would take pleasure in his people, who, in Ps. 149: 4, he says is the Lord. That verse explains who the King is that shall be praised, and makes the passage prophetic of the King of Zion, of whom David so often speaks.

We come again to 2 Chron. 29: 25, and he says he gave in full Adam Clarke's comments. Well, then that question is settled! He says Dr. Clarke shows very plainly the instruments were used by the authority of David. Now mark the consistency. He rejects the writings of David because David, by the command of God, brought babies of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh into the Jewish church, and now accepts the uninspired opinion of Adam Clarke, who brought babies according to the flesh into the Christian church without any command from God for so doing. He says Dr. Clarke shows plainly that the instruments were used by the authority of David; that David

invented the instruments and commanded their use. Does anybody doubt it? But the Holy Spirit by Peter says that David was a prophet (Acts 2: 30); that he spoke as moved by the Holy Spirit (2 Pet. 1: 21). Therefore we conclude that David gave the command of God as declared in the passage under review. But when it is written, "Moses commanded the people," "Moses said," etc., during their travels in the wilderness, do we understand that he did it by command from God or that it was in opposition to God? Does he make the distinction between Moses' commands and God's authority which he does between David's commands and God's will? If David were, as the Holy Spirit affirms, a prophet and spoke by the "Spirit of Christ which was in him" (1 Pet. 1: 10-12), were his commands the commands of God by his prophets? (2 Chron. 29: 25.) Will he explain why he rejects David on account of his admitting babies into the Jewish church by command of God and indorses Adam Clarke, who admits babies into the Christian church without any command? Will he explain anything? Well, this is a good place for him to say I "growl" and "grumble" and "get mad." I do not design to complain or growl. He can conduct this discussion as he pleases, can call his assertions "arguments" and the opinions of his cranky friends his "big arguments;" but I claim the right of showing they give neither scripture teaching nor logical arguments when they assert their opinions, and not their faith. They have no faith, for they have no teaching on the subject—not a single passage.

His reference to Amos 6 shows he is crazy, and is deluded into the belief of such nonsense untold. I know not what to do with an opponent who, instead of replying to an exegesis of a passage, will go on asserting over and over again what he first said about a passage. I have never had such an opponent before. He has the gall of an ox. But, then, he gives it up, and says the passage is nine hundred years too old. To old for what? He uses them to condemn David, and I used them to show God justified David by a later prophet.

He asks why I do not build an ark, as Noah did. I would if the Holy Spirit by the apostles indorsed Noah as a prophet and Noah had prophesied that the "children of Zion should build an ark to his name." Such puerile talk! He had better fill in his time with a spelling lesson.

Again he says that all I said about rebellious kings was put in to fill time and space. Another assertion without proof! Now he comes over his talk about why I do not offer sacrifices, burn incense, practice polygamy, etc. Because the New Testament is outspoken on these subjects. If the New Testament were silent on these subjects, I would practice them if I thought best, without regard to his *ipse dixit* that I shall not; but if the New Testament indorsed them and the practice as fully as it does instrumental music, I surely would not heed the voice of his thunder. The Holy Spirit has spoken on these subjects is the reason we do not practice them. The New Testament is clear in its teaching. It is not true that the New Testament is silent here.

He knows it is not, and all this bombast is for effect—an appeal to prejudice, and not to eliminate the truth. "*Ad captandum vulgus.*" Were we debating these questions, I would soon show why we do not practice them; but I am not to be drawn off by such dust throwing.

He comes to Ps. 149, 150, and asks if I will not introduce the "modern dance." No; I will not introduce a devilish for a sacred dance. I am willing to introduce just what David had reference to. I wonder if this appeal to prejudice is one of his "big arguments" he told us of. It is but an appeal to prejudice. If God says dance, let us dance—not like a profane "French dancing master," but let us dance, as David did, to the praise of God. Because David "praised on the dance" is no sign God authorizes hugging set to music. "On the dance" rather indicates that "dance" was an instrument—a pipe rather than a step; but if God authorized it, I am content to practice whatever it was. But of taking the sword and fighting—O, dear! Does not my brother read the figures of prophecy? Does he not know that the heathen, being brought under the dominion of Christ, are being slain by the sword of the Spirit? As I before suggested, let him read Ps. 2, *passim*. In all my debates I have never before had an opponent I had to instruct in every little matter; and after I have taught him, he again brings it up, as if nothing had been said on the subject. Does not Paul speak of us as soldiers being panoplied and in battle? (Eph. 5.) The figures of prophecy fall to meet much understanding in my brother, or is it "anything to beat Grant?" I really had expected integrity of purpose in this discussion.

We now come to his promise of counter arguments and he takes the motto: "*Things right in themselves, but wrong religiously.*" He says washing hands is right. Yet it stands among the things our Lord condemns in the strongest terms. Why? Because it is done as a religious act. He does not tell where this is found, lest we should turn and see the fallacy of his statement. As usual, he gives no exegesis of the passage, but simply makes a few unwarranted assertions about it. His reasoning is this: It is always wrong to do as a religious service anything not commanded of God. (Major proposition.) Instrumental music belongs to this. (Minor proposition.) Therefore to use it in worship is sinful. (Conclusion.) Notice his syllogism. His major proposition is doubtful; his minor proposition is the assumption of the question in debate. His "therefore," then, is an assumption. It is not true that in religious service we must do nothing but what is commanded. It is not commanded we shall stand when we sing, or kneel when we pray, or preach behind a pulpit, or sing from a note book, or all sing together, or sing first and then read and then pray and then preach, sing invitations, dismiss with benediction, have a tankard with the cups, have more than one cup, have the loaf on a plate. All these things, and more, come into our religious service as much as the washing of hands. God has commanded none of these,

but who doubts God has authorized them by the permission of the liberty of the gospel without the bondage of law? The proposition is not true. Many things God has not put under the bondage of law we practice under the liberty of the gospel of Christ. His minor proposition is: "Instrumental music belongs to this class of things." By this I suppose he means the class unauthorized. Pretty assumption in the midst of a debate! I am affirming they are authorized, and he makes his denial the minor proposition of a logical syllogism. The Babylonians would class him among the seven wonders of the world. "Therefore!" Ye gods of the ancients, listen! "Therefore it is sin!" Heat that for "bigness!"

But to the passage. (Mark 7: 3.) In this passage Jesus did not object to the washing, but to the tradition of the elders, which made the word of God of no effect. They were more troubled for their traditions than for obedience. Their worship was in vain, because they had more respect for human traditions than for divine teaching. Notice, this hand washing was not in their worship. It was a matter of cleanliness before eating. The rebuke was not against their washing, but against their respect for some man-made rule and carelessness of God's teaching—against their narrowness and hobby worship. They made more ado over the neglect of this human commandment than the great want of justice, truth, and righteousness among them. Apply this to some of our day, and see the analogy—those who are great sticklers for the human commandment by the traditions of a few elders, "Thou shalt have no organ in the churches," but are careless of the truthfulness of their teaching, the slandering of their brethren, the unity of God's saints, and the harmony of the kingdom. What would Jesus say were he to come among them to-day? He would say: "You make the word of God of none effect by your unhallowed traditions."

Of the "eating of meat as a religious service." Bah! Who ever heard of a man filling himself up from the devotion of his heart? In such a service who is served? Religious service! It is naught but the flesh that is served. Paul speaks of those "whose god is their belly," and the brother speaks of their stuffing as a religious service. I would call it serving the flesh. Paul speaks of eating meat that had been offered to idols, and said it was not wrong; but for fear some religious cranks would make evil of it, they had better desist; and since that every crazy hobbyist uses the apostle's remark to help him rule the church by his stubborn devilishness, which he terms a "weak conscience." There is nothing said for or against the eating of meat as a "religious service." My brother's imagination is prolific.

He says again: "God has not only not authorized us to use instruments in the worship in making music to his name, but he has told us plainly to make music of another kind." Better show the fallacy of my proof before making an assertion like that. Does he want me to

go all over it again for him. Of his argument based on the age of instrumental music, it is like the argument for infant baptism. It is true in the seventh century there was a mixture in the church of the corruption of heathenism, Judaism, and Christianity; but history does not tell whether instrumental music in the eighth century came from the one or the other. Certainly it was known to be in the church in the year 370, according to Alford; and Paul to the Corinthians speaks of our knowing what is harped by the distinction of the sounds of the harp (1 Cor. 14: 7), showing that the church was familiar with instrumental music then; and John in Revelation speaks of it as if the church was familiar with it. No man of thought can doubt, since it was in use in the synagogue and in the temple of idols, from which the converts to the church all came, that unless the Holy Spirit gave a law against its use it would certainly be brought into the congregation of the saints. Therefore I shall not notice what the cranks may say in that line. It is like the argument of the Sabbatarians along that same line, infant baptism, and other humbugs. Certain it is that the first objection to it was made where they first find it spoken of. It was in the church six hundred and seventy years before an objection was made to its use. It certainly was not given to us by the Romish Church, for it was there before the "man of sin" entered the temple.

Of "choosing our methods of worship." The worship is the adoration of God, and the method crops out from the worship within, as I have shown. "Religion of our own make." Well, I would as soon make it for myself as to let others make it for me. My brother had better answer what I have said about worship before he gives us another "gabble" about it. He pretends to give us the items of religious worship, and says the New Testament gives the only law of worship. The law of love is that we love; the law of worship is that we worship. He says: "Fellowship is one item of worship." Well, if he means contribution, must he put it in with his left hand or right hand, into a hat, basket, or bag? Must a brother or sister go around to receive it (of course they would not let a sister dare do it), or must a box be put on the stand or at the door? Well, one item is *psallo*, which means to play, as I have shown; and the word *aeido* also has a degree of instrumental music in it. These words are translated "sing;" and when they say that is authority for the voice alone, they know the scholarship of the world will not bear them out. They know better. When he says, "We are commanded to sing, not play," he knows, before God, he is misrepresenting the word to gull the illiterate. He knows that whole paragraph is not true. He says: "Let us add nothing to nor take from." Then away with your command that God has not given that you would make the foundation of a new sect!

Of his quotation from Brother Carr concerning "hear ye him." Well, "he" says we shall hear the Holy Spirit, as shown. Then to

hear the Holy Spirit is to hear him. The Holy Spirit says we shall hear David, who spoke by the Spirit of Christ which was in him. Then to hear David is to hear the Holy Spirit—to hear Christ. How many times must I go over this before he will notice it?

Of the sufficiency of the New Testament, he ignores all I have said, and denies Paul's statement that the Old Testament is profitable for teaching, instruction in righteousness, etc., to make the man of God perfect. He says we can be perfect without it.

Of walking by faith he says: "Having seen that no one can use instrumental music in worship by faith." He should have said: "Having asserted it continually." If he has "seen" it, he has failed to make others see it, unless they have but the one eye of a hobbyist. I do not object to what he says here on the subject of faith. We walk by faith in God's word. But it is amusing, after all the scripture I have given him and which he has offset with bombast, without critically examining one passage, but his wonted dictum sets them aside or ignores them, that he now adds with a gravity laughable: "It follows that those who use the instrumental music do not please God in their worship." He says: "The Christian must not go beyond what is written. (1 Cor. 4: 6.)" Then he must not add a new law, saying, "Thou shalt not have an organ in the church," and make it the foundation of a new sect. Poor, dear, little brother! Why does he not search for the beam in his eye? I am getting weary of his assumptions that he only is right. Let him prove somethings beyond the assertions of himself and his friends. If we must speak only as the oracles of God, where does he find the law that prohibits? In the whole array of scripture he brings from the Revised Version every passage is against him. Of 2 Pet. 1: 3 he gives us a garbled quotation and adds: "If no other passage, this is sufficient to condemn as sinful anything not taught in the New Testament. We have seen already that instruments of music are nowhere authorized in the New Testament." Where did he see it? What assumption! That is the proposition we are discussing, and had he not better wait till the discussion is over before he assumes the whole thing settled in his favor? I have given proof after proof, and he has criticised none of them nor showed the error of any. He has said some are foolish and brought in some friends to give their opinions and help them assert, and now he has found a negative. This debate is really laughable. He claims to have had one hundred and eight debates. I think he must have taken his first lessons from some old maid. He neither answers an argument nor makes one, but tears along with one assertion after another; and now on the negative he has found that his side is right. He does not say the affirmative has failed to find it authorized, but he says he has seen that it is not authorized. Dear man! Why did he not tell us before we began? But read his "therefore." Look sober when you read it, if you can.

Now he comes to 2 Tim. 3: 16, 17, and says: "We have seen already that that part of the Scriptures belonging to the child of God in the Christian age is the New Testament." Where did he see this? He certainly did not get it by any criticism of my argument on that passage, for he has not noticed anything I said on that passage. I called his attention to the fact that there were no New Testament Scriptures written when Paul wrote that; and Paul told Timothy he had known them from a child, and those he had known from a child were able to make him wise unto salvation. He complains because I repeat; but, with all my repetition, I cannot get an argument into his head so he will examine it; but he will go on and talk as if nothing had been said. Does his side demand such advocacy? Have they nothing better to put up? Again his "therefore" is a begging of the question.

Now he comes to Rev. 22: 18, 19. Well, what does this say we must not add to? Why, it is "the prophecy of this book." But he takes in the whole New Testament with the four evangelists, and, with the addition of a new commandment staring him in the face, he throws the denunciation of the apostle John at me. What is he doing with the article of his creed upon which they are building a new sect? Why do they not put it into the confession and ask: "Do you believe with all your heart that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and in the use of the organ, and that two or more uniting to send out the gospel is a society and are a most damnable heresy?" If for that you put them out, why not tell it when you take them in? Two uniting make a society; and if a society is heresy, a union is damnable. In this line he runs on mixing worship and service, as if the two were the same. All this talk is but assuming the question. It applies to me as well as to himself. Read the paragraph which follows the quotation of Rev. 22: 18, 19, and see if you can find a point in it on the subject. To it all I say a hearty "Amen! Me, too, my brother!" Why, when my brother opens his mouth, you cannot tell what will run out of it. Surely there is nothing in this exhortation to sinners but what we all indorse. The question we are discussing is: "What has God taught us to do, and are we to do it?" Paul says we worship God in spirit (Phil. 3: 3), "and have no confidence in the flesh." Our worship is of the heart and intelligence. The outcroppings through the flesh are not the worship. Singing, praying, playing, shouting, dancing, etc., are not worship. I have often called his attention to it, but he will neither answer my criticism nor profit by what I say; but he goes on just as if nothing had been said. With the small concordance I have with me I cannot find where God in the New Testament commands me to worship him. My brother says I must not do it without a command, and it will not do to go back to the "things written aforetime" to learn. God does not command us to worship. He shows himself in such grandeur and loveliness that the believer cannot help but worship him. The Son's revelation of the Father calls forth all

our powers of love, admiration, and adoration, till our hearts are filled with devotion and all our powers break forth in his praise. God need not tell us how to do it. We cannot help but do it, and the act will be spontaneous. Think of the coldness and formality of thanks and praise given by rule! Such nonsense! No wonder so many churches are freezing to death under such teaching!

Next he is going to give us "some plain and eminently scriptural objections."

"1. They always cause divisions in the congregations where introduced." They never cause division among those who stand on Christ alone and have no other article in their creed. If some poor, stubborn souls run off because they cannot rule, it will divide the sheep from the goats and perhaps save the church from God's judgment. Some people will quarrel as long as they tarry. "*Some preachers would be friends but for the organ.*" So they hate because of the organ. Ah, such sticklers for law, and yet violate God's law of love because of something against which they can find no law! I tell you, it is the devil in all such. They lack Christian culture and grace.

"2. They pander to the world," etc. Not any more than my brother, who says he practices elocution before the glass that he may captivate his hearers.

"3. They are made a test of fellowship by those who use them." Not a bit of it. Those who use them will fellowship all who stay. The test of fellowship is with those who get out.

"4. They cultivate choir singing." That is good. Singing should be done by singers and preaching by preachers. To cultivate the talent of the church often means to cultivate the mouth only. Let the singers sing without the discordant bawl of some who do not know enough of singing to know they cannot sing. A good soloist is a wonderful help in a meeting.

"5. They make confusion by drowning the voice." Sometimes I would that some voices were drowned.

"6. Their real use being to draw," etc. O, that is surely bad! Better have something to disgust the people so they will not come; or if they do come, let them come to snicker.

"7. They cultivate an aristocracy in the church." Yes; better go to church dressed like a clown, and, when there, swagger and spit and snore to keep down aristocracy. When I was a boy and went to see Mary Ann and her father, who would some day be mine, too, I wore my best clothes and tried to be nice.

"8. They are earthly, sensual, devilish. (James 3: 15-17.)" That is about as close as I have known him to get in his application of scripture. Did I not tell you he would say anything he wanted to have said? He wants to be good and do what God says, and makes such a statement as that.

"9. If good for one, they are good for all; and the more, the better."

Yes, if God authorizes it. You see, he is after the other fellow. He has not forgotten his debate with Brother Braden. No doubt it was impressive.

"10. Open the flood gates and let in the negro minstrels." Yes, if God says so. You see, he has lost the religion he had a few minutes since, and has taken it all into his own hands, and God is left out. Now this is another appeal to the prejudice. There is no argument in it.

"11." Another broad, bold assertion! There is no "works of the flesh" about it, as I showed in my last. No adultery, uncleanness, wrath, hatred, variance, strife, etc., about it. Those who oppose it show more the "works of the flesh."

"12. Man is the author," etc. I guess not. God commanded it by his prophets under both the Old Testament and the New Testament on certain occasions.

"13. The purpose always is not to please God, but man." So he takes God's place and tells the purpose of the heart of all. Three times in the oral debate he took the throne and called me up to judgment—condemned me and sent me down to hell. God has but little work to do, with my dear brother near. He is such a help to the Father of mercies.

He says: "I wish now to make an argument on the items of worship." I wish he would. It would be such a change from what he has given us. But he begins by talking about items of worship; so I am doubtful if we get much argument. Let us see. O, he is only illustrating! In an experience of one hundred and eight debates, has he not learned that an illustration is not an argument? So, after all our hope, we get no argument at last. I will venture he will assume the very question in debate. Watch him. Moses has nothing to do with transferring items; God has the control. "Prayer is one item." But prayer is natural. Prayer is not a service. It is not in obedience to commands, but from the heart's desire; because of want, desire—not a service. We ask God to serve us—give us something. "Prayer service!" How loose men get in religious thought. B sings; C wants the priesthood transferred. Well, prayer, the priesthood, and singing were all transferred; but the same ones did not sing, nor pray, nor officiate; but they did these things in the same way, and from the patriarchal age they learned how to do it under the Jewish age, and practiced the same style of prayer, singing, and offerings. Nothing was changed, except the place and the priest. Fifteen hundred years passes, and the offering pointed to One who comes to make full expiation for sin. Christ has fulfilled the law of carnal offerings (see Heb. 9), and once for all made atonement; but the devotional of the two old dispensations remains unchanged. Prayer remains the same as of yore. Singing is also unchanged. The change in sacrifice is clearly pointed out, the change in priesthood is clearly defined, as is also the

change of the law and its manner of presentation from the tables of stone to the tables of the heart. The devotions of sainthood fill the place of the burnt incense of old. God's temple becomes the body of Christ, and his abode among men is in the hearts of his people. All these changes are clearly made known; but they are still taught to pray, but, as in the Jewish dispensation, they must go into the temple, and there they may stand, kneel, lift up their hands, or smite their breasts. These forms were of old, and no change is made, for no change is reported. The apostles prayed after Pentecost just as they prayed before Pentecost. The style, form, etc., were all unchanged; but, as of old, it was done in the temple of God; and if they could not go into the temple, they must, like Daniel, look toward it and pray with their face toward the church. There was no change made in prayer, for no change is reported. So singing was left without change, for no change is reported in praise. If God made a change, the Spirit of God, which knows all the things of God (1 Cor. 2: 11), would surely report it; but since, as in prayer, no change is reported, so, as in prayer, no change could have been made. Who said God has changed the form for the devotions of his people? How does he who reports such a change know such a change has been made? A gets the privilege of praying in the temple of God; B sings as of yore, for no change is made; and C finds a priesthood so superlatively grand that Adam and Levi are readily forgotten, and the scheme of redemption breaks in upon his view, with the second Adam on the throne, a High Priest forever. "That there be no mistake in the work of the disciples, Christ promises to send them the Holy Spirit to guide them into all truth, thus making their work infallible." Well said, my brother; and since they left singing as it was, we will not interfere with the work of the Holy Spirit. How different is this explanation from his illustration, which he calls his "argument," which has not the shadow of truth in it! But hear what he says of C: "Poor, unfortunate fellow! He waits to the close of the sacred canon, to the last work of John on Patmos, to find that no mention is made of instrumental music in the worship of saints." Were I to say that of immersion, it would be just as true as his statement. Immersion is not mentioned in all the New Testament. He replies that *baptidzine* is spoken of, and that means the same. So *psallo* is used, and that means an instrument in connection with singing; and David is indorsed by the Holy Spirit, and his teaching is quoted and his definition accepted. He cannot make as strong an argument on immersion as I have made on instruments for praise in the church of Christ. If he will not believe, "he would not believe though one arose from the dead." Aye, they have arisen to the shining shore, and there testify to the use of harps in God's praise.

WARLICK'S FIFTH REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

For one who has never experienced such feeling, I suppose I can sympathize as much as any other man with the furious and raving spirit as shown in my opponent's last speech. He is, indeed, an object of pity. To be as mad as he is and talk as ugly as he does is bad enough of itself, but worse when he denies it. I never suffer myself to get into such state of feeling. I regret very much that my brother has led out on this line. I have known from the first that he would get out of humor when the unscripturalness of his contention was exposed and the falsity of his own reasoning was turned against him. In fact, he came to the debate mad at Brother Lipscomb; and almost all of his first speech was made up of unchristianlike, if not ungentlemanly, thrusts at that brother, whom he had never seen and of whom he says he never heard until he came South; and when I defended Brother Lipscomb in no unjust manner, he turns his venom against me and virtually charges me with lying when I say he is mad—something every one can see from the way he appears, and which I take special pleasure in repeating with all possible emphasis. He says that when he exposes me I feel so much like a fool that I think he is mad. Well, I suppose I may answer according to the folly of my antagonist and say that if it be any comfort or consolation to him to even imagine that he is able to expose to any extent what I have said or may say in this debate, he is welcome to the feeling; and over it he need have no particle of jealousy, for I am sure that no one else will be foolish enough to think so. I will declare that if he should succeed in answering one thing I said, I should not only feel like a fool, but I would know that I was one, for the arguments of such persons only is he able to deal with.

He says I must retreat, fall back, or he will tell what Clark Braden thinks of me as a debater. I will modestly inform him that I shall be pleased to have him take his own course in the matter. I suppose I may say what I think of Braden if I wish. I have the contract, signed by both Braden and myself, for a written debate. I have our correspondence also, and am fully prepared for him if he wants to take Braden's part. I also have a copy of Brother Braden's manuscript; and I simply want to caution him about how he quotes, or I may get both of them "in the hole."

He warns me to say no more about Brother Meeks, and says Meeks

has been misrepresented. I have said nothing about Brother Meeks that he will deny. I have said that since it is known that Meeks is a "digressive," he is not called to hold meetings for churches where he was once heard gladly. Brother Stark thinks this a better reputation than my own. Well, I do not envy it of Meeks or any one else. I may, in justice to myself, say that it is not so in my case. I have never held a meeting where I was not invited to return.

Brother Stark says he was slandered in the matter of sowing the seeds of instrumental music in the McMinnville church. He will not surely deny preaching on the subject there, and that one of the brethren felt called upon to review the discourse. Now because the Gospel Advocate simply told it on him he throws up his hands and cries: "Slander, slander!" The Advocate was in no way responsible for his preaching in a church that was at peace, in the hope, ostensibly, to cause division in the church. The Advocate would be remiss in regard to duty if it should fail to report men who are seeking in every way to destroy the peace of Zion. My brother need not hope to be screened from exposure by those who are God's friends.

But I must say something further in regard to the proposition affirmed by Braden in the debate in Dallas. I read it as written by Braden himself: "Do the New Testament Scriptures authorize, or permit, the use of instrumental music as an aid to the singing that is part of the worship of God?" This is just as it read in the oral debate; but when we came to arrange for the written debate, Braden refused to affirm the proposition again with the word "authorize" unmodified in it; so we compromised on the following: "Do the New Testament Scriptures authorize (in the sense of to permit or sanction) the use of instrumental music as an aid to that singing that is a part of the worship of God?" We began to write the debate, but it was not finished and published. If any should ask, "Why?" they may learn, perhaps, by asking Clark Braden.

But enough of Braden, unless Brother Stark has more to tell. I must, however, notice Brother Stark's predicament into which he brings himself by indorsing what Brother Braden says in his explanation. I quote: "Warlick wanted me to affirm that the New Testament authorizes the use of instruments in the worship of God. I called his attention to the fact that things can be authorized in two ways. . . . I said a man would be a fool who would affirm that the New Testament commands the use of musical instruments as worship." To this Brother Stark says: "Amen. So say I." Now I ask: What will he do with all that he has said in this debate, repeating, as he has, so often that God commands the use of the instruments in the sanctuary of the saints? Eh! Again he has repeated the statement that the instrument is in the word *psallo*; that you cannot have a psalm without the instrument: that we are commanded to *psallize*, therefore commanded to use the instrument in praise or worship to God. Listen.

my brother. What have you to say for this contradiction? By indorsing Brother Braden he denies his proposition and goes back on all he has said in the debate. If he thinks that he and Braden are agreed, I challenge him to ask Brother Braden whether he will affirm the proposition worded as we now have it and then publish Braden's answer.

That cowardly, contemptible subterfuge in which it is claimed that those who do not use the instrument have made it a test of fellowship and that they are responsible is really sickening. It is really too silly and false to deserve notice, except to say that I am sure that even Brother Stark knows it is not true.

My opponent says that I have the "gall of an ox." Elegant language this to come from the school of "sweet-spirited" men! I answer: The gall of the ox is said to be very bitter, I believe. Well, my relation to him in this debate is of such character to demand the use of the bitterest kind of gall. You see, it requires this kind to handle Brother Stark.

My brother is very mad because I have shown that the consequences of his position and argument in quoting David as authority in the New Testament church logically compel him to take David as authority and as our example in other things, and that since David brought his babies into the church, burned incense, and practiced polygamy, of course Brother Stark should do the same things. Why not? If David is our example in one thing, he is in all things. Does he answer by saying the New Testament teaches us differently from the way David did on these questions? I answer: Just so; and so also does the New Testament teach differently to what David did on the music feature of the worship. David says: "Play on the harp and the instrument of ten strings." The New Testament says: "*Sing; make melody in the heart*"—not on the instrument. Do you see the difference, my brother? "I trow not."

When my opponent says that those who favor the instruments in the worship and who work through the society are doing more real work than those who stand firm for the word of the Lord in all things, he asserts that which is not true. Their own statistics show that where they do the least through their man-made machines, we have more churches and more members. Only recently a scribe has made plain this fact, and complains much at it. It seems that we get on better and do more work where they do the least. Only a few years ago in Texas at a lectureship the faithful preachers proposed to the "digressives" that we select four preachers from each side and let their work be compared as to additions, churches organized, houses built, and number baptized. The "digressives" were afraid of the test. No, sir; they do not do half as much as they blow about. Besides, their work is to try to capture the field after others have established the cause—as Brother Stark would like to do at McMinnville,

for instance. They are slow to go out into the forest and blaze the way for others. They prefer to wait until some true missionary has opened the way for them, then they will go and try to reap where another has sowed. I wonder if my brother will compare results with the apostles and early Christians. They had no society aside from the church of God, the plant which our Heavenly Father planted. No man-made society will equal what they did without such devilish and ungodly things.

I do not know that I quite understand my brother in what he says about his praying with his face toward the temple, God's dwelling place. If he means the real church, his idea is palpably wrong; for the Christian is in that temple all the time. If he means the meeting-house, I suggest that he would need a compass every time he prays, so that he could know just how to turn his face so as to be sure to have it turned toward the meetinghouse. There is no telling what a "digressive" will say, however, when you get him in a close place.

After such ridiculous statements as this, my opponent has the cheek to boast of his knowledge of the Bible and of his age and experience in debates, and intimates that I know but little. Still, he says that he writes his speeches with a small concordance in his hand, and that he has trouble with all my references, because I am not careful to tell just where they all are. I will declare he amuses me. I promise, however, to be more careful to give the place, so my brother will know how to find what I quote, that he may turn to it and verify it, for he seems unable to determine in any other way. But permit me to say that if I were him, after saying this I would not boast any more of my knowledge, of what some others said of my book, and of how little my opponent knew.

He says he thinks my first debates were with an "old maid." No; but my present debate would remind one of such an opponent. I think if I had had some experience in debates with "old maids," I should have been better prepared to appreciate the penurious and very sensitive disposition of my present antagonist. I have had one debate with a woman, but she knew what a debate was and what an argument was and how to make one. My good brother might learn many profitable lessons about the art of debating from that woman.

My opponent is mistaken again when he says that I have not met his arguments. I have. He has not made an argument or given a passage that I have not turned against him. This is the unfortunate part of it with him, and that is what makes him so mad. So he can do nothing but growl and complain. I challenge him to name one argument I have not replied to. I want to notice everything. I promise that he shall not make a point in the entire debate.

My brother denies that all the "higher critics" among us, as a people, are with the "digressives;" but he need not do it. All know it is true, that there is not one exception to this. He says that what I

gave in my last speech from the wise men among us—such as Campbell, Lard, Franklin, Hobson, and others—was only their opinion, but that what he says about it and what he affirms is faith. Well, I wonder how it happens that he believes what he says, but that they had only an opinion? Pshaw! Theirs was faith, while his is not; for he has no evidence upon which to base faith. If his life depended on it, he could not show one verse—no, not even a part of a verse—authorizing the use of the organ in Christian worship in all the book of God. My brother says that the Jews burned incense, offered sacrifices, and used the instrument in their worship. He can see that in the gospel age we do not burn incense, but offer prayer as our incense; that instead of killing the animal and offering it as a sacrifice, we are to offer our bodies as a living sacrifice; but he thinks we may and must have the same kind of music that they used, and in a literal sense at that. Why is he not able to see also that while they used the instrument in the worship for outward show, splendor, and pomp, we are to worship in spirit and in truth; that ours is preëminently a heart worship; and that instead of playing, we *sing*, make melody in the heart—not on an instrument? Stubbornness is the only thing that will keep him from seeing this.

My opponent's silly twaddle about there being no command to stand up and sing, to put the contribution into a hat or a box, is puerile and nonsensical. The Bible teaches by precept and example; and in doing such things, in whatever way we do them, we do no more than what is commanded; but in using the instrumental music we do more than what is commanded—something not authorized, and, therefore, sinful. In Lev. 10: 1, 2 (R. V.) we read: "And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took each of them his censer, and put fire therein, and laid incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he had not commanded them. And there came forth fire from before the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord." This shows that to do as religious service anything which God has not commanded will bring down his wrath upon us. God has nowhere commanded, not even hinted at, an authority for using instrumental music in the Christian worship. It is, therefore, "strange fire," and will be condemned with those who use it.

My friend says that the weapons mentioned in Ps. 149 were figurative, not literal; that the chains were also figurative; and so is the dance here mentioned. Of course what he says is simply not true, not a word of it. But I ask: Why does he make everything in the passage figurative except the musical instruments, all of which he says must be taken in a literal sense? He says that he gives the exegesis of his passages; but how ridiculous the exegesis, and how incompetent the exegete! I ruined him on this passage before; so I shall say but little more on it. Everybody knows that the whole thing is literal, and that it all belongs to the Jewish, and not to the Chris-

tian, age. The word *dance* here does not mean a musical instrument. It is from the word *machol* in the Hebrew, and simply means to dance, to turn in a circle. My brother says we may dance—not in the modern way, but if we dance, we must dance just like David did. Then I ask: Why does he not play like David did? Why does he play after the modern style and use the modern instruments? If he may do this way, using the modern music because David used the old kind, then others may use the modern dance, hugging thrown in, because David danced the old way. Why not?

My excited and angered brother says that Moses invented the tabernacle; and after saying this, he boasts about his ability as an exegete. Why, I am astonished at him. If he will read only a few chapters in Exodus, he will see how little he knows about it. Moses did everything only as the *Lord commanded Moses*. Is it possible that he does not know anything about the Bible? He even says that instrumental music was used in the tabernacle of the Jews, when no one ever thought of even imagining such a thing. *Instrumental music was never used in the tabernacle*. It was used in the temple in the days of David; but in the latter centuries of the Jewish dispensation it was not even used there, that any one knows of. The evidence shows contrariwise. No man can prove that in the time of Christ the instruments were in the temple. Jesus never heard one instrumental tone in the temple in his life, that any one knows of. It is next to certain that he did not.

My friend says that if we use the tuning fork to obtain the pitch of the song, we may use the organ to maintain the pitch. I answer: The tuning fork, when used, serves the singers in the same way that the announcing of the number or page of the song to be sung does. I wonder if Brother Stark would have some fellow with a strong voice to stand up where all could hear, and, while the saints of God were singing praise to their God, let him keep calling out the page, lest some one lose the song. This is about the strength of his argument. He thinks there is no authority for the note book, but there is. Authorities say that the Egyptians had a definite system of rhythm and notation. The Hebrews, it is said, learned to sing from them, and early Christians learned from the Hebrews. So my friend loses out on this point. These last matters, I think, he got from Clark Braden. In fact, I have a suspicion that Braden wrote the best part of my brother's last speech, anyway; but I do not care, for I know that Stark and Braden are not agreed, and that Braden has the popular idea on the subject. So I should like to have everything that may be said in favor of the unscriptural practice brought out. I feel fully prepared to meet the whole "push" and turn them down on the question.

My friend's reply to my negative arguments as offered in my last speech indicates great strength as a respondent, provided one cares

nothing for what he says. I quoted from history to show, and did prove, that the first organ certainly known to have been brought into the worship in the "Christian church" (so called) was in the seventh century. He replies that it had been used all the time, but that some one objected to it about that time. I wonder if he has any conscience at all. If he had said that Jesus Christ was a horse, he would have been as near the truth as when he made that statement. I showed also that the Greek Church has never used the instrument, and that they immerse altogether, showing that the Greek language does not favor sprinkling for baptism nor the use of the instrument in the worship. I showed that things were sometimes wrong because done in a religious service which in themselves were right, and illustrated by the washing of hands, condemned by Christ. I showed that we are not allowed to choose our own methods of worship, any more than we may choose the object of our worship, by all of which I demonstrated the sin in the use of instrumental music in Christian worship. By an argument on the three dispensations I showed that the instrument could not be brought into the Christian dispensation, but that it was one of the relics of an abrogated age. My brother's reply to all this is such a bundle of confusion and nonsense that I seriously doubt whether he can understand it himself.

My brother comes back again to his old chestnut that I cracked and bursted for him in the first of the debate, and asks: "Where has God said, 'Thou shalt not have an organ in the church?'" I answer: It is in the verse immediately following the one in which God says: "Thou shalt not baptize babies." Does he remember where that verse is? Does he reply that we are authorized to baptize only believers, and that this will forbid our baptizing babies? I say: Well and good. We are authorized to make melody in the heart, not on an instrument; and by this commandment we are forbidden to use the instrument.

My brother says I should add another question to my creed and ask all candidates for baptism if they believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and if they believe that the use of instrumental music in the church is sinful. No; when they acknowledge faith in Christ, they say by the acknowledgment that they accept *him—Christ*, and not David—as their teacher; and since Christ never taught any one to use instrumental music in the worship, I know that as long as people are loyal to him they will never use the organ in the worship. But my brother needs the extra question. He should ask his candidates for baptism whether they believe that Christ is the Son of God, and also whether they will accept David, who belonged to the Jewish dispensation, as their teacher in the Christian Church instead of Christ, especially on the question of instrumental music in the worship.

When Peter wanted to make three tabernacles—one for Moses, one for Elias, and the other for Christ—God said: "No. This is my Son; hear him." If Brother Stark had been there, he would have said:

"Now, God, you may say what you please. I am going to build a tabernacle for David; and I shall put an organ in it, too. So, you old 'crank, old foggy, old flunky,' you may just shut your mouth. I have some liberty. I shall do as I please in the matter. You may 'strike the tune on your nose' if you want to; I shall not do it."

My brother says that if I study elocution in order to speak right, I may study singing in order to sing right. Just so; but in studying the song, I practice singing the notes; but when I come into the worship, I do not sing the notes and offer them in praise to God. In the studying of elocution, I used a mirror to practice before; but I do not think of bringing it into the pulpit when I go to preach and use it there. Though I may practice singing with the instrument, I do not think of bringing the instrument into the Lord's house and using it there in an effort to please God in the worship.

I have already shown that what my opponent says about culture, refinement and the best music is always where the instrumental music is used is as false as can be; but he repeats it. I only wish to say that the Italians are the best instrumental musicians. I may also include the Germans. If he wishes to hold these up as a standard of refinement and culture, I shall not envy him his standard. Among our people I know that the best singing is always where the instrument is not used. Neither Christ, the apostles, nor any of the early Christians ever used the organ or any other instrument in the worship. I suppose Brother Stark will say it was for the want of culture and refinement. Shame on you, my brother! Is it possible that you cannot be correct and represent the truth on any question pertaining to the matter in hand? Our brother says he wants all the instruments he can possibly get. Well, this would make confusion sure enough, and Paul says God is not the author of confusion; but what does my brother care for what Paul or any other inspired man says on the subject? Nothing—absolutely nothing.

I showed in my third speech that the wisest, purest, and best men among our own people were opposed to the instrument in the worship on the ground that it was not only unscriptural, but evil in its tendency. I wish now to give some authority from the great religious leaders of the age.

John Wesley, the father of Methodism, when asked his opinion on the instruments being introduced into their chapels, said: "I have no objection to the instruments being in our chapels, provided they are neither seen nor heard."

Adam Clarke (Methodist) said: "I am an old man, and I here declare that I never knew them to be productive of any good in the worship of God, and have reason to believe that they were productive of much evil. Music is a science I esteem and admire, but instrumental music in the house of God I abominate and abhor. This is

the abuse of music, and I here register my protest against all such corruptions of the worship of the Author of Christianity."

Conybeare and Howson on Eph. 5: 19: "When you meet, let your enjoyment consist, not in fullness of wine, but fullness of the Spirit; 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."

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

On Ps. 42: 4 Spurgeon says: "David appears to have had a peculiarly tender remembrance of the singing of the pilgrims, and assuredly it is the most delightful part of worship and that which comes nearest to the adoration of heaven. What a degradation to supplant the intelligent song of the whole congregation by the theatrical prettiness of a quartet, bellows, and pipes! We might as well pray by machinery as praise by it."

Quoting I. M. Neal upon the first mention of instruments in the Psalms: "It is observed that the early fathers, almost with one accord, protest against their use in churches, as they are forbidden in the Eastern church to this day, where yet, by the consent of all, the singing is infinitely superior to anything that can be heard in the West."

I will now quote from some of the fathers in the postapostolic church.

Justin Martyr (A.D. 139) said: "The use of singing with instrumental music was not received in the Christian churches, as it was among the Jews in their infant state, but only the use of plain song."

Chrysostom (A.D. 347) said: "It was only permitted to the Jews, as sacrifice was, for the heaviness and grossness of their souls. God condescended to their weakness because they were lately drawn off from idols; but now, instead of organs, we may use our own bodies to praise him with."

Thomas Aquinas (A.D. 1274) said: "Our church does not use musical instruments, as harps and psalteries, to praise God withal, that she may not seem to Judaize."

All of this is ruinous to the organ in worship.

My brother's position on the subject of worship seems to be rather flexible. He says there is no law or standard to control it, and in his argument he shows to believe that God will accept the worship of an honest heart, though shown in as many ways and by the use of as many aids as the human heart may require. To be consistent in this

claim, which is as false as anything he has said in the debate, he will not object to any of the forms or aids employed by heathens in their devotion. Especially will he accept the figures and pictures of the Catholics used as aids in their worship. They offer as an excuse for their pictures the same arguments as those offered by the "digressives" to justify the use of an organ as an aid to worship. Upon this point I wish to quote from Cardinal Gibbons, in "Faith of Our Fathers:" "The doctrine of the Catholic Church regarding the use of sacred images is clearly and fully expressed by the general Council of Trent in the following words: 'The images of Christ and of his Virgin Mother and of other saints are to be had and retained especially in churches, and a due honor and veneration is to be given to them—not that any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them for which they are to be honored, or that any prayer is to be made to them, or that any confidence is to be placed in them, as was formerly done by the heathens, who placed their hopes in idols; but because the honor which is given them is referred to the originals which they represent; so that by the images which we kiss and before which we uncover our heads or kneel we adore Christ and venerate his saints, whose likeness they represent.'" (Page 235.) "Religious paintings embellish the house of God." (Page 241.) "Religious pictures are the catechism of the ignorant. In spite of all the efforts of church and State in the cause of education, a great proportion of the human race will be found illiterate. Descriptive pictures will teach those what books make known to the learned." (Page 243.) "Is not our country flooded with obscene pictures and immodest representations which corrupt our youth? If the agents of Satan employ such vile means for a bad end, if they are cunning enough to pour through the senses into the hearts of the unwary the insidious portraits, in God's name why should not we sanctify the souls of our children by means of pious emblems? Why should not we make the eye the instrument of edification, as the enemy makes it the organ of destruction? Shall the pen of the artist, the pencil of the painter, and the chisel of the sculptor be prostituted into the basest purpose? God forbid! The arts were intended to be the handmaids of religion." "Almost every moment of the day the eye is receiving impressions from outward objects, and is constantly communicating these impressions to the soul." "We cannot, therefore, overestimate the salutary effect produced upon us in a church or room adorned with sacred paintings." "I am happy to acknowledge that the outcry formerly raised against images has almost subsided of late. The epithet of idolaters is seldom applied to us now. Even some of our dissenting brethren are already beginning to recognize the utility of religious symbols and to regret that we have been permitted by the intemperate zeal of the reformers to have so long the monopoly of them." "May the day soon come when all Christians

will join with us, not only in venerating the sacred symbol of salvation, but in worshipping at the same altar."

Now, I would recommend to Brother Stark and to all the "digressives" that they learn a lesson from the Catholics on aids and helps in the worship, and "go all the gaits." They have no fears of doing wrong, anyway. The fear of God is not before their eyes. So it matters not what they may wish to use, it is all right, just so it works well and proves to be a success. They got instrumental music from the pope. Then, why not borrow his paintings? Why not?

Knowing, as I do, that Brother Stark is not fairly representing the organ side of this debate, for reasons I shall not mention, but for one I will mention, which is that the "digressives," as a class, do not believe his proposition (he is the only living man known among them who will affirm it), and knowing, as I do, just what they do claim and what they usually offer as an excuse for using the organ in the worship, and wishing to take all their foundation from under them, I shall call attention and reply to more of what they consider their strongest points in its favor. I do not want them to say when they read the book that Stark does not fairly represent them, and that while I had no trouble to handle him, the real issue was not discussed. They generally admit that which everybody knows is true, and that is that in all the book of God there is not a hint at an allusion toward the faintest representation of a hope that in the worship of the saints in the Christian age instrumental music may be used by the authority of the Lord. But they say it is an expedient. Let us see. Paul says: "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient." From this language it is clear that the expedient things must come within those things that are lawful. It must be first shown that a thing is lawful; and then if it is not inexpedient, we may use it. It was lawful for Paul to eat meat, but it was not expedient for him to do so. The apostle teaches that some things lawful were not expedient, but he never even hinted that any unlawful things could be used as a mere expedient. Let the advocates of the organ first show that it is lawful to use it, and then by its results we may determine whether it be expedient to employ its use in the worship of God. Suppose it should turn out that it is even lawful to use it (an unreasonable, improbable, and an impossible thing); since its effects are so disastrous to the unity among brethren, causing, as it does, division, strife, and hatred wherever used among those who would but for its introduction and use be united in the bond of Christian love and union, Paul would write it down as among the inexpedient things. It cannot be defended from a standpoint of expediency. It is neither lawful nor expedient. Therefore, away with the abominable thing! Let it be cast out of all the churches and clothed in sackcloth and made to sit in ashes until it has at least partially atoned for the evil it has done.

It is claimed that instrumental music edifies those who use it, and that we may use anything that will do this. Catholics claim the same for their pictures, candles, crucifixes, etc. Now it is certain that there is as much authority for these as for the instrumental music in the worship of the saints under the gospel. Shall we have them, too? If not, why not? But does instrumental music in the worship really edify? Or, as A. Campbell said, to the really spiritually minded is it not more out of place than otherwise and like a cow bell in a concert? "Edify—to build up; to instruct; to improve." (Webster.) Who was ever built up in the faith or made stronger in the Lord by listening to an organ play in the worship of the saints? It edifies no one and instructs and strengthens no one; but it interferes with the devotions of many, and must, therefore, be condemned upon this general principle. It has lost its popularity upon the claim that it draws people out to church. You never hear this claim urged in its favor now. It has come to pass that the people generally prefer to hear singing to hearing an organ. So its friends must give this claim up, too, and look elsewhere for an excuse for using it.

I wish now to offer some syllogisms which I shall use as counter argument on the question. I hope my brother will carefully examine each one in the order I give them and in the spirit of fairness and candor.

SYLLOGISMS.

(1) All melody made by divine authority must be made in the heart. (Eph. 5: 19.) (2) To make melody on the instrument is not to make melody in the heart. (3) Therefore melody made on an instrument is not by divine authority.

(1) We are to sing so as to teach, admonish one another. (Col. 3: 16.) (2) The instrument cannot aid in teaching and admonishing. (3) Therefore the instrument cannot be used in the song service.

When God commands one thing to be done in his service, he forbids by the command the doing of something else—e. g., he commanded Abraham to offer Isaac, which forbade his offering Ishmael; he commanded the Jews to worship at the altar in Jerusalem, which forbade their worshipping at an altar in Bethel. (1 Kings 13.)

(1) God says he hates a man who sows discord among brethren (Prov. 6: 19.) (2) Those who introduce the organ into the worship cause discord among brethren. (3) Therefore, God hates a man who introduces the organ into the worship of the saints.

(1) There are seven things which if a man does he is an abomination in the sight of God. (Prov. 6: 16.) (2) The use of instruments in the worship is one of the seven things, because it causes discord. (3) Therefore those who use the instrument in the worship are an abomination in God's sight.

(1) God, by his divine power, has given us all things that pertain

to life and godliness. (2 Pet. 1: 3.) (2) That word does not furnish us with instruments in worship. (3) Therefore the use of the instrument is not Godlike.

(1) That which is not Godlike, or godly, is ungodliness. (2) The use of the instrument in the worship is not godly. (3) Therefore the use of the instrument is ungodly.

(1) All ungodliness is sin. (Tit. 2: 12.) (2) Instrumental music is ungodliness when used in worship. (3) Therefore the use of the instrument in worship is sin.

(1) God seeks—and, therefore, desires—only those to worship him who worship in spirit and in truth. (John 4: 24.) (2) As is taught by A. Clarke in his commentary on this passage, whatever else is taught in this verse, it means that to worship in spirit and in truth is to worship like the Spirit in the truth has directed. That word does not teach any one to worship with the organ. (3) Therefore those who use the organ do not worship in spirit and in truth.

(1) "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord." (Col. 3: 17.) (2) Anything done in the name of the Lord is simply by his authority. God authorizes only in his word. His word does not authorize the use of instruments in the worship. (3) Therefore those who do use instruments in the worship do it without divine sanction.

(1) Any worship not in God's name is sinful. (2) The use of the instrument in worship is not in his name. (3) Therefore the use of instruments in the worship is sinful.

(1) The use of the instrument in the worship is sinful (2) "The wages of sin is death." (3) Therefore those who use the instrument will not be saved if they do not repent.

(1) Christ said to his apostles: "Teach all nations . . . whatsoever I have commanded you." (Matt. 28: 19, 20.) (2) These apostles did not teach people to use instruments in the public worship. (3) Therefore instrumental music in worship is no part of the "all things" commanded by Christ.

(1) Christ told the apostles that the Holy Ghost would guide them into all truth. (John 16: 13.) (2) The Holy Ghost did not guide them into the practice of using instrumental music in the worship. (3) Therefore the use of the instrument in the worship is no part of the truth.

(1) The entire system of divine worship is found in the New Testament. (2) Instrumental music in worship is not found in the New Testament. (3) Therefore it is no part of the divine system of worship.

(1) The law of worship given by God is perfect. (James.) To add to a perfect law makes it imperfect. (2) Instrumental music is not in God's law of worship. It is added. (3) Therefore instrumental music makes the law of God imperfect.

(1) Congregational worship was appointed by inspired men, and was ordained of God. (2) All things left out of congregational worship was left out by the authority of God. Instrumental music was left out of the worship. (3) Therefore instrumental music was left out of the worship by the authority of God.

(1) Christians should speak the same things (1 Cor. 1: 10), walk by the same rule (Phil. 3: 16). This can be done only by speaking as the oracles of God. (1 Pet. 4: 11.) (2) The oracles of God authorize no man to put instruments in the worship of God. (3) Therefore those who put the instrument in the worship disregard the apostolic rule.

(1) Those only are sons of God who are led by the Spirit of God. (Rom. 8: 14.) (2) God's Spirit teaches no man to put the instrument in the worship. (3) Therefore those who put the instrument in the worship of God forfeit their claims to sonship.

(1) Paul says: "Mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have received; and avoid them." (Rom. 16: 17.) (2) Those who introduce the instrument in the worship cause division contrary to the doctrine. (3) Therefore Paul says: "Mark and avoid those who introduce the instrument in the worship."

(1) Condemnation rests upon those who add anything to the law of God. (Rev. 22: 18.) (2) Those who add the instrument to the worship add to that word. (3) Therefore condemnation rests upon those who introduce the instruments into the worship of God.

(1) To walk in the footsteps of Jesus is to do only what he and his apostles taught. (2) Neither Christ nor his apostles taught and practiced the use of instrumental music in the worship. (3) Therefore those who use the instrument in worship do not walk after the apostles nor in the footsteps of Jesus.

(1) Doing as religious service anything not mentioned in the word is to go beyond what is written. (2) To go beyond what is written is condemned in the Scriptures. (See 1 Cor. 4: 6; 2 John 1: 9, R. V.) (3) To do anything not authorized is therefore condemned in the Scriptures.

(1) To use instruments in the worship is going beyond what is written, because it is not authorized. (2) To go beyond what is written is condemned in the Scriptures (3) Therefore the use of instruments in connection with the worship is condemned in the Scriptures.

(1) Anything condemned in the Scriptures is wrong and sinful. (2) The use of instruments in the worship is condemned in the Scriptures. (3) Therefore the use of instruments in the worship is both wrong and sinful.

(1) The Scriptures thoroughly furnish the man of God unto all good works. (2 Tim. 3: 16.) (2) The Scriptures do not furnish authority to use instruments in the worship. (3) Therefore the use of instrumental music in the worship is not a good work, and should not be practiced.

I have given these syllogisms straight along, without pausing to comment, so as to give the reader the best possible advantage of them; and, besides, they are so plain that comment is wholly unnecessary anyway. The first and second proposition has been abundantly proven by the arguments already offered in my speeches; so I only have to state the truths already discovered in this debate, and I have done so in this form as well as otherwise. I shall contend that as long as it remains true that no hint at any authority for the use of the instrument in the worship can be found, the conclusion in each syllogism must stand against it and against those who employ its use in their effort to worship God.

I have followed very closely my good brother in all his wanderings all over all the dispensations past, the one under which we now worship (the Christian), and I have even gone with him into the age yet to come; I have even carefully examined his guesses. Still, we find him in the same condition in which he started out in the debate, without any authority for his proposition and for his practice under it. All the evidence—absolutely all of it—has been shown to stand against him. Then I ask: Why will he remain stubborn? Why not accept the plain truth of our God and cease perverting the right ways of the Lord? Does he think that God will hold him guiltless who hardens his heart and sears his own conscience and absolutely refuses to allow God's word to remain true only when and where it happens to suit his misguided and prejudiced soul? Will he be exhorted to turn from his evil course before it is too late for him to repent? As certain as that God is in heaven and that Jesus Christ is God's Son and as sure as the Bible is God's word, just so certain will those who think, talk, and act as does Brother Stark be forever lost. There can be no doubt about this; for if such a one may be excused, then there is no reason for condemning any one at all; but all mankind would have no reason to feel afraid, for universal salvation would certainly be the promise of God to the whole creation. I know it is hard for one to turn from his course after he has gone as far as has Brother Stark in this matter, but it is to be hoped and confidently believed that many honest hearts will be turned to the right way by this debate. I have heard of and know of much good that has already been accomplished, and I pray God that much more may yet be done.

STARK'S SIXTH SPEECH.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, Brethren of the "Kingdom of Heaven:"

This is the third day of the discussion; and my brother, who was to demolish me in two days, insists this shall be my last. So I must answer his two speeches in this and give him a chance to reply. It is hard to answer his loose style of reasoning, if it be reasoning. To review all his assertions and irrelevant matter would be burdensome and to the reader tedious; but if I may be pardoned, I may ask: What have his personalities to do with the use of organs in worship? What has my being "mad" or glad, pleased or displeased, to do with the question discussed, any more than my being old or young? He says I have been begging for mercy all the way through on account of my age. The reader knows I have not said a word about my age in any speech I have made; and as for mercy, I would not be so cowardly as to ask mercy from a fallen foe who resorts to so many misrepresentations to keep his spirit up. Such a man is a poor representative of the truth.

For forty years I have known the inwardness of the sect who make a command of their own a test of fellowship; and all the leaders, from Franklin down, would slander their brethren to propagate their heresy.

Notice the many statements my brother makes, out of whole cloth, to foster prejudice. The Lord knows I would ask no mercy at his hands till he shows more strength than he has yet developed; but such statements are in keeping with his whole talk. He has evidently been accustomed to only oral discussions, where the hearer cannot go back and find the statement false, as the reader can. It is a pity he will make so many such reckless statements without the shadow of fact to sustain them. Has he nothing else to say? Does his cause demand it? Let the reader turn back and look for the proof and tell me if an instrument of music in the hands of a David is not needed to drive the evil spirit out of our young Saul. I am really ashamed of our brother; and, instead of asking for mercy, I am moved to pity.

Again, what has the opinions of farmer, banker, lawyer, etc., concerning how best to revive the church to do with the question that "the word of the Lord authorizes the use of instruments in his praise," any more than their opinions concerning the best methods of feeding swine? As I said at the beginning, such talk is all he has. No scripture reason or philosophy has he to present, and he must fill in his time with something.

He says I do not notice what Amos 6: 1-4 says against the use of instruments of music. Why, on that passage I based my third argument in my first speech, and have twice referred to his wild assertions concerning it. Poor brother! Has his memory failed him so young, or does he not care what he says? Is he the best that side can furnish? Are such reckless, incorrect statements a necessity for sustaining the heresy?

His talk about the "little teachers" who looked up for me the definitions in the college libraries is a disgrace to his head and heart and to the cause of Christ in Tennessee and Texas, and is a violation of the rules of honorable controversy. (See Hedge's "Logic," by which he agreed to abide.) These "little teachers" are his brethren, and far his superiors in standing, scholarship, manners, good breeding, and truthfulness. They give full definitions from the lexicons they quote, while his own definitions of the word from lexicons are so garbled they are false. Whenever and wherever this debate is read, my brethren will have a contempt for a man who in his own illiteracy will sneer at men who have taken honors from our best colleges and then taken postgraduate courses from the best of the nation, and through this book sends forth uncalled-for slanders of such men as Brother Meeks, of Henderson, Tenn., whose praise is in all the churches except those infected with this damnable heresy. He says Sophocles examined all the cases where *psallo* is used by Greek writers. How does he know? Sophocles gives fewer references than any of the other lexicographers. For a man whose education scarcely exceeds our city grammar schools to sneer at men chosen as professors in our best colleges is the climax of audacity. From their full and unbiased definitions of *psallo* as given by the best lexicons in use he would have you turn to his garbled extracts from the same authors. He then gives the opinions of men on some passages. It is not the opinions of men we care for. Adam Clarke's opinion puts sprinkled babies into the church. "If we take him on the music question, why not on the baby question?" he asks. Dr. Lockhart and Professor Evans, whom this illiterate debater and heretic calls "little school-teachers," give the full definition of *psallo* from the best lexicographers. My brother, with a mere smattering of Greek, comes forward with the same lexicons and gives garbled extracts from the same authors, leaving out what is against him. Which is to be accredited? He gives Thayer's comments on passages of scripture. What care we for comments? It is the scripture we want, not some one's opinion. We want the meaning of the words as defined, not the opinions of some biased by prejudice.

A careful examination of his fourth speech shows my brother's reliance is wholly on the opinions of some fogies of generations ago. Does he know that A. E. Sophocles was a "little school-teacher" of perhaps no more learning than the one now occupying the chair he

once filled? Does he know the one now in the chair contradicts his predecessor and sets Sophocles aside? But how my brother knows how much Greek literature Sophocles examined is beyond my ken. It is certain he makes few references of the word from authors. If he examined so much, why does he refer to so few cases of its use? O, my brother has such a wild imagination, and can say anything he wants said! Is it not a fact that chanting has always been done with musical accompaniment, and Sophocles speaks simply of the chanting, while others take notice of the playing accompaniment?

He says I did not publish my letter of inquiry to the college professors. This is another specimen of his loose way of telling things. Turn back to my fourth speech, and see that the questions are published and the answers given. Why is it that among the leaders of that sect there is such a proneness to draw upon their imagination and state things different from what they are?

Ignoring my point clearly made on Eph. 5: 19 that a psalm is not a hymn nor a song, and that Paul makes a clear distinction in the words, my brother gives several translations of the passage, and in all the distinction between psalm, hymn, and song is clearly kept up the same as in the Common Version, and then, with "*gall equal to two oxen*," says: "This is sufficient to show that to sing, and not to play, is the New Testament meaning of *psallo*. He who talks otherwise is without excuse." The point we made is that *psallo* includes an instrument, and God by the Holy Spirit in his prophet defines it as singing praise with instrumental accompaniment; that *hymn* means to sing dirges without an instrument, and *song* was a poem to be sung or read. In all the versions the distinction is clearly kept up the same as in our own. Then, where is their help in defining the word? Where does he find his conclusion? What bearing have all his quotations on the point? Psalms, hymns, and songs are in the passage—in all of them—and in all are used by Paul as distinct. If all mean the same thing, why are all used? If they all mean the same, then a psalm is a hymn and a song is a psalm and a hymn. His array of quotations are simply to his defeat. Why not answer the point as I made it? I accept all his translations, and still the same question arises concerning the distinction Paul makes between a psalm, a hymn, and a song.

After this flourish of trumpets, he says: "Having now seen that the lexicons, commentaries, translations, and, in fact, all standards, are a unit in cutting out the instrumental idea as the New Testament meaning of *psallo*," etc. Any one who can thus jump at conclusions from anything and everything said either does not know an argument or else does not care what he says. His quotations from lexicons are all garbled, his translations prove nothing, and his commentaries are only opinions of men; and we admit all and still ask: What is the meaning of *psallo*? He then quotes the opinion of his "pure and good

brethren" as the end of the controversy. Mark, all these from whom he quotes are all partisans, and simply give their opinions in direct contradiction to the learning of men of known scholarship. I could thribble his quotations from as good men on the other side, but what will it prove?

But he tells us that the word means "to pluck, pull, or twang," without singing. Then, as Paul says, they shall *psallo* ("pluck, pull, or twang"), and (Eph. 5: 19) they shall sing. As a hymn means to sing, who says they shall not "pluck, pull, or twang" in the church when they are speaking with hymns and songs? He admits that *psallo* means to "pluck, pull, or twang" the strings of a musical instrument. Now, what does the passages teach? "Speaking to one another with 'plucking, pulling, or twanging' the strings of a musical instrument, while you sing hymns and read songs." But he will say the twanging is in the heart. Then the singing is in the heart also, for both are done in the same place, at the same time. Some must *psallo* with an instrument; others must sing without an instrument; and others must "pluck, pull, and twang" the heart as the instrument played upon. We say: "There is music in my soul to-day." That is the "*psalloutes*" of the heart—a figurative expression of Paul to the saints as the effect of *psalloing*, hymning, and reading songs. Every reader, learned or unlearned, understands that the psalms, hymns, and songs produce melodious rapture in the heart of the worshippers.

Need I say any more on "psalms, hymns, and songs?" He is to have another speech; and I think by that time he will admit, what he says I have failed to prove, that the slugging and plucking of musical chords are done in the church at the same time. If his definition of *psallo* is correct (and I think it is), Sophocles is left out; and we are taught to "pluck, pull, and twang" a musical instrument (*psallo*, with his own definition) with our hymns and songs in the church. He says I have not proved it; so he has kindly and learnedly helped me out. Take away the pettifogging of these *learned* cranks, and the passage is easily understood by the most illiterate. Do they not know that *aidoutes* and *psalloutes* are both in the heart as well as either? If the instrument, as my brother says, is the literal heart, then it is the literal heart that sings, and there is no voice in it.

Brother Allen he quotes as saying *psallo* means to "pull, pluck, twang;" and as we must *psallo* ("pull, pluck, twang") with the spirit and with the understanding, then I can play with the spirit and with the understanding; for Paul says I understand what is harped by the sounds, just as well as I can understand what is sung with the voice—hymned. Strange they have no argument, but simply throw dust—darken counsel. Cannot any one understand this, unless much learning has made him mad? I do not think my brother will get mad on that account.

I have much more I would like to say; but my brother is getting

tired, and in private letters asks for a stop, and I must cut the review short. But since my dear brother has made one attempt at criticism, I must answer him. He tells us: "The instrument is not in the word [*psallo*], for the word means *pluck, pull, twang*." Well, please tell us how one can *pluck, pull, twang* without something to *pluck, pull, twang*; and is not that something an instrument of some kind? But he goes to David (Ps. 81: 1, 2): "Take a psalm." Well, what shall we do? Bring your instruments, "and make a joyful noise to the God of Jacob." If this does not tell how a psalm is rendered, one cannot understand the word of God. If you "take a psalm," it must be played ("pull, pluck, twang") in some way. These poems of David were all written for instrumental accompaniment; and, therefore, they were called "psalms." David tells us often how they were to be "*psalloed*." (See Ps. 147, 150, *passim*.) You cannot sing a psalm without a musical instrument. If the word means to twang, you must have something to twang; if to pull, you must have something to pull. These are the definitions he indorses, and something to pull or twang must be resident in the word. You cannot twang unless you twang something, and that something is an instrument, and that is in the word. But he says David was not such a fool as to repeat himself. My dear brother has never studied the parallelisms of Hebrew poetry. He says he is prepared to show that I do not mean what I say. Then, why does he not show it and show what I do mean?

He wants to know why I refer only to those passages in Psalms to prove an instrument was used where an instrument is mentioned. Dear me! After Webster has defined a word, does he define it every time he uses it, or does he use it with the definition given? When seeking the definition of a word, will I go where the word is defined or where it is used without being defined? A schoolboy should be able to answer that. Why does he go where baptism is defined to know what baptism means? I am afraid my brother is getting rattled. Poor boy! He ought to know the word *sing* is often translated from other words which mean to sing without an instrument. Has he not noticed my criticism on these words, or is all this talk for smoke and for dust throwing, to darken counsel with the illiterate? Let me remind him this is a religious debate, and chicanery and misrepresentation and pettifogging are not becoming in a search for the truth.

He says: "I know the instrument is not thought of where it is not mentioned." O, something more that is new! Does he know water is not thought of in baptism where it is not mentioned? Webster defines "organ" as "an instrument of music." In this debate we use the word without defining it. Do we put the definition into the word when we use it? Please do not get off any more such strong arguments. *Show me some mercy on account of my age. Do not carry my gray hairs in sorrow to the grave with such ponderous thoughts.*

If the Holy Spirit defines the word *once* and then uses it often, does not the Holy Spirit put that definition into the word and use it with the definition given, or does he use it with various definitions? How in the case of *baptidzein*? Paul defines *baptidzo*. (Rom. 6: 4; 1 Cor. 10: 1, 2.) In places where it is not defined, has it the same meaning? If driven to such extremities, I do not wonder that by private correspondence he is endeavoring to shorten the debate. Of course I do not seek proof from a word undefined. That is the difference between us. He is looking for proof where there is none, and what he does not find he asserts. Notice his quotation from my book. I do not care to explain it. It seems plain enough to me.

Brother Smith, in his tract, argues that if *psallo* means to sing with an instrument and we are told to *psallo*, we must use an instrument or sin. No; God could not command his people to sing, for all could not keep it. If Brother Franklin had been commanded to sing, he would have died a sinner; or Campbell, either to play or sing, he would have been lost. They could do neither; but either could render a song—an ode—and thus join in fulfilling the teaching of Paul. Hence, God could not give a command where he had given no power to fulfill. As only a part could render a psalm and only a part could render a hymn, or even a part could speak by a song and read an ode, therefore he could not command all to do it, since only a part could perform it; but he could, as he did, give command to all, saying: "Let them—let them praise the Lord upon the harp," etc. This he could and this he did command. Does my brother obey that command? Does he "let them?" The New Testament says *psallo*, but does not define the word it uses. David defines the word by the "Spirit of Christ which was in him." It is thus we learn what to do. Jesus says to baptize, but does not tell how to do it. Paul defines the word, and then we know just what Jesus meant. From his quotation, my book must be a pretty good thing. In writing, does my brother define every word he uses? If in reading, though correctly used, we do not understand what he means, do we properly go to Webster for a definition? No wonder he thinks I am "mad," when I keep him so fretted over the blunder he makes. He says with a sneer that I say in my book I was only two weeks learning the definition of *psallo*—only fourteen days to read and believe the two last psalms. How much time would it take him if he only believed what God says by his Spirit in the prophets? God's use of the word *praise* is clearly defined. "David in spirit" tells how to praise God: "Praise him on stringed instruments and organs." (Ps. 150.) He also tells us how to sing. (Ps. 144: 9; 147: 7; 149: 3.) These all define the word *sing* as God uses it. Then, why does my brother say we are commanded to sing, and not play? If he did not pretend to be a follower of Christ, I could easily explain such talk. We cannot afford to sell out our interest in the Savior for a short triumph in a debate. With the helps we have, one can gather all the

scriptural meaning of *praise* and *sing* in two days, unless confused by prejudice and blinded by bigotry. To get a scriptural definition, I would not need to read the assertions of Kurfees and Carr, the infidel writings of Lipscomb, and the unsupported declaration of McGarvey that *psallo* does not mean the same in one part of the Bible that it does in another part. The plain, scriptural definition of *sing*, when clearly given, is enough for every believer who has no sect to support.

Notice his exhortation to me to repent. Three times in the oral debate the dear boy climbed upon the throne, called me up to judgment, condemned me, and sent me down to hell; and here again, without argument, he gets in his opinion about me, judging my heart as being filled with hatred and envy. This shows the arrogance and dogmatism of that sect. They can find commands not to use an organ where there are none, but overlook such as "Judge not," etc.; "Rebuke not an elder;" "Let the younger submit to the older." Such teaching and commands that are plentiful he cannot find. I am not speaking of this for my sake, for I am not smarting under his lash, but to show the spirit of the whole sect—the spirit of the "man of sin" of whom Paul speaks. If they cannot rule, they must ruin; and where they do rule, they most surely ruin.

My brother is a slow student, and thinks one could not learn much on the music question in two weeks, and jeers that I finished so soon; but this is only our third day of study together, and he has run out, and we drop off one day for his sake, and close the discussion in three days, I having learned that he has no argument on his side and not a passage of scripture; and what he cannot carry by bombast, wit, ridicule, and sarcasm is lost. I spent two weeks in the honesty of my heart learning there is nothing but assertion and dogmatism on that side; and my brother has spent three days and finds nothing else, and gives it up, and calls in Brethren Carr, Kurfees, Hall, Grubbs, et al. to help him with their assertions without proof. Look over the extracts from them, and they are as barren of proof as his own. Take McGarvey's criticism: "The Greek word *psallo* originally meant to touch, then to twang a bowstring or play a stringed instrument with the fingers, as in the expression: 'Touch my light guitar.' It meant to play a harp, and finally to sing." It never meant to sing without the harp, as the root of the word would be lost. He adds: "You can find this gradual progress in the use of the word in the Greek lexicons generally, and especially in Liddell and Scott, though in the last and greatest meaning given is to sing to a harp." Brother McGarvey ought to know that this "last and greatest definition" is correct; that from the earliest times they sung to the harp, which they would twang and cause to vibrate; that wherever the Septuagint Version says they *psalloed* it meant they sung to a harp; that the Hebrew word which *psallo* translates meant to sing to an instrument of some kind; and Liddell and Scott say the word means to sing to a harp;

and not a lexicon can be found, except Sophocles', that does not connect it with instrumental accompaniment.

When Rice, in his debate with Campbell, found a lexicon which departed from the scholarship of the world and gave sprinkling as a definition of *baptidzo*, did Brother McGarvey accept it? Then, why does he endorse the eccentric Sophocles, who says it means to chant, *contra*, to the united scholarship of the world? Sophocles does not say the chanting was done without an instrument, but simply places the emphasis upon the chanting, without mentioning the playing; while all know that the ancients chanted to the sound of an instrument, and David, who was a lover of music (as I presume Sophocles, like McGarvey, was not), gave emphasis to the harp and the pleasant psaltery. I will venture Sophocles was like McGarvey, Campbell, Franklin, and all the leaders I have known on that side, and was a crank on the subject, and could neither sing nor play, but could chant, like the others, in a kind of monotone, and his own feelings biased his judgment. I have known the whole cranky set for fifty years and the animus of the whole thing among the leaders. Some boy preachers educated in their schools are disposed to make the word of God of no effect through the traditions of the fathers.

Must I again explain worship for my brother's sake, who will not see? Worship is of the heart. As all worship will produce acts, these are called "acts of worship;" but they are not the worship, but acts produced by the worship of the spirit within us; and by the figure of speech called "metonymy," these acts without that are produced by worship within are sometimes called "worship," and may all proceed from worship, or they may be performed without worship, which shows they are not worship. I think if my brother would get a small juvenile work on mental and moral philosophy, he would be greatly benefited. What is worship by a saint in one place is worship by the same saint in every place. How does my brother know God will not accept my worship if another plays an organ? What has that to do with my heart's adoration? Will it put the evil spirit it cast out of Saul when he heard it into the man who hears it now, so that I will give up my worship and raise the devil in the church, causing discord and strife among saints, with all attendant evils? Worship is of the heart, and will break out in such acts as are peculiar to the man, as reading songs, humming them, or playing on an instrument; praising, praying, shouting, or leaping like the man Jesus healed; bowing low to the earth or clapping the hands and shouting God's praise. My brother wants me to spend all my time repeating these things, but I think the reader will understand me.

He speaks of my sin in using the organ. I do not use the organ. I can neither play nor sing, but I am glad to know just what Paul would say were he to come back. He would say I may use a song—may read a poem

He closes his fourth speech with a distinction between worship and service. So, after all his opposition to me, he thinks just as I do of the distinction between worship and service, praise, etc.

I now come to my brother's fifth tirade. He still insists that I am mad. I have thrice denied it, and once more state that I have not been angry with the little fellow. My feelings have been more of pity than otherwise. I greatly regret the discussion has taken the turn it has. He must fill out his time with something, and as he can talk more glibly about me than on the question under investigation, he puts in the most of his time about me. As I said, if it were true, it would have no bearing on the question of the use of organs in the church of Christ for the praise of our God.

He defies me to tell what Clark Braden thinks of him. It is not necessary. Those who read the book may think about as Clark Braden thinks, and they may not. Brother Braden and I think much alike.

He still keeps up his talk about Brother Meeks. Though it has nothing to do with the subject, I still feel I should defend a man whose praise is in all the churches of Christ who have no creed but the law of the Lord. Brother Meeks preaches the same gospel he did in the church at Henderson, where for twenty-one years they praised God with instrumental strains without discord, till Brother Elam, of the sect of the "antis," went down, divided the church, led off a part, and built a new sect upon the human dogma: "Thou shalt have no organ for praise in the church of the Master." Because Brother Meeks would not go with them in their heresy, he must now be slandered wherever their church organ is circulated and read; and now they are trying to get the vile slander into this book. Brother Meeks never put an organ into the church and never preaches on the subject of church music. He preaches Christ as the head over all, God blessed forever, and proclaims no law Christ has not given. His only sin is that he did not give up all and follow Elam. Who divided the church in Henderson that dwelt together in love till this man-made question was raised by a man-made creed, saying, "They shall not use it," when God says: "Let them?"

Again, I have thrice denied and pronounced it a slander when he says I ever attempted to put an organ in the church at McMinnville or ever preached on the subject of music or in any way alluded to it. It is useless to try to correct any statement he makes. He will simply cry the louder: "'Tis, 'tis, 'tis!"

I only spoke of the piety and praise of the Old Testament prophets, and the illustrations I read were from Ps. 19, 23; Isa. 53, 55. I would not stop to correct this; but to tell such things for effect, to arouse prejudice, is their stock in trade; and if you debate with them, you must meet these personalities. It is all they have to carry the unsuspecting by prejudice. I tried to have my brother leave out these personalities, as there is no argument in it; but he replied that what

he wrote must all go in just as he wrote it. Of course I must reply to their misrepresentations enough to keep prejudice allayed.

For saying he has the "gall of an ox" I suppose I should apologize—to the ox. Of course I use the slang phrase with the common meaning, and all understand me. To the committee of arrangements he said they need arrange for but two days, as he only wanted two days to demolish me; and to me he writes that if I "were accustomed to debating, I would understand why he asked for concessions." It is that wonderful assurance that has its effect upon the unwary. The thoughtless would think he had taken a boy to raise. I shall always feel ashamed of the book, and regret that it must drift into such personalities; but how else can one answer a palpable misrepresentation? I never before had an opponent whose only argument was his own assertions—his own *ipse dixit*.

He still persists in saying Amos (5: 21-27) cried against the "melody of their viols." Then he denounced songs and sacrifices and offerings. Read it. His only arguments are the assertions of himself and friends, who deal in naught but opinions. No scripture is found by any of them. Go back and read what they say. How enthusiastic are his laudations of those on his side!

He says if I accept the inspirations of David on the music question, I must take babies into the church, as David did. David never took infants even into the Jewish church. God took them in by his covenant with Abraham. David had nothing to do with it; but by the Spirit of Christ, David prophesied of the new dispensation, as I have shown, and said, "Let the children of Zion praise their King with instruments of music," which he enumerates. But this same brother with whom I am trying to debate comes up with the uninspired opinions of Clarke and Wesley, and accepts them without a particle of proof from the sacred oracles. Then if to accept what David by inspiration says about music I must accept infant baptism, etc., he, if he accepts the uninspired opinions of Clarke and Wesley on music, must accept their views on infant baptism also. David never baptized a babe. "Consistency, thou art a jewel."

He denies that the churches who use organs, favor societies, etc., are doing more for evangelism than those opposed. Yes, he denies everything. Let them compare notes, and they will find I am right. In three papers there are from 1,500 to 2,500 additions reported every week, and the three societies—the home, foreign, and women's—collect and spend in mission work about \$450,000 annually; while the "antis," running a little side issue, with one man doing the whole work and management and the donors knowing little about what becomes of their gifts, do scarcely enough worth reporting. Yet the preachers do a large amount of gratuitous preaching to proselyte uncultured Christians into untaught churches; and while they claim to have more churches than we, they have not one paid missionary to

our forty and few doing the work of an evangelist. Of course he will come out with more assertions of a general character, but he will give no published statistics. Indeed, they have no statistics to publish, except a few begging letters. They fulfill one passage: "Let not thy right hand know what thy left hand doeth." If the left hand puts it into their own pocket, there is no way for the right hand to find it out. There are no reports and no books kept.

He again repeats that the melody is in the heart, and the "*psalloutes*" is the twanging of the heart strings. Well, the singing is in the same place, and how does he get any voice in it? He quotes this to prove they sing with the voice, saying: "They sing, not play." Does he know the use of conjunctions? If the heart is the instrument played on, it also furnishes the song. "*Adoutes kai psalloutes*" is as closely connected in Eph. 5: 19 as is "Reform, and be baptized" in Acts 2: 38. If one is the twanging of the heart, the other is the singing of the heart. Both are in the same place. I suppose he will call this "silly talk," and pass it unnoticed.

I have explained the case of Nadab and Abihu. Let the reader turn back and read. God told them not to offer strange fire. They did it, and died. Let the reader turn back to my fifth speech and see what I said about Moses inventing the tabernacle. I never said it. I said just what the Bible says on the subject. My brother cannot be trusted to make a statement of facts. I do not think Braden wrote any of his speeches, or the misstatements and misrepresentations would be left out. Braden is not only truthful, but has also much good sense.

He says he quoted from history to prove, and did prove, that the first organ was introduced in the seventh century; and then he quotes the protests of the church fathers against instruments—Chrysostom in A.D. 139 and Justin Martyr in A.D. 347. Why did they protest if there were no instruments in use? Strange! Why does he not tell where we will find what Justin Martyr wrote in these things he quotes, that we may look it up? He states so many things at random we cannot know when he tells what is correct. Now I do not believe Justin Martyr or Chrysostom ever wrote what he attributes to them. But if he has misrepresented, he will stick to it. If he misquotes me right before the reader, can I trust him to quote the fathers? He is evidently not debating for the learned, but for the illiterate. He may be able to carry a few with his *ad captandum vulgus* style. But if he now gives the page, I will have no chance to examine, as this is the last speech he allows me. In our written agreement I was to have fifteen minutes to close, but this he now refuses; so let the reader be prepared for anything in his last speech. Brother Braden declares him a "shyster."

Now he quotes Conybeare and Howson on Eph. 5: 19. Opinions again instead of scripture. By the scholarship of the world I have shown that a song is an ode written and may be read; a hymn is a

dirge song sung on occasions of sorrow, as at the last supper and in the Philipian jail; and a psalm is an ascription of praise sung with instrumental accompaniment—a song of celebration. With this agrees the inspiration of the Old Testament and New Testament teaching. Has he answered this? Like a child, he repeats: "It is not, it is not; it is silly." He seems not yet to understand that the question is not of worship, but of praise. This I have continually explained. Praise is not worship, prayer is not worship, singing is not worship; for all these can be done without worship—done in hypocrisy. But when these acts come from the adoration and exultation of the heart, they are acts of worship. By a figure of speech they may be called "worship." But he uses the word "worship" because by so doing he can better appeal to the prejudice of his sect, which is built upon a human tradition in opposition to the organ. He says that my position on worship is flexible; that God will accept the worship of an honest heart. Yes; there is no worship but of an honest heart. All acts from any other source are not worship. That honest worship of the heart may break forth in many ways and in a thousand acts. It is like the love which will keep his commands and do many things not written, as freewill offerings. How many do more than is commanded for love's sake! So with the worshipful heart. Some will shout, some embrace, some cry, some talk, some sing, and some play his praises on an instrument. What they love most they will offer to their God. Some will contribute of their increase of goods, which will be as much an act of worship as songs of praise.

All his talk about Catholic pictures and his quotation from Bishop Gibbons have no bearing upon the question. I do not think looking at the pictures of Christ on the cross ever injured me. But does this prove the word of God does not authorize the use of instruments in his praise?

He knows I do not represent the organ side. Well, I am not trying to. I am only trying to prove my own proposition, that "the word of God authorizes the use of instruments in his praise." I have given sixteen arguments, which have been answered only with a "pooh!" "It's silly," etc.

He asks if instrumental music instructs or edifies, and calls up Brother Campbell, who knew not a tune from a katydid's song, for an opinion. Paul says it instructs and edifies, and we know what is piped and what is harped from the sounds that are given. He says we understand from the sounds of the pipe and the harp, and are, therefore, edified, if his definition from Webster is true. He says it interferes with the devotion of many. No, no; the devoted do not notice it any more than they do a nightingale's song in a tree. It is only the stubborn and self-willed, whose devotion is turned into anger because they cannot rule the acts of all others; only the devilish, whose evil spirit would be cast out, like Saul, except it drives them

away from the worship. To give up their worship and leave is their only hope of retaining the spirit of Satan within them.

We now come to his wonderful syllogisms. He hopes I will notice each one. It is a rule of logic that if the major or minor proposition is assumed or doubtful, the conclusion is an assumption or doubtful. You will, therefore, notice that in every case he assumes that the question at issue is settled, and he judges the case for all the readers. The reader will please turn back to his syllogisms at the close of his last speech and compare them with my version as here given. I will make mine as much like his own as truth will permit.

1. God, by his divine power, has given to us all things that pertain to life and piety through the knowledge of Christ. (2 Pet. 1: 3.)

2. That furnishes authority for the use of instruments in his praise.

3. Therefore their use pertains to life and piety.

1. That which is not godliness or godly is ungodly.

2. The use of instruments in praise is godlike, for it is done before the throne. (See Rev. 14: 2-4.)

3. Therefore the use of instruments in praise is godly. "The ungodly shall not stand in judgment, nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous."

1. "Sin is the transgression of law." (Major.)

2. There is no law against the use of instruments in God's praise. He has found none.

3. Therefore there is no sin in their use.

1. "All ungodliness is sin." (His major.)

2. None but a man of sin in the temple of God, trying to show that he is God, judging others, and giving laws God has not given, has declared such praise ungodly.

3. Therefore the cry against it is of the devil and is devilish.

1. "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord." (His major.)

2. In the name of the God of Jacob we are commanded to "let them praise his name on stringed instruments and organs," as I have shown clearly; and he has not found a single passage against it.

3. Therefore instruments are used in the name of the Lord.

1. All melody made by divine authority must be made in the heart. (*Adoutes kai psalloutes.*)

2. If the *psalloutes*, rendered "making melody," is done in the heart, the *adoutes*, rendered "singing," is done in the heart also.

3. Therefore the singing and the playing are done at the same time and place.

1. If we play so the pipe or harp gives no uncertain sound (play correctly), we will understand what is played or harped. (1 Cor. 14: 7-9.)

2. Instruments thus aid in admonishing the saints (Col. 3: 16) when properly played in psalm singing.

3. Therefore instruments may be used in song service.
1. God says he hates a man who sows discord among brethren.
2. Those who fight the organ without divine warrant sow discord among the saints and build a sect on a human creed to divide the church of the living God.
3. Therefore, God hates the contentions and discords which come from the whole devilish set; and misrepresentations and deceit will characterize their strife. It does.
 1. There are seven things which if a man does he is an abomination in God's sight.
 2. The sowing of discord without law lies at their door.
 3. Therefore to fight the music God has authorized is an abomination in his sight.
 1. If God teaches one thing to be done, it forbids the doing of something else in its place or doing only a part of what God has taught.
 2. God has taught us to admonish with songs, hymns, and psalms.
 3. Therefore to reject hymns and psalms, or either, and allow nothing but songs to be read, is a violation of God's teaching.
 1. "God seeks and desires only those to worship him who worship him in spirit and in truth."
 2. As Adam Clarke is no authority, except in scholarship and the definition of words, in this debate,
 3. Therefore both the major and minor propositions being assumed in the above, the whole is an assumption.

Who told us if in our devotions and adorations we failed in the fullness of the knowledge of the truth or highest spiritual conception, all will be ignored by the divine One? Such things give no chance for growth and spiritual development after coming into the kingdom, and the babe just born into the church must wait till he has reached the fullness of growth and sainthood before he is permitted to worship the God to whom he looks through a glass darkly. It simply teaches that in our adorations (not praise) we shall try to hold God in the highest spiritual conception as revealed by the truth.

But why waste time and paper on this bundle of ignorance and folly? Is my brother ignorant of every principle of logic, and does he not know that every syllogism is based upon the assumption that what he has asserted is gospel truth? To deceive the thoughtless he has taken this way to reassert his bold assumptions. Notice the last one: "The use of the instrument in worship is sinful." That is the very thought we are debating. A man who can with such assurance make such a statement as the major proposition of a syllogism must have the "gall of four oxen." It is like his taking a vote at Henderson in a congregation of 250 or 300 to try the feelings of the community on the debate, and succeeded, with Brother Freed's help, in getting up about twenty-five, all members of the church of the "antis," who

claimed a majority in the house. This strategy took the conceit out of him for a little while, but these syllogisms show its unparalleled preponderance again.

You notice that as I have changed the minor proposition, they all stand in support of my side as much as they did for him; but there is nothing in them for either side—only a bundle of assumptions from one end to the other. It is simply another style of assertion. Take the last one: "The use of instruments in worship is sinful." That is the question we are debating. He says in another: "Sin is the transgression of law." He has found no law against the use of instruments in praise, if he calls that worship. Now let us see.

1. Where there is no law, there is no transgression—no sin.
2. There is no law against their use in praise.
3. Therefore no sin.

Let him show the law before he dogmatizes. Have they set the word of God aside by their traditions, and, taking the place of God, would assert the laws of his kingdom? Where is his law? He has none, except of their own make. If God did not care enough about it to speak of it, why do they add to his laws and place one law on the statute book God has never spoken? Such presumption I have never heard of outside of Rome.

I must here take leave of my brother. We will soon meet at the feet of the Lamb with the throng that are harping his praise with harps in their hands. Will he put in his life here fighting against God? I cannot think he has done much harm in this debate, except perhaps to disgust some who might have been persuaded to love God. He seems to have no regard for God's word and not much for his own. By agreement the last speech was to have been mine, but he has repudiated the agreement and declares he will have the last speech. I expect, therefore, it will end with a "wind storm." I think by this time the reader is prepared for him. Let the reader be careful in his search for the truth. "If the truth makes you free, you will be free indeed." I am done. May He who makes the lilies bloom, whose every touch is beautiful, and to whom all nature, with murmuring streamlets, roaring cataracts, gentle zephyrs, and pealing thunders in notes harmonious, offers praise to his wonderful name, have mercy on us all. Would God I could touch the lyre as David played the harp. I would join all the heavenly minstrelsies with the best I could command in offering praise to his adorable name, for "praise is comely with the God of Jacob." My work is ended. I have fought the fight; I have kept the faith; I have passed the height, and, racing down the slope, I have reached the Jordan's bank. Before me the mist rises. Beyond it is the sunlight and the greetings. Angels, bear the news to dear ones. Tell them I am coming home; tell them my work is almost done; tell them I am coming soon.

WARLICK'S SIXTH REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I come before you at this time to close the discussion. I assure you that I have enjoyed the affair very much. Both the oral and written debates have been very pleasant tasks to me. It is true my erring brother's spirit has not been at all times just such as I should order were I to direct him. Yet I cannot say I am displeased even with that; for I know, as all can plainly see, that it only shows conscious defeat upon his part; and over this, of course, instead of being displeased, I should be glad, as I am—not that I glory in the flesh or rejoice in the weakness of my brother. I do not. "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of Christ." My joy in the matter is because I have the truth in the debate. Knowing this, I rejoice at its victory over error.

I must say, however, that I regret to have to convict my good brother of misrepresentation upon a personal matter at the close of our discussion. He informs the reader several times in his last speech that I am tired and want to quit, and that I have so expressed myself in letters to him in our private correspondence. This is a mistake. He has had his own way in this matter. In proof of this I quote from his letter to me written on June 2. He says: "I send you my fifth speech. I am entitled to three and a half more, but simply a summing up is all I care for. There is to be no new matter in the last speeches. If you abide by the rule, I may want only a few minutes for reply. I will know when I get your response to my fifth speech, which I send to-day. I think I will close here with my short speech." Again, in a letter bearing date of June 12 he says: "As I remember, you have my fourth and fifth speeches unanswered. Till you catch up I cannot say how many more I shall have to write, as I do not expect to continue my argument further than what is called out by your reply." Again, in a card of May 28 he says: "I have my fifth speech about ready, and will most likely have another after your say, making six in all." These letters show that Brother Stark has had his own way about the number of speeches he would write. In all of my letters to him I gave him to understand that he might write as many as he wished, or all of his speeches if he desired. I only asked that he let me know in advance just how long he expected to keep up the fight. I felt that this was due me, that I might know how to arrange my matter for my own speeches. I was not willing to put in all I wished

to say until near the close of the debate. So I insisted that he say just when he would quit. The whole matter has been in his own hands. So it is very unnecessary and unfortunate for him that he complains like he does in his last speech. I think in his fourth speech the reader will find he says he is done with his argument.

In regard to the fifteen-minutes' rejoinder I have only this to say: For the oral debate Brother Stark was to have a fifteen-minutes' rejoinder at the close, but he did not use it. He made only a very few remarks at the close. I followed him and said more than he did. These talks were given in expression of thanks to the people generally, and were no part of the debate. The written debate was to be the oral debate published. My contention was that he, having refused to use the time in the oral debate, had no right to use it in the written discussion. This he admits when he says the reader can turn back and reread. He is mistaken when he says it is customary for the affirmative to close the argument. In religious discussions the negative always does this. When Brother Stark requested the fifteen minutes to close the oral debate, I wrote Brother Smith, who was conducting my part of the preliminaries, to give it to him. Now, since he ran out of something to say and could not use the time, I feel that he should not complain. It is too late now.

The reader will know whether the good brother has taken occasion to refer to his age or not. He knows what I have said before; so I shall not take time to repeat it again in this speech. It is strange that he would complain so much at personalities and indulge so freely in them. I ask the reader not to become disgusted with his very low and mean personal flings at his opponent. It is all due to his galling under the soreness from the cuts I have given him. This is the course generally taken by a man when defeated, as he has been in this debate. His saying that I am weak and anything but logical in my arguments may be true, but I know that those who heard the oral debate would say that J. C. Stark should be the last man to propose to pass judgment upon me, and I am sure that those who read the debate will be greatly amused at his proposing to offer a criticism. In modesty I beg to say that while I am not as old as he is by about half or more, I have had much more experience in debate than he; and yet he has taken frequent occasion to refer to his experience in debate, and for it he has appeared to ask credit. Now, if I am correctly informed, he has had but few debates; and since I have learned something of his preparation for such work, I am sure that if I had been present at any of his discussions I should not have indorsed him as a representative man. I guess Brother Meeks, Brother McDougle, and others of Henderson knew about how strong he was in why they left the town and would not attend the oral debate. I suppose the "digressive" church in Henderson, who invited the day sessions of the debate to be held in their house, and most of whom were present at the first

session, but turned us out after that and would not allow another session to be held in their house, and some of them never returned to the debate—I guess they saw something of the brother's strength is why they quit. One of the elders of the "digressive" church, who was present at the first session of the debate, left, went to his home in the country, and was not seen in the town any more while I stayed in Henderson. A brother of that elder, a Methodist, laughingly told me that he would hold me responsible for his brother's person in case he ran clear off. Such talk as this was very common on the streets of Henderson during the debate. Every one felt sorry for the dear old brother because he seemed to think he could debate. I should not refer to such things except for the personal references to myself found in my good brother's last speech.

In the field of education as a scholar my brother writes me down rather low. Well, I have never made special pretensions to scholarship, while Brother Stark has; and yet I am glad that I am far in advance of him in education. I have shown ability to handle the books, while he shows that he cannot. On the definition of *psalmo* I gave the meaning direct from the lexicons; but he, not able to do that, inquired of Drs. Lockhart and Evans to know what the lexicons gave as the meaning of the word; and when I showed that neither of them gave a single author's New Testament definition of the word *psalmo*, and that the New Testament meaning was what we wanted, my good brother, instead of showing, or even trying to show, that I was wrong in the matter, and that they did quote the full definition of the word as found in the books to which they referred, simply asserts that they did quote in full, and then abuses me for exposing them. I here repeat that in no case did I find in their letters the full definition of the word *psalmo* as given in the books from which they pretended to quote. I challenge either of them, Brother Stark, or any other man to show that I am mistaken about this. Let him or them take the books and show that I have garbled the meaning of a single author or that these two gentlemen represent correctly a single book to which they refer in their letters to Brother Stark. As I said before, I will repeat, the New Testament meaning of *psalmo* is the very part of the definition they were careful to cut out in each case. I ask: Why did they do this? The answer is plain.

It certainly must be disgusting to the reader to have Brother Stark say that from Franklin down all the brethren who have opposed the use of instrumental music in the worship were heretics and had only their opinions to govern them in their worship. Such statements are too untrue and slanderous to deserve more than a passing notice. But why is the testimony of the two little school-teachers, the only evidence my brother has offered, and which I have shown to be a misquoting of their own books, the testimony of the wise, unbiased scholarship of the world, while the evidence of A. Campbell, Moses Lard,

Ben Franklin, J. W. McGarvey, F. G. Allen, I. B. Grubbs, and many others of the wisest and most competent men we have ever had, any one of whom has more brains than Brother Stark's two little school-teachers have stomach, is only heresy? Yet Brother Stark denominates the men whom I have named as narrow, contracted partisans. Pshaw! My brother, you talk childish. But Brother Stark says he might have given other witnesses if he had preferred. Yes, these "might haves" are always in the way. The truth is that he could have done no such thing. Only the narrow partisans, all of whom are incompetent men, will say what Brother Stark does in this contention. *Not one competent* man among us will say that *psalmo* in the New Testament means to sing with a musical instrument. As J. W. McGarvey says: "Only the smatterers in Greek say that." But my brother says I admit the word means to twang, although in the New Testament it means to twang the strings of the heart. I quoted F. G. Allen on this, and he is very correct. Paul says the melody is made in the heart; but Brother Stark thinks if the psalming is the heart work, then the singing is, too; and this objection he offers as an argument, and he challenges me to answer it. Well, to show how silly is the objection I have but to quote Peter's answer to the Pentecostians: "Repent, and be baptized." (Acts 2: 38.) The same persons are commanded to repent and be baptized; yet repentance is a mental act, while baptism is an outward, bodily act (prompted, of course, by the act of the mind). But, to be sure, Brother Stark does not understand this. Poor man! Let us be forbearing with him and pity him.

His criticism of Sophocles' lexicon is amusing. Every one knows that Sophocles is standard, and that his investigations covered a period of more than twelve hundred years, and including the time of Christ and the apostles and for one thousand years this side of them; and during all that time Sophocles failed to find one writer who used the word *psalmo* to include the use of a musical instrument. In fact, all the lexicons, as I have shown, cut the idea of the musical instrument out of the word *psalmo* in their New Testament meaning.

My brother asks if the word *water* is not in the word *baptize*. I answer: No; baptism may be performed without water—the baptism of the Holy Ghost and the baptism of suffering, for instance. So with *psalmo*. It never includes the use of a musical instrument. It means simply to touch, to twang, to pluck; and when the thing touched or twanged is an instrument of music, the instrument is always expressed, as in the quotations from the Psalms which my brother quotes so often. David always mentioned the instrument when he intended it to be used. This is true of all the Bible writers. Where the musical instrument was not mentioned, it was excluded. In the New Testament it is never mentioned. So it is excluded from the New Testament use of the word. The melody must be made in the heart, and

not on an instrument. Why labor on this point? Everybody but Brother Stark knows it is true, and he admits it a part of his time. He says in his book that the New Testament commands us to sing, but that it does not tell us how to do it. In this statement he convicts himself of thinking that the musical instrument is not in the word *psallo*, though now he turns around and says that it is. But what does he care for self-contradictions? He says after Webster defines a word he then uses it without defining it; but the cases are not parallel, and even Brother Stark knows it. What he says in the above quotation shows it. Read it again. In his book, on page 480, we have these words: "Under the New Testament we are taught to praise God, but are not told how." My brother now says that the "how" is in the word itself. I ask: Which time does he tell the truth? Because I show up these contradictions made by a man whose self-esteem has so run away with him as that he seems to have lost his balance, he gets mad and talks ugly; but I do not care.

My brother refers again to David as authority for the worship in the New Testament. I have exposed his nonsense on this a number of times. Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ, not by David. I have shown clearly that Ps. 149, 150 refer to the Jews and the time of David, and not to Christ and his church. Carnal warfare is advised in Ps. 149, and dancing is commanded in Ps. 150. Brother Stark ought to be ashamed of himself for trying to place this in the Christian age. It is not only silly, but it is really mean and sinful; and because I tell him of it he gets very angry and says I judge his heart. Christ says: "Of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." Now if Brother Stark's words do not show a heart filled with hatred for God and his truth, I am sure the Savior was mistaken. I have no hesitancy in saying that Brother Stark will be lost if he does not repent of his waywardness and return to the right way.

He comes back to *psallo* again and presumes to criticise McGarvey. I am sure McGarvey will be amused if he sees the criticism; but I guess he will only pity, and not censure, the critic. My brother thinks that Sophocles contradicts the other lexicons. He does not. They all agree with him. Sophocles defines the word as it was used from B.C. 150 to about A.D. 1100. This included the time in which the New Testament was written. Sophocles did not find the idea of the instrument in the word. Now the New Testament meaning, as found in all the lexicons, excludes the musical instrument from the meaning of *psallo*. Take Bagster's Lexicon, for instance. He defines *psallo*, in the New Testament, "to sing praises" (Rom. 15: 9; 1 Cor. 14: 15; Eph. 5: 19; James 5: 13); *psalmos*, in the New Testament, "a sacred song" (1 Cor. 14: 26; Eph. 5: 19; etc.). Thayer defines *psallo*, in the New Testament, "to sing a hymn, to/celebrate the praises of God in song." This is Mr. Thayer's definition, and not a comment, as my brother supposes. I suggest that it would be well for Brother Stark to get

a book and try to inform himself before he goes into another debate. I think he had no more than one lexicon in the oral debate, and he seemed scarcely able to read that. He depends altogether upon the letters of those two little teachers, and I have shown that they are very unreliable.

After the exposure I gave him on his effort to get a distinction between *hymn* and *psalm*, I am surprised to see him try it again. Let the reader turn to the quotation from Meyer's "Commentary" given in my fourth speech and get the facts.

He repeats, but not with so much confidence as before, his distinction between the service and worship. He pays no attention to the authority I gave. He simply asserts what he thinks. We have found his assertions to be generally wrong, and this case is no exception to the rule. His twitting me for making assertions and not proving is medicine that he should take, for his case is of a far more malignant type than mine. He thinks that Paul in 1 Cor. 14: 7, where he uses the word *harp* in making a simple illustration, gives authority for the instrument in the worship. By a parity of reasoning he may also claim that when Christ said John had piped to the people and they would not dance, he meant to authorize the instrument in the worship, and also the dance as well. Why not? Of course this would be ridiculous, but it is as good as anything my brother has said or can say in favor of his proposition.

When I show Brother Stark that his reference to David as authority for the use of instrumental music in Christian worship logically forces him to accept David as authority on infant membership, burning incense, and polygamy, all of which David taught and practiced, my brother replies by saying that I quote Clarke and Wesley, and I should indorse them also on all they taught. I answer: If I put Clarke and Wesley on a par with David, I should accept the suggestions; but I quote them only as commentators and as scholars, and not as divine teachers. So my brother loses his point here. I still insist, and no man need try to deny it, that if the "digressives" quote David as authority for the use of the organ in the worship, if they use the organ because David did, they should burn incense because David did. They should also practice polygamy, because David did, and bring their babies into the church, because David did that, too. They may do like Brother Stark, twist and squirm all they please; but it stands against them, and they cannot help themselves.

My good brother's effort at reply to my syllogisms is perhaps the most amusing thing he has said throughout the entire debate. I think it would have been better for him to have pursued his usual course and do with the syllogisms just as he has done with the most of all that I have said—just let it alone and passed it by in silence. It would at least have left the reader without a knowledge of how weak an effort he would make in trying to notice them. Instead of

trying to show that either the major or the minor premise was false, or even assumed, he simply asserts that they are and then tries to raise a doubt about the conclusion. Those syllogisms stand intact, and there is not a "digressive" preacher beneath the stars who can meet and answer them. Before offering them I had abundantly shown that the major premise in most of them, and in the others the minor premise, was almost the exact language of the Scriptures. So all I had to do was to state the syllogism and write the conclusion.

On Nadab and Abihu my brother continues to misquote. The Revised Version has it as I gave it. They were condemned, not because they did what God had commanded them not to do, *but for doing what God had not commanded.*

Near the close of the good brother's speech, just before he gave us his little exhortation, he gave up his contention on the meaning of *psallo*. He has claimed throughout the entire debate that the instrument of music was resident in that word; and, therefore, when God commands us to sing psalms he commands us to use the instruments of music. Again he has said that when David said, "Let them sing with the harp," he gave command to use the instrument in the gospel age; but now, in almost his last breath, he gives this all up, takes it all back, and says: "God did not care enough about it to speak of it." If God has not spoken of it, how dare Brother Stark speak of it and urge its use in the worship of God's saints? If he and others had had the Spirit of God and had not spoken where God is silent; if the "digressive" preachers had cared no more for it than Brother Stark says God does, and, therefore, had not spoken of instrumental music in the worship, what an amount of pain and sorrow among the children of God and what an amount of division in the family of God would have been averted! How sad that they will speak where God has not spoken and advocate that which God by his silence condemns!

Brother Stark's appeal to the angels, pathetic as it is, will serve him no purpose unless he ceases to pervert the right way of the Lord, returns to the "old paths," and walks in them. I hope he may do this before it is everlastingly too late for him.

I now come to my summary. I started into this debate with the intention not to allow my opponent to have one point in the entire debate. I am glad I have succeeded with this purpose. He and Clark Braden may call me a "shyster" for it if they want to. I do not care. I think Braden a much stronger man in every way than Brother Stark. He is a far better debater. But I have no hopes of ever getting him into another debate or of getting him to finish the written discussion. He will not even return my manuscript. [Since the above was written, Brother Braden returned the manuscript, after keeping it several years.—WARLICK.] I have had many debates with all kinds of opponents and all sizes of men, but my "digressive" brethren are the easiest men handled I have ever met. I do not think this is because

they are the weakest men I have met, but because of the weakness of their cause. They fight against that which they know is the truth, and this puts them to a disadvantage. I do not hope to have many debates with them. As a rule, they are cowards, and will not defend their practice.

But to the summary. In the first speeches of this debate it was agreed that union among God's people was a thing which Christ desired and for which he earnestly prayed. (See John 17.) It was further agreed that anything that would interfere with answering this prayer and bringing about a union among Christians was wrong and sinful. We, as a people, have given much attention to the things that divide religious people; and now, after we have done a great work in this line, we are divided ourselves over such unscriptural things as the use of instrumental music in the worship of the saints. In vain have the advocates of the organ been pleaded with to leave it out of the worship, but they stubbornly refuse, thus showing a greater love for the unscriptural thing than they have for the fellowship of the people of God or for Christ himself, who prayed for a union upon the teaching of the apostles. They have tried to deny the blame of bringing about the division, it is true; but their claims on that question are worse than foolish.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DIVISION?

It is claimed that if an instrument be brought into a congregation and divide it, those who oppose are responsible for the division unless they can show scripture forbidding its use.

If this be true, then I suppose that if one member should want to introduce infant baptism or sprinkling for baptism, and should even do so, though the congregation be divided, those who oppose are responsible for the division; for the same verse that forbids these things forbids the use of the instruments.

Is it objected and argued that the commanding of one thing forbids the doing of another thing, and that since we are to baptize believers only and are taught plainly that baptism is an immersion of the whole body in water, that for these reasons we are forbidden to sprinkle or baptize babies?

I answer: Very well; and in the same way are we forbidden to play on the instrument and make music of that kind, since we are clearly commanded to make another and a very different kind (see Eph. 5: 19)—*melody in the heart*, and not on an instrument. Consistency is a precious jewel, but the legs of the lame are not equal.

Whatsoever we do in *word* or *deed*, let us do all things in the name of the Lord. (Col. 3: 17.)

1. It is always the cause of dissension and division among the members of the same congregation, and also among Christians in general.

Even preachers who would otherwise be workers together in the Lord's cause are not even friends, but are enemies on account of the unscriptural instruments used in the worship.

2. They are made a test of fellowship by those who use them. They bring them in, and say to those who oppose: "You submit to these, or stay out. You shall not worship with us."

3. They pander to the world and degrade the true worship of God, making the church service more like a "theater" than anything else. On this account people go where they are used simply to be entertained.

4. They cultivate only "choir" singing; the whole assembly does not sing, because they cannot decently praise God in song.

5. They make confusion by drowning the voice to that extent that you cannot hear the words of the song, and so no one is taught, and thus is one of the scriptural objects of singing lost. (See Col. 3: 16.)

6. The real use or intention of them being to draw, to attract, to aid in the singing, etc., makes their greatest value depend upon the improvements made by man, since it calls for the most attractive machine, and frequently the most expensive one. This is extravagance.

7. They foster an aristocracy in the church, which is contrary to the true spirit of Bible Christianity. The poor and unlearned remain away on account of them.

8. They are "earthly, sensual, and devilish." (James 3: 15-17.)

Next it was shown that while God accepted, and even approved, the use of instrumental music in Jewish worship, he never did command its use; that the quotations from First and Second Chronicles, when correctly translated and understood, do not support the idea. (The reader is asked to turn to my speech in which this is shown.) We found that God in the olden time had approved of many things which Jesus said was not right. Our Savior mentions polygamy as one among the number. We found that instrumental music originated in a family that were ungodly in their lives. We also learned that God says he will not listen to the songs even of those who use the instrument. He says: "I hate, I despise your feast days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies. Though ye offer me burnt offerings and your meat offerings, I will not accept them; neither will I regard the peace offerings of your fat beasts. Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols. But let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream. Have ye offered unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel? But ye have borne the tabernacle of your Moloch and Chiun your images, the star of your god, which ye made to yourselves. Therefore will I cause you to go into captivity beyond Damascus, saith the Lord, whose name is The God of hosts." (Amos 5: 21-27.)

We found also that though David invented the religious use of the instrument, God condemns it, and pronounces a woe against all who

follow David's example. God says: "Woe to them that are at ease in Zion, and trust in the mountain of Samaria, which are named chief of the nations, to whom the house of Israel came! Pass ye unto Calneh, and see; and from thence go ye to Hamath the great: then go down to Gath of the Philistines: be they better than these kingdoms? or their border greater than your border? Ye that put far away the evil day, and cause the seat of violence to come near; that lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon their couches, and eat the lambs out of the flock, and the calves out of the midst of the stall; that chant to the sound of the viol, and invent to themselves instruments of music, like David; that drink wine in bowls, and anoint themselves with the chief ointments: but they are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph. Therefore now shall they go captive with the first that go captive, and the banquet of them that stretched themselves shall be removed." (Amos 6: 1-7.)

Instrumental music originated in the family of Cain, who was never known to worship God as he required. If he made an offering, it was not in faith and was upon his own human altar.

Jubal, the inventor, was a polygamous son; and he was the first character of this kind of whom we have any account.

Polygamy and instrumental music originated in the same rebellious family. (See Gen. 4.)

In the same family started the manufactory of weapons of war. They were a warlike family.

Tubal-Cain, a brother of Jubal, the inventor of the instruments, is said to be the Vulcan of the Greeks. In this family, then, started idolatry.

Instrumental music, war, weapons, polygamy, and all sorts of rebellion and idolatry of different kinds, started in the same family and were supported by the same character of individuals. This presents a complication not very desirable.

VERDICT OF OUR WISEST MEN ON THE ORGAN.

I here reproduce a few among several letters I have already given: "I can but express the conviction that my good brethren who have favored the organ in worship have made a fearful mistake. That with the lost simplicity in our worship we will experience a loss of spirituality and genuine devotion we have a feeling that amounts to conviction. No gain can compensate a loss like that. Time and the history of our churches will determine the gain or loss in these regards." (W. H. Hobson.)

"I believe the organ to be a grievous innovation in the Christian Church that our Heavenly Father does not approve of. I think it will be discovered by the more reflecting brethren themselves; and only a return to apostolic worship in our churches can be acceptable

to the great Head of the church, who has not on record his sanction to add to or take from his institutions, ordinances, or forms of worship." (Mrs. A. Campbell, in "Home Life," page 420.)

"I regard it an abominable innovation that does no good at all, but a great deal of harm. Sooner or later it turns the worship into an entertaining performance. The meanest thing connected with its introduction in almost every place is the unchristian spirit that attends its advocacy. When people go crazy over it, they do not hesitate to rend a church and retard for years the prosperity of the cause." (I. B. Grubbs.)

It has been shown in this debate that the first organ used in the church since Christ was in the seventh century, and now I remember Brother Stark asks me why I showed in my fifth speech that some of the early fathers spoke against it before the seventh century if it was not in use then. I answer: Some of the people then, just as the "digressives" do now, wanted to bring it in because the Jews used it in David's day, and the fathers spoke against it, saying they did not want to follow the Jewish law, but they would follow Christ and his apostles. In this connection it was shown that both the practice of infant baptism and sprinkling and pouring for baptism were taught and in use some time before the instrumental music was brought in, and an argument upon that fact was made. I wish here to reproduce that argument. In our debates with the pedobaptists we have claimed that it is not only true that no trace of infant baptism can be found in the Bible, but that its use in the church cannot be found in any history prior to the beginning of the third century, when we have the first favorable mention of it by Origen, and this we declare is conclusive evidence against it.

Now let us try the same argument on instrumental music. It is not only a fact that no mention is made of it in the New Testament, but it is also true that it was not used in the church earlier than the seventh century, says J. W. McGarvey. I submit that if the argument is evidence against the right of the pedobaptists to sprinkle their babies, it is just as conclusive against those who use the instruments in the worship.

Another argument used by us on immersion is that the Greek Church has always, and does now, practice exclusive immersion. We claim to show by this that those who speak the Greek language understand the word *baptidzo*, the word used by our Lord for *baptism*, to mean to immerse, and not to sprinkle and pour. This argument, we think, is final and sufficiently strong to convince any one if properly considered; and so it is.

But let us try the same argument on instrumental music. "It is a fact that the Greek Catholic Church has not permitted it in their worship to this day, nor did they ever employ it." (J. W. McGarvey, in Octographic Review of August, 1897.)

According to our own showing, this proves that the words used by the apostles for the song service do not admit of the instrumental accompaniments.

MAN CANNOT CHOOSE HIS OWN ITEMS OF WORSHIP.

God does not allow us to choose what we will worship, how we will worship, or what we shall dedicate to him in worship. If we may bring our instruments and offer them to God in worship in the name of Jesus Christ, when Christ never appointed a worship of that kind, then we may bring our play, our dance, and everything else that we may choose, and offer them to God in worship in the name of Christ. In this way we cut ourselves loose from all divine legislation in matters of divine worship and delight our souls in a religion of our own formation.

If man may be the author of any one part of his own worship, he may be the author of another part; and if so, why not all of it? If all or any part of this be true, then on what ground could Paul condemn "will worship," or self-chosen worship?

The expedience of the age demands it, they say. Expedience and progress played sad havoc with the Jews after the Lord had led them across the Jordan and settled them in the earthly Canaan. They wanted a king, became clamorous for a king—not because it was God's will (for it was not), but they wanted to be "like their neighbors," "up with the times," "just abreast of the age." They were tired of that "old-fogy" manner of living under the judges, and now they must mend their ways and have style as well as the others. What was the result with the Jews? Wreck and ruin. What will be the result with us? Just the same, unless we stop, reconsider, and again be governed and guided wholly and exclusively by God's word.

After showing that God by Amos condemns the use of instrumental music in the worship of his saints, we took up Brother Stark's argument from the psalms of David, and showed that none of them had reference to the Christian age or to the Christian in any sense, and that if we were to admit that they actually proved that God commanded the use of the instrument in the time of David, it would be no authority under the gospel. This is shown by a proper division of the word. "Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ," not by Moses or David. "Hear ye him," is what God said to the people. We are not under the law, but under grace, says Paul. "Before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. . . . But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." (Gal. 3: 23-25.) From all of this (and much more could be said) we see the foolishness of quoting the psalms of David as authority in Christian worship. We showed that the instrument was excluded from our worship by the following argument: A, B, and C are all citizens of the Jewish age and of the

Christian dispensation as well. Of three of the leading characteristics of their worship, A prefers prayer; and in contemplation of the change soon to occur, while they are yet in the Jewish age, A prays that prayer will be transferred to the next age. B desires that singing will be transferred. C confidently expects that instrumental music will be carried over. God sends one, even Christ, to transfer all that seemed good to the divine mind. He transfers prayer, and A is well pleased; he transfers by his own practice and enjoined by his apostles the singing feature, and B is well pleased; but musical instruments are dropped out and left among the weak, beggarly elements of an abrogated law. C declares he will have the instrument; and so, by the power of the majority, he brings them in. C is a rebel and a sinner, and leads the majority astray.

If Christ and the apostles were raised to use the instruments, then their leaving them out of the Christian's standard of worship shows very plainly that such silence was a silence of purpose; and, therefore, instrumental music was purposely left out.

Some one says that if the disciples worshiped in the temple, which they did, then they must have used the method of worship employed there. Well, I wonder! The burning of incense and all the sacrifices, too, I suppose!

They met in the synagogue, but did not worship as did the Jews, for they were turned out.

I held a meeting in a Universalist church house, but I did not worship as the Universalists do. They had an organ in the house, but I did not use it.

THE WORSHIP PRESCRIBED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

It consists in reading the Scriptures. (See Col. 4: 16; 1 Thess. 5: 27; 1 Tim. 4: 13.)

In prayer. (See Acts 3: 1; 1 Thess. 5: 17; 1 Tim. 2-8.)

In exhortation. (1 Tim. 4: 13; Heb. 3: 13.)

In the Lord's Supper. (Acts 20: 7; 1 Cor. 11: 17-34.)

In singing. (Matt. 26: 30; Eph. 5: 19; Col. 3: 16.)

In the contribution. (Acts 2: 42; 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2.)

CAN WE ADD TO ANY OF THE ABOVE?

Suppose we read in an "unknown tongue." People are not edified; so we do no good.

If we pray to an "unknown god," it is idolatry.

Exhortation to wild enthusiasm is wrong.

To add to the Lord's Supper is condemned.

To use the instruments as aids to the singing is sinful.

SUFFICIENCY OF THE SCRIPTURES TO SAVE.

"He will guide you into all truth." (John 16: 13.)

"He shall teach you all things." (John 14: 26.)

Faith comes by God's word. (Rom. 10: 17.)

"Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." (Rom. 14: 23.)

"Without faith it is impossible to please him [God]." (Heb. 11: 6.)

"We walk by faith, not by sight." (2 Cor. 5: 7.)

He that goes "beyond the things which are written" is condemned. (1 Cor. 4: 6, R. V.)

He that goes "onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God." (2 John 9, R. V.)

"Walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." (Rom. 8: 1-6.)

"Speak as the oracles of God." (1 Pet. 4: 11.)

"Speak the things which become sound doctrine." (Tit. 2: 1.)

What you have seen and heard of me, commit to others. (2 Tim. 2: 2.)

"Given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness." (2 Pet. 1: 3.)

Furnish to "all good works." (2 Tim. 3: 16, 17.)

CHURCH AND HOME COMPARED.

It is claimed that we may have anything in the church that we have at home. We have organs and other instruments in our homes. The home is a sacred place. So we for a similar reason may have instruments in the church.

But it is out of the question to say we may have everything in the church that we use at home. We have peaches and cream, corn bread and buttermilk, and even turnip greens, on our tables at home; but where is the man who will say we may use such things in the "house of God" on the "Lord's table?" Yet the two cases are parallel.

The congregation at Corinth got the same idea into their foolish heads. They ate a full meal at home, and so they thought it no wrong to eat all they wanted when they met for worship. Paul taught them that they were mistaken. He told them most emphatically that what they did was not to eat the Lord's Supper at all. He says: "Have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the church of God, and shame them that have not?" (1 Cor. 11: 22.)

This, it seems to me, should be final. If Paul were here now, he would doubtless say to the "organ players:" "You have houses in which to play your instruments. Go home and play them there. Do not despise the house of God and those that have no organs."

Let us be content with the things that are written and worship only as the Spirit in the word directs. This will take all our time.

I wish to call the reader's attention to a few of the syllogisms which I have offered as positive evidence that the use of instruments of

music in the worship is not only unauthorized, but wrong and sinful, being condemned in the Bible.

1. The entire system of divine worship is found in the New Testament.

2. Instrumental music in the worship is not found in the New Testament.

3. Therefore instrumental music in the worship is no part of the divine system of worship.

1. The law of worship given by God is perfect. (James.) To take from or add to a perfect law makes it imperfect.

2. Instrumental music is not in God's law of worship; it is, therefore, an addition.

3. Therefore instrumental music in the worship makes God's law of worship imperfect.

1. Congregational worship was appointed by "inspired men" and ordained of God.

2. All things left out of congregational worship were left out by the authority of God. Instrumental music was left out of the worship.

3. Therefore the leaving of instruments out of the worship was by the authority of God.

1. Doing as a religious service anything not mentioned in God's word is going beyond what is written.

2. To go beyond what is written is condemned in the word of truth. (See 1 Cor. 4: 6; 2 John 1: 9, R. V.)

3. Therefore to do anything as religious service not mentioned is condemned in the Scriptures.

1. The use of instruments in connection with the worship is going beyond what is written.

2. To go beyond what is written is condemned in the word of the Lord. (1 Cor. 4: 6; 2 John 1: 9.)

3. Therefore the use of the instrument in connection with the worship is condemned in the Scriptures.

1. Anything condemned in the Scriptures is wrong and sinful.

2. To use the instruments in the worship is condemned in the Scriptures.

3. Therefore the use of the instruments in worship is wrong and sinful.

MORAL.

Woe be unto the man who undertakes to worship God in this way! God is not worshiped by machinery. As Adam Clarke says: "We may as well try to pray by machinery as to praise by it."

1. God seeks—and, therefore, desires—only those to worship him who worship in spirit and in truth. (John 4: 23, 24.) As is taught by Adam Clarke in his "Commentary" on this passage: "Whatever else is indicated, it is certain that to worship in spirit and truth, one must worship as the Spirit in God's word directs."

2. The word does not direct us to use the instruments in the worship.
3. Therefore those who use them do not worship in spirit and in truth.

1. "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." (Col. 3: 17.)

2. Anything done in the name of the Lord is simply by his authority. God authorizes us only in his word. His word does not authorize the use of instruments in the worship.

3. Therefore those who do use them do it without divine sanction.

1. Any worship rendered not in God's name is sinful.

2. Using instruments in the worship is not in his name.

3. Therefore using the instruments in the worship is sinful.

1. The use of instruments in the worship is sinful.

2. "The wages of sin is death." (See Rom. 6: 23.)

3. Therefore those who continue to use them in the worship will not be saved, but will be finally lost.

On Brother Stark's strongest contention, and evidently what he considers his best argument, which was on the Greek word *psallo*, I have shown that everything is against him; that there is absolutely no reason for his claim. I read directly from the lexicons themselves, showing that all of them excluded the idea of the instrument from the meaning of the word as found in the New Testament. None of them—not one—puts the instrument into the New Testament definition of the word. As J. W. McGarvey truthfully says, "You could come as near proving that *baptidzo* means to sprinkle as you can proving that *psallo* means to sing with an instrument of music," and that only the "smatterers in Greek ever say that it has such a meaning in the New Testament." This leaves my brother with absolutely nothing to stand on. He must go down in defeat, where he deserves to go, and there remain until he learns not to handle the word of God deceitfully.

In this connection I wish to say that I am glad the debate will be published. I am proud of the debate, and not ashamed of it, like my brother. I hope it may be read by many "digressives" who shall be honest enough with themselves and with God to see and accept the truth. I hope and pray that much good will come of the debate.

I wish to say to any and all "digressive" preachers that I shall take special delight in meeting any of them in debate when they have courage to affirm and defend their practice. In fact, I really desire such opportunities; for I think it right to discuss vital questions when and where good may be accomplished, and I certainly think this a vital one. I am satisfied with the results of the two debates that I have held on the subject. I am even encouraged by them sufficiently to cause me to desire to hold many more like them. Divided over the question as we are, I feel that we must do something to remove the

division or else quit preaching *Christian union* to the people on the *Bible* and the *Bible alone*.

I close with some quotations from others:

"Where the *Bible* speaks, we will speak; where the *Bible* is silent, we will be silent." (Thomas Campbell.)

"Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." (Paul—1 Cor. 1: 10.)

"If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." (Peter—1 Pet. 4: 11.)

"Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." (Jesus Christ—John 17: 20, 21.)

May God help us all to see, believe, accept, and obey the truth.