DISCUSSION

Is Instrumental Music in Christian Worship Scriptural?

BETWEEN

M. D. CLUBB (Affirmant)
Secretary Tennessee Christian Missionary Society
and Editor Tennessee Christian

AND

H. LEO BOLES (Negant)
President David Lipscomb College

NASHVILLE, TENN.
GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY
1927

CONTENTS

Contents

PREFACE

The discussion contained in the following pages appeared first in the Christian-Evangelist and Gospel Advocate. So many requests were made to the participants of the discussion to have it put into permanent form, that it may continue to do good, that they have yielded to the requests of their friends and now present it in this permanent form.

This discussion grew out of a suggestion by the negative that the reasons or arguments for and against Instrumental Music in Christian Worship be published in one of the leading papers on each side of the question. The Christian-Evangelist was selected by the affirmative and the Gospel Advocate by the negative. Both of these religious journals have a large circulation, and the publication of the discussion carried by them afforded an opportunity to reach a larger audience than could be had by an oral discussion.

The participants have had but one end in view—to find the truth on the question, "Is Instrumental Music in Christian Worship Scriptural?" About all the arguments that have been made for and against this proposition will be found in the present discussion. These are presented in such a way that the average reader may easily grasp and understand them. It was the purpose of both participants to present the discussion in a simple way, that the simple truth might be readily seen on the question.

The Greek word *"psallo"* has been very fully discussed. The reader will find both its classical meaning and its New Testament use set forth in a way that may be easily understood. Many authors and lexicons, both of the classical and New Testament uses of "Psallo," are quoted. The average reader, without any knowledge of the Greek language, can appreciate the discussion on "Psallo."

The authors entertain the hope that the discussion, presented in this form, will prove very profitable to all who are interested in the study of this mooted question. More than two hundred authorities are quoted in these pages. In nearly

every instance the exact location of the quotation is given, so that the reader may easily verify the quotation. The authorities quoted include Standard Lexicons, both Classical and New Testament, Encyclopedias, Histories of Music, Commentaries, and various Translations. The reader will find both ancient and modern scholarship presented in this discussion. Forty-seven different translations have been compiled and presented in this discussion for easy and convenient reference by the reader. The authors are led to believe that in bringing together so many ancient authorities and the cream of the scholarship, who have studied this question, they have done a very valuable service. All of these authorities may had in this one volume, thereby saving much reading and expense to others. it is needless to add that each has conducted his part of the discussion in the spirit of Christ and that both hold each other in warm personal friendship and high regard.

CHAPTER I

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

At the beginning of this discussion, which is to appear simultaneously in the Gospel Advocate and the Christian-Evangelist, I suppose a word of explanation would be in order. The discussion grows out of conditions which are peculiar almost entirely to the South. The music question is of no concern whatever in any other religious body except our own, and with the great mass of our people it is, as it should be, "a dead issue." Professor McGarvey was asked a short time before his death what he then thought of the question as it affected our people, and he answered: "The churches have settled it." Here is a custom which is well-nigh universally practiced by Christians of our time, and not one word of objection is raised against it, except by a small group of Christians here in the South. This incontrovertible fact should have some weight with these brethren.

But for us in the South it has been, and still is, a fruitful source of weakness, humiliation, and reproach. We would have been a great, influential body of people in the South today, had it not been for the unseemly strife and alienation which the long agitation of this and one other question has produced. Our plea for the unity of all Christians has been nullified by our own division; for how can a people plead for unity, when they themselves are not practicing it? Our conservative brethren have made two things tests of fellowship—organized missionary work and instrumental music in worship. Opposition to these has led them to separate from us and form another religious body. But I still regard them as my brethren, and hope some day the breach will be healed.

I think it is a fair question to ask: Who is responsible for this unfortunate and unhappy division? The answer to this question will be found when we discover who is in

the right, whose position on these things is according to the will of God. If our conservative brethren are right in their attitude and teaching on these two questions, if God approves of their course, then responsibility for the division is upon us. If, on the other hand, we are right in our attitude and teaching on these same questions, if God has given his approval to our course, then the responsibility is upon them. I see no way of escape from this conclusion. Now, the purpose of this discussion is to seek for the truth concerning one of these questions.

The proposition is: "Instrumental Music in Christian worship is Scriptural." By "instrumental music" I mean music made on a mechanical instrument, such as the organ, piano, etc. By the preposition "in" I mean in connection with. By "Christian worship" I mean those acts of adoration, reverence, and homage to God, in the name of Jesus Christ, with which all are familiar in the ordinary church service; I mean also, those acts of singing, reading, and prayer, in which we may engage in the home, or which may be done in any place, by one or many, where the heart is attuned to praise. By "Scriptural" I mean "according to," "in harmony with," or "warrented by" the Scriptures; or, to use the words of H. L. Calhoun, I mean "right," or "according to God's will."

In a word, I am affirming that the general custom of the great body of the most intelligent, spiritual-minded, and devoted Christians of our day, of accompanying their singing with instrumental music, in their church assemblies, in their social gatherings, and in family worship, is Scriptural. Being, therefore, a Scriptural question, I make my appeal to the Word of God. What, then, is the teaching of the Bible, as fairly and impartially interpreted by the best thought and scholarship of the world, past and present, on the proposition, "Instrumental Music in Christian worship is Scriptural?"

My first argument will be drawn from the meaning of the word, or words, which Paul and James used in the following passages: Rom. 15:9; 1 Cor. 14:15, 26; Eph. 5:19;

Col. 3:16; and James 5:13. May I ask all who expect to follow me in this discussion to stop here and read each of these passages? Keep them constantly in mind. Now, these are not the words that Paul and James used. They did not know the English language, for it was not in existence at that time. They spoke and wrote in the Greek language. Hence, to find out the true meaning of our English words, "psalms," "hymns," "spiritual songs," "sing," "sing praise," "singing," and "making melody," we must go back to the actual words which Paul and James used. These words' are "ado," "hymneo," "psallo," and their cognate nouns, "ode," "hymnos," and "psalmos." We shall confine our attention mainly to the meaning of "psallo." What did Paul mean when he told the Romans and the Corinthians, the Ephesians and the Colossians, to "psallo?" What did James mean when he said, "Is any cheerful, let him 'psallo?' " I cannot refrain from quoting Alexander Campbell at this point. In the Campbell and Rice debate (page 54), Mr. Campbell says: "Fortunately the meaning of any word, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, or English, is a question not of opinion, but a question of fact; and being a plain question of fact, it is to be ascertained by competent witnesses or by a sufficient induction of particular occurrences of the word, at different times on various subjects and by different persons. All good dictionaries, in all languages, are made upon a full examination of particular occurrences—upon a sufficient induction of distinct instances—and convey the true meaning of a word at any given period of its history." Mr. Campbell was seeking the meaning of a Greek word when he made that statement, just as we are doing now. He was seeking for the meaning of "baptizo ;" we are seeking for the meaning of "psallo."

THE LEXICONS

My first witnesses are the Greek lexicographers. Mr. Campbell said of them: "They are the most learned and most competent witnesses in this case in the world." ("Campbell and Rice Debate," page 58.)

LIDDELL AND SCOTT: "Psallo, to touch sharply, to pluck, pull, twitch, to pluck the hair; of the bowstring, to twang it; to send a shaft twanging from the bow; so, a carpenter's red line, which is twitched and then suddenly let go, so as to leave a mark. II. Mostly of the strings of musical instruments, to play a stringed instrument with the fingers, and not with the plectron. 2. Later, to sing to a harp; LXX. (Ps. 7:17; 9:11; al.), Eph. 5:19; 1 Cor. 14:15; to be struck or played; to be played on a harp."

The noun, psalmos: "a touching sharply, a pulling, twitching, or twanging with the fingers. II. Mostly of musical strings. 2. The sound of the cithara or harp. 3. Later, a song sung to the harp, a psalm, LXX., N. T."

Liddell and Scott's Lexicon stands at the top of the whole list of Greek lexicons. There is no higher authority than this as to the meaning of the word *"psallo"* at the time Paul used it.

ROBINSON (New Testament Lexicon): "Psallo, to touch, to twitch, to pluck, e. g. the hair or beard; also a string, to twang, e. g. the string of a bow; especially of a stringed instrument of music, to touch or strike the chords. Hence, oftenest absolutely psallein, to touch the Iyre or other stringed instrument, to strike up, to play. In Septuagint and New Testament, to sing, to chant, properly as accompanying stringed instruments."

In the noun form, psalmos: "a touching, twang, e. g. of a bowstring; of stringed instruments, a playing, music; tone, melody, measure, as played. In later usage, song, properly as accompanying stringed instruments. 1. A psalm, a song, in praise of God. 1 Cor. 14:,26; Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16. 2. Specifically, plural, the book of Psalms."

PARKHURST: "Psallo. 1. To touch, to touch lightly, or perhaps to cause to quaver by touching. 2. To touch the strings of a musical instrument with the finger or plectrum, and so cause them to sound or quaver. So musicians who play upon an instrument are said to touch the strings, or simply psallein. And because stringed instruments were commonly used both by believers and heathen in singing

praises to their respective Gods; hence, 3. To sing, sing praises or psalms to God, whether with or without instruments. Rom. 15:9; 1 Cor. 14:15; Eph. 5:19; James 5:13.

"Psalmos, 1. A touching or playing upon a musical instrument. 2. A psalm, a sacred song or poem, properly such a one as is sung to stringed instruments. See Luke 20:42;1 Cor. 14:26."

YONGE'S English-Greek Lexicon: "Psallo (only of playing on stringed instruments). Psallein, from psao, psallere, properly to touch the strings of a bow, or of an instrument of music; to play on a stringed instrument. In the New Testament, to sing while touching the chords, while accompanying one's self on a stringed instrument; to sing psalms (Rom. 15:9).

"Psalmos, 1. The music of stringed instruments. 2. A song sung to the accompaniment of music."

BRETSCHNEIDER (Lexicon of the New Testament): "Psallo, to touch the strings, strike the Iyre, play the Iyre; to produce music either to musical instruments, or with the voice alone, and only of a joyful music, and hence to glorify in song."

ZORELL (New Testament Lexicon): "Psallo, to play on a stringed instrument, strike the cithara with the fingers; sing a hymn to the notes of the Iyre, sing, sing sacred hymns in honor of God.

"Psalmos, sound of the Iyre, song to be sung to the sound of the Iyre, to be sung in honor of God."

THAYER (New Testament Lexicon): "Psallo, a. to pluck off, to pull out. b. to cause to vibrate by touching, to twang; specifically, to touch or strike the chord, to twang the strings of a musical instrument so that they gently vibrate; and absolutely to play on a stringed instrument, to play the harp, etc. Septuagint for niggen and much oftener for zimmer; to sing to the music of the harp; in the New Testament, to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praises of God in song, James 5:13; in honor of God, Eph. 5:19; Rom. 15:9. 'I will sing God's praises indeed with my whole soul

stirred and borne away by the Holy Spirit; but I will follow reason as my guide; so that what I sing may be understood by myself and by the listeners,' 1 Cor. 14:15.

"Psalmos, a striking, twanging; specifically, a striking the chords of a musical instrument; hence, a pious song, a psalm (Septuagint chiefly for mizmor), Eph. 5:19; Col. 3; 16; the phrase 'echein psalmon' is used of one who has it in his heart to sing or recite a song of the sort, 1 Cor. 14:26; one of the songs of the book of the Old Testament which is entitled Psalmoi, Acts 13:23."

ABBOTT-SMITH (New Testament Lexicon): "Psallo (in Septuagint chiefly for zimmer pi., Judg. 5:3; Ps. 7:17; al.; also for niggen pi.) 1. to pull, twitch, twang; hence 2. absolutely, (a) to play a stringed instrument with the fingers; (b) later, to sing to a harp, sing psalms (Septuagint); in New Testament, to sing a hymn, sing praise, James 5:13; Rom. 15:9; Eph. 5:19;1 Cor. 14:15.

"Psalmos, in Septuagint chiefly for mizmor; 1. a striking, twitching with the fingers, hence a striking of musical strings, and hence in later writers, 2. a sacred song sung to musical accompaniment, a psalm (Septuagint), 1 Cor. 14:26; Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; of O. T. psalms, Luke 24:44; Acts 13:33; Biblos psalmon, Luke 24:42; Acts 1:20."

Here I pause. We now have before us the evidence of eight of the best Greek lexicons in existence. We could easily double and treble the number. And what is their combined testimony? It is this: that *"psallo"* in the New Testament allows, permits, the use of instrumental accompaniment in Christian worship; and that is what the proposition calls on me to prove. Instrumental music is so related to the word *"psallo"* through long and honorable association that the right to use it is unquestionable, unless it is specifically forbidden; and that man does not live who can produce one particle of evidence that either Christ or his apostles ever uttered one solitary word against it.

It is with pleasure that we introduce our opponent in this discussion, especially to the readers of the Christian-Evangelist. H. Leo Boles is president of the David Lipscomb

College, Nashville, Tenn., the leading college of our conservative brethren, and one of the editors of the Gospel Advocate. It will be seen from this that he is a man whom his brethren honor and in whom they have confidence. Therefore, if the position of our opponent on the question at issue can be sustained, we have a right to expect that he will be able to do it.

CHAPTER II

FIRST NEGATIVE

Truth is eternal; man did not produce it and arguments cannot change it; we should love it. He who loves the truth has nothing to lose in a fair, honest investigation for the truth and should sustain such an attitude toward it that will woo it. We begin this investigation to help all who may read this discussion come to a fuller knowledge of the truth on this question.

My opponent, Brother Clubb, is editor of the Tennessee Christian and Secretary of the Tennessee Christian Missionary Society. These facts should help the reader to know that Brother Clubb is a representative man on the affirmative side of this question. If his proposition can be proved, surely the editor of the Tennessee Christian and the Secretary of the Tennessee Christian Missionary Society can prove it. If he fails, then our readers may know that the proposition cannot be proved.

In his first paragraph he attempts to create sentiment in favor of the affirmative side of the question before he has given any proof in support of his proposition. He is mistaken in regard to the number of religious bodies who are not using the instrument in worship. "It [vocal music] was continued by the Jews, and it is the only kind that is permitted in the Greek and Scotch churches, or, with few exceptions, in dissenting congregations in England." ("Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge," page 852, on the subject of "Vocal Music.")

Brother Clubb states that the music question has been settled "by the churches ;" that they have settled it by "custom." No question is "settled" until it is settled right; and it is not settled right until it is settled by the word of God, if it involves "Christian worship." This question can

not be settled by a majority vote. If all the religious bodies used instrumental music in worship, that would not prove Brother Clubb's proposition. A large proportion—about seven-eighths—of the religious world practice sprinkling for baptism. I am sure that Brother Clubb will not say that such a vast number's practicing sprinkling proves that sprinkling is Scriptural baptism.

He says: "Our conservative brethren have made two things tests of fellowship—organized missionary work and instrumental music in worship." Let's keep the records clear. He is in error. The New Testament fixes all tests of fellowship "in Christian worship." We obey them; he rejects them. Again, he says that those who do not use mechanical instruments in worship have separated from them and have formed "another religious body." Again he is mistaken. We stand on the word of God as revealed in the standard versions of the English Bible. We stand upon the New Testament teachings on the music question. Those who use the instrument in worship have departed from the pioneers of the Restoration Movement and departed from the New Testament and formed "another religious body." My practice and teaching in regard to vocal music in the worship is not called in question. Brother Clubb's position is called in question. He admits that I am right and even practices vocal music in worship. I deny that his position is Scriptural.

Let us define the terms of his proposition. "Instrumental music:" "music made on a mechanical instrument ;" any kind of an instrument—stringed instruments, wind instruments, percussion instruments. "In:" within, a part of, included in; not "connected with" worship, but "in" it; not merely accompanying worship, but actually "in" it. "Christian worship:" worship in the name of Christ; worship described and authorized in the New Testament; not the worship of the patriarchs or the Jews, but "Christian worship." "Scriptural:" according to the Scriptures; by the authority of God as expressed in the New Testament; not according to

"custom," "scholarship," or "majority vote," but what the Scriptures in the New Testament teach.

In order for this discussion to be profitable, the real issue must stand out clearly and distinctly; there should be no sophistry or evading. Very little progress can be made in our search for the truth if the real issue is not kept clear before the reader. The issue as set forth in the proposition is clear-cut and sharp. By the very wording of the proposition my opponent has placed instrumental music "in Christian worship." According to the proposition, instrumental music is not "an aid" or "an expedient" in Christian worship; it is "in Christian worship." All the common, trite illustrations of the "walking stick," "ear trumpet," and "eyeglasses" are irrelevant and will not be used in this discussion, since instrumental music has been made a part of Christian worship. The proposition limits the field of our discussion to one single issue namely, instrumental music is "in Christian worship" and sustains the same relationship to it that vocal music does.

For instrumental music to be "in Christian worship," it must come this side of Pentecost. Christian worship began when the church was established. We are not now concerned about what was "in the worship" before Pentecost; we are interested in what is "in Christian worship."

My opponent's proposition puts him out of harmony with the Christian Standard. Recently one of its editors said: "In spite of some things that may have appeared in our columns, the Standard certainly cannot indorse the position of those extremists who have sought to say that the Scriptures command the use of instrumental music. They play with technicalities. They do not show forth an unmistakable 'Thus saith the Lord.' " (Letter, October 6, 1925.) Also he is out of harmony with J. B. Briney, for Brother Briney has said: "That the use or non-use of an organ should be made the standard by which it is to be decided whether a congregation is a church of Christ or not is a marvel in view of the fact that there is no direct teaching in the New Testament on the subject. . . . A moment's reflection

will convince sober reason that it does not belong to the sphere of faith, for faith rests upon plain and unequivocal statements of the word of God." (Christian Standard, July 4, 1925.)

He puts himself in the class with J. C. Stark, who said that Paul "authorized the use of instrumental music in the worship of the church. . . . That it is positively commanded by the apostles and thus authorized by the Holy Spirit under the gospel dispensation. This should end the controversy." ("The King and His Kingdom," page 528.) Brother Clubb is in the class with O. E. Payne, who said: "Henceforth we must unite in agreeing that if we forego musical instruments we cannot conform to the divine injunction to psallein." ("Instrumental Music is Scriptural," page 172.)

He quotes A. Campbell as saying that lexicographers "are the most learned and most competent witnesses in this case in the world." Mr. Campbell made that statement with reference to "baptizo not about "psallo." Mr. Campbell knew the value of the evidence of lexicographers, not only in regard to "baptizo but also "psallo." Knowing the meaning of "psallo," he said: "So to those who have no real devotion or spirituality in them, and whose animal nature flags under the oppression of church service, I think with Mr. G—that instrumental music would be not only a desideratum, but an essential prerequisite to fire up their souls to even animal devotion. But I presume, to all spiritual-minded Christians, such aids would be as a cowbell in a concert." ("Millennial Harbinger," 1851, page 582.)

The real issue of the proposition should be discussed; this should not be a mere logomachy—a war of words about a word. My opponent is to prove that the New Testament Scriptures teach that the mechanical instrument is "in Christian worship." In Chapter I he has not quoted a single verse of Scripture; he made reference only to five verses, and then tried away to the Greek lexicons. I want to state with emphasis that ANY PROPOSITION IN THE REALM OF RELIGION THAT CANNOT BE PROVED

BY OUR ENGLISH BIBLE IS NOT TRUE—IT CANNOT BE PROVED. He has left the English Bible and gone to Greek lexicons, because there is not one single word in the New Testament about instrumental music "in Christian worship ;" and since the New Testament, and the New Testament only, describes and authorizes Christian worship, he cannot prove his proposition; he cannot prove anything to be Scriptural that is not in the Scriptures.

The New Testament was not written in "classical Greek ;" it was written in a vernacular of the Greek language peculiar to the age in which it was written. I submit the testimony of a number of scholars as proof of the above statement.

DR. EDWARD ROBINSON, in criticizing Dr. Schleusner for confusing classical definitions and New Testament meaning of Greek words, says: "Instead of an orderly deduction of the derivative meanings of a word from the primitive signification, he has thrown the different meanings together without any regular method.... A lexicon of the New Testament at the present day presupposes the fact that the language of the New Testament exhibits in many points a departure from the idiom of the ancient Attic Greek. . . . The Jews who spoke the Greek language undoubtedly acquired it from the intercourse of common life, and not from the study of books. . . . The Greek which they spoke was the colloquial Greek; and this would, of course, be modified by the modes of thinking and feeling to which they had been accustomed." He describes his own method of arranging his lexicon, and says: "In defining words, those significations are placed first which accord with Greek usage, and these are illustrated by references to the writers who lived after the age of Alexander; and if they accord likewise with more ancient Greek, references are also made principally to Xenophon, though often to Thucydides and other writers. Then follow those significations which depart from Greek usage, and which are either to be illustrated from the Septuagint as compared with the Hebrew, or depend solely on the usus loquendi of the New

Testament writers. The arrangement of the primitive and derivative significations of words is such as to present, as far as possible, to the eye of the student, the regular gradations by which the latter have sometimes apparently deviated so widely from the former." (Preface to Lexicon, 1825 edition.)

E. A. SOPHOCLES: "In the second century of our era the language had deviated perceptibly from the ancient standard. Old words and expressions had disappeared, and new ones succeeded them. In addition to this, new meanings were put upon old words." ("Glossary of Later and Byzantine Greek," page 10.)

DR. SAMUEL G. GREEN: "We note that the Greek of the Scripture is, for most purposes, a language complete in itself.... Its peculiarities, though best approached from the classic side, may be reached by a shorter way, and be almost as well comprehended." (Preface, "Handbook to Grammar of Greek Testament.")

THAYER, in his preface of his lexicon, speaks of the two classes of definitions, "sacred and classical."

DR. A. T. ROBERTSON: "The New Testament is written in the vernacular Greek of the time. . . . As a whole, the New Testament books represent the spoken tongue.

The New Testament Greek is not translation Greek, and thus differs radically in most respects from the Septuagint, which shows the Hebrew idiom at every turn. . . . In general the New Testament stands on a very different plane from the Septuagint as to its language, though like it in many idioms.... In so far as the gospel has new ideas to set forth, a new turn has to be given to old words," etc. ("A Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament," pages 5-7.)

We must remember in this discussion that *"psallo"* has its classical meaning and also a New Testament meaning. Attention will be given to the definitions of *"psallo"* in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER III

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

It is not my purpose to take much more time or space in discussing the terms of the proposition. These were made perfectly clear in Chapter I. But I want it distinctly and definitely understood that I am not affirming that instrumental music in Christian worship is commanded, nor does the proposition demand that I shall. This is the position my opponent wants me to assume, and he has tried manfully to force this meaning into the proposition as defined. His long elaboration of the terms is wholly misleading and irrelevant. He adds nothing whatever of value to the explanation of the terms of the proposition. What he says about the preposition "in" as meaning that instrumental music is "in" the worship is based on the assumption that it is a command, and that I am affirming this. This is a false assumption. I am not affirming any such thing. It will be necessary for the reader to bear this in mind, for I predict that my opponent will be assuming this all through the discussion. Neither I nor my brethren have ever held that instrumental music in Christian worship is commanded. But it is none the less Scriptural, because there are other grounds for its use in worship which make it just as Scriptural as if it were actually commanded. That this is true will be proved to the satisfaction of every unprejudiced person who reads this discussion.

I am affirming that instrumental music in worship is a Christian expedient; and if it is, it follows that it is Scriptural. Mr. Calhoun says: "All expedient things are right— i. e., Scriptural and advantageous; but they are not commanded—i. e., enjoined or prohibited." (Tennessee Christian, June, 1925.) With this I agree. It is from the standpoint of expediency, therefore, that I shall conduct my part

of this discussion. Every argument presented will focus on that.

It was stated in Chapter I that "our conservative brethren have made two things tests of fellowship—organized missionary work and instrumental music in worship." My opponent denies this. But facts are stubborn things, and they are all against him. He makes his boast that he stands with the "pioneers." Here again the facts are against him. The pioneers likely had different opinions about instrumental music and many other things, but they never made their opinions tests of fellowship, as the conservative brethren have done. Alexander Campbell never uttered a word which placed instrumental music in the realm of binding faith. His whole attitude and teaching throughout his life was opposed to making opinions tests of fellowship, as everybody knows. And he was president of the American Christian Missionary Society from its formation till his death. The position of Mr. Campbell was as far removed from that of my opponent as light is from darkness.

Thomas Campbell never uttered a word against instrumental music in worship' nor did Barton W. Stone, Walter Scott, A. S. Hayden, and many others who may be classed with the pioneers. Barton W. Stone said: "If we begin to magnify our opinions and make them tests of fellowship, we depart from the foundation laid in Zion, and shall be under the necessity of becoming a sect by forming a book of opinions as our creed and demanding a subscription to it as the basis of union." ("Pioneer Sermons and Addresses," pages 150, 151.) This looks as if it might have been written for the present discussion.

Brother Boles says: "The New Testament fixes all tests of fellowship 'in Christian worship.' We obey them; he rejects them." Here he is assuming the very thing to be proved; and he asks that his opinion as to what the New Testament teaches on the subject be taken as final, regardless of all the evidence to the contrary. This is exactly what he will be doing all through this discussion.

He says I reject the teaching of the New Testament in

the matter of worship. This is another "stock" expression with no basis of fact. Where is the Scripture that I am rejecting? I challenge my opponent, here and now, to give the chapter and verse of any command that I am violating, or failing to obey, in worship. DO this, Brother Boles, and this discussion may come to a close at once, and I will give the rest of my life to instructing the churches not to use instrumental music to accompany their singing. You produce just one clear, explicit statement from the word of God condemning instrumental music in worship, and I will give it up, and so will my brethren. Will Brother Boles give the chapter and verse? No. Why? Because there is none. The Scripture is all on the other side, as we shall see.

My opponent says his practice and teaching in regard to vocal music is not called in question. He is mistaken in this. His practice of singing without instrumental accompaniment, of course, no one calls in question. I sing without the instrument frequently. But when he says, as he does, that I may not Scripturally use instrumental accompaniment, that I am sinning and transgressing when I do-— when he says that Rom. 16:9; 1 Cor. 14:15, 26; Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; and James 5:~13 exclude instrumental accompaniment in worship, his position is called in question by the scholarship of the world, and also by the most intelligent, spiritual-minded, devoted Christians of our day.

What my opponent says about my being out of harmony with J. B. Briney and the Christian Standard, and in company with J. Carroll Stark and O. E. Payne, I pass with a word. It is certain that he has misinterpreted the quotation from Brother Briney. In this quotation he does not mean that the Bible is silent on the subject of instrumental music in worship, except as a matter of binding faith—a thing which must be done. As a matter of privilege, of permission, it is far from being silent about it. That the New Testament sanctions the use of instrumental music in worship is what Brother Briney has contended for for years. I am also positive that the Standard has been misconstrued in the excerpt from a personal letter quoted. I

have evidence in a personal note just received that the Standard is in full accord with my position.

Again, my opponent says: "In Chapter I he has not quoted a single verse of Scripture; he made reference to only five verses, and then tried away to the Greek lexicons. Readers, ANY PROPOSITION IN THE REALM OF RELIGION THAT CANNOT BE PROVED BY OUR ENGLISH BIBLE IS NOT TRUE—IT CANNOT BE PROVED. He has left the English Bible and gone to the Greek lexicons, because there is not one single word in the English New Testament about instrumental music 'in Christian worship ;' and since the New Testament, and the New Testament only, describes and authorizes Christian worship, he cannot prove his proposition; he cannot prove anything to be Scriptural that is not in the Scriptures." Will the reader kindly ponder this quotation till he is thoroughly familiar with it? Do not be alarmed at the CAPITALS; it is only our opponent's way of giving emphasis. And do not be afraid of the noise; just remember that it is the lightning and not the thunder which kills. In this quotation is a fallacy which lies at the basis of much of the misconception about instrumental music in worship. We must make this matter clear even at the risk of taking all the space left for this chapter.

My opponent would have you believe that we are trying to get away from the English Bible. Not so. We are not seeking to get away from it. We are seeking to understand it. What does it mean as interpreted by the best scholarship of the world? My brother and his people have put a certain interpretation on passages referring to singing in worship. We are asking, Is this interpretation true? My interpretation of these same passages does not agree with theirs. We honestly differ about it. What are we to do? Why, if we are wise, we will seek all the light from every source available that will aid us in discovering the truth. Our English Bible is a translation. We always have recourse to the original language in which the inspired writers have revealed to us the will of God; and when in doubt about the meaning of any passage in our English Bible, we

can go back to the very words in which divine revelation of was given.

There lies open before me as I write a copy of the New Testament. It is the one from which all other New Testaments in the world, in all languages and dialects, have come. All others, our own English New Testament included, are but translations. It alone is the original as it came fresh from the minds of the inspired men who wrote it. It is the one New Testament which was written under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit. It is in the Greek language. God chose the Greek in which to enshrine his revelation of his Son and Christianity, because it was the most perfect language in the world,: and capable of expressing the most delicate and exact shades of meaning. It is important to remember this in our present discussion.

Here is Eph. 5:19 just as it came from the pen of the apostle Paul: "Lalountes heautois psalmois kai humnois kai odais pneumatikais, adontes kai psallontes te kardia humon to kurio." Translated in our American Standard Revised Version? it reads: "Speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord." Both of these passages are Scripture. The difference is that one is the exact language which the apostle used, and the other is a translation made by fallible men. I unhesitatingly accept both. But get this clearly in mind: whatever Paul meant by "psalmois" is exactly what we must mean by "psalms," and whatever he meant by "psallontes" is exactly, what we must mean by "making melody." Unless they mean the same thing to us, we have not got the meaning of the Holy Spirit as he spoke through the apostle Paul.

Our first witnesses to bear testimony must, of course, be the lexicographers. In Chapter I. I submitted the testimony of eight of the standard Greek lexicons as to the meaning of *"psallo"* and its noun form "psalmos." Seven out of the eight say specifically that in its classic and later use, in the Septuagint and the New Testament, *"psallo"* includes instrumental signification. And I will prove that the eighth

one does not exclude it from his New Testament use. There is not a standard Greek lexicon in the world that disputes this combined testimony. Some do not explicitly state that it carries this meaning in the New Testament, evidently taking it for granted that it would be so understood, because of its long association with that idea, but not one declares that the instrumental meaning is excluded from its New Testament sense.

What is the force of this array of evidence? According to Alexander Campbell, "it is the most learned and the most competent testimony in this case in the world. All good dictionaries," he says, "in all languages are made upon a full examination of particular occurrences—upon a sufficient induction of distinct instances—and convey the true meaning of a word at any given period of its history." These lexicons refer us to examples of the New Testament use of *"psallo"*—"particular occurrences and distinct instances," as Mr. Campbell would say—thereby showing positively that they were basing its New Testament meaning on these examples of its use. What could be stronger evidence than this?

CHAPTER IV

SECOND NEGATIVE

Brother Clubb in his second affirmative begins to quarrel with his proposition and quibble with its issue. Such an attitude shows that he is dissatisfied with his task. He wants us to "distinctly and definitely" understand that he is "not affirming that instrumental music in Christian worship is commanded," yet he assures us that "it is just as Scriptural as if it were actually commanded." There is no reason for quibbling over the word "command." If anything is Scriptural, it matters not whether this Scripture be given as a command, promise, or instruction, it is binding upon those who serve the Lord. He is relieved of no embarrassment whatsoever by saying that his proposition does not call upon him to affirm that instrumental music is commanded. I want him to answer this question: Is singing commanded in the New Testament?

He says that he is "affirming that instrumental music in worship is a Christian expedient." He should be affirming his proposition. His proposition says nothing about "a Christian expedient." He shall not evade the issue. His proposition puts instrumental music "in Christian worship," and not as "an expedient to the worship." Anything that is an aid to the worship or an "expedient to worship" cannot be said to be "in Christian worship." He may ramble around in the field of "expediency" all he wishes, but the reader shall see that he is evading and equivocating.

I declare that he and those who are with him in placing instrumental music "in Christian worship" have left the principles of the fathers of the Restoration Movement. Alexander Campbell said that instrumental music in the worship was like "a cowbell in a concert." Does Brother Clubb stand with A. Campbell on this point? Thomas

Campbell laid down the principle: "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent." The Bible is silent on instrumental music in the worship, yet Brother Clubb loudly proclaims that it is "in Christian worship." Brother Clubb says: "Thomas Campbell never uttered a word against instrumental music in worship." Instrumental music was not discussed during the days of Thomas Campbell. It never became an issue until the last days of his son, Alexander Campbell. Brother Clubb knows that none of the churches of Christ used instrumental music in worship until about 1860; and those who used it at first claimed no Scriptural authority for using it. W. T. Moore, in his "History of the Disciples of Christ," says: "The advocates of the organ contended that their plea was not contrary to Scripture, even if there was no precept or example for the use of the organ in worship." (Page 510.) The pioneers of the Restoration did not use the instrument. Those who first used it did so admittedly without "precept or example" for its use. It is modern for any one who claims to be a member of the church of Christ to affirm that "Instrumental Music in Christian worship is Scriptural."

He wants to know what Scripture he rejects, and challenges me to give a commandment which those who use instrumental music "in Christian worship" disobey. I would refer him to the Christian Standard, which has been cataloging the sins of Brother Clubb and his allies for some time; or, if he prefers, I can point them out to him. God's Book clearly teaches that we should "not . . . go beyond the things which are written." (1 Cor. 4:6.) There is nothing written in the New Testament Scriptures about instrumental music in Christian worship. Brother Clubb goes "beyond the things which are written" when he places instrumental music in Christian worship. Will he live up to his promise and quit using it? Again, we are forbidden to add anything to the teachings of the New Testament Scriptures. (See Rev. 22:18.) Brother Clubb has added instrumental music to New Testament worship. He asks me to show him "just one clear, explicit statement from the

word of God condemning instrumental music in worship," and promises to end this discussion if I will do so. That is a very generous promise. Suppose a Catholic should say: "Brother Clubb, 'show me just one clear, explicit statement from the word of God condemning' the burning of incense 'in worship, and I will give it up, and so will my brethren.' " What would Brother Clubb do with this Catholic?

May I suggest that Brother Clubb should show Scripture for using instrumental music in Christian worship before he begins practicing it? It is not Scriptural to introduce anything in worship and then ask for a Scripture condemning it. He should give "one clear, explicit statement from the word of God" that teaches it before he begins practicing it.

The quotation he gives from Brother Calhoun was written more than twenty-five years ago. Brother Calhoun has repudiated the statement and has ceased to use instrumental music in worship. Brother Clubb reprinted this statement from Brother Calhoun in the Tennessee Christian in June, 1925, and now he quotes it as though Brother Calhoun said it in June, 1925. This is not fair to Brother Calhoun. Let us keep the record straight.

Brother Clubb admits that my practice and teaching are Scriptural, and says that he "sings without the instrument frequently." He admits that I am Scriptural. My position is not called in question; my practice is admitted by Brother Clubb to be Scriptural. His practice is on trial. He has been asked to give Scripture for his practice; he has failed to do so; he cannot, as there is no Scripture authorizing the use of instrumental music in the worship.

He says that I "misinterpreted the quotation from Brother Briney." I am sure that I did not "misinterpret" him, for I did not even try to "interpret" him. I simply quoted Brother Briney's statement. Brother Briney said "that there is no direct teaching in the New Testament on the subject." He further said: "A moment's reflection will convince sober reason that it does not belong to the sphere of faith, for faith rests upon plain and unequivocal statements of the word of God." Now, that is what Brother Briney

said, and it needs no interpretation. He also is "positive" that I have "misconstrued" a statement from one of the editors of the Christian Standard. Again he is mistaken. I did not "misconstrue" anything. I did not attempt to "construe" anything. I simply quoted a paragraph from a letter which says that Brother Clubb and those on his side of his proposition "play with technicalities. They do not show forth an unmistakable 'Thus saith the Lord.' " Brother Clubb knows that the Christian Standard will not affirm his proposition as he has it stated.

He does not deny being in the class with Stark and Payne. Stark says that instrumental music "is positively commanded by the apostles" and that Paul "authorized the use of instrumental music in the worship of the church." Does Brother Clubb indorse these statements of J. C. Stark? O. E. Payne said: "Henceforth we must unite in agreeing that if we forego musical instruments we cannot conform to the divine injunction to psallein." Does Brother Clubb agree with Payne?

Reader, bear in mind that any proposition in the realm of religion that cannot be proved by our English Bible is not true—it cannot be proved. I join my opponent in asking you to "ponder" this statement. My opponent states by implication that the English New Testament cannot be understood without Greek lexicons. This is a serious charge against the English translators. It is an unpardonable reflection on the intelligence of English-speaking people.

We have observed that there are two divisions of Greek literature—classical and New Testament. We are now to observe that there are two hinds of lexicons—classical and New Testament. There are two kinds of classical lexicons— those which give the meaning of words according to classical usage only, with no reference to the New Testament meaning (Donnegan's Greek and English lexicon belongs to this list); second, those which give classical meaning with incidental reference to the New Testament (Liddell and Scott's lexicon belongs to this class). There are also two classes of New Testament lexicons—those which give first the classical

meaning and then the New Testament use (Thayer belongs to this class); second, those which give only the New Testament meaning ("Dictionary of the Vulgate New Testament," by J. M. Harden, belongs to this class).

Now, in this discussion we are concerned only with New Testament lexicons and only with the New Testament use of "psallo." It is confusing to the reader for Brother Clubb to lug into this discussion, without any discrimination, Greek lexicons, and then quote the classical meaning of *"psallo"* as though it were a New Testament meaning. The issue must be kept clear; no sophistry should be used. *"psallo"* is used only five times in the Greek New Testament. What is its meaning as used in the New Testament?

I should like for Brother Clubb to explain why he has to leave the English New Testament and go to the Greek lexicons to prove instrumental music is "a Christian expediency." Does he think that he can get "Christian expediency" out of "psallo?" May we ask what other "expediencies" are in "psallo?" Let us make *"psallo"* disgorge all of its "expediencies." What say you, Brother Clubb?

We now notice the testimony of the lexicographers which were introduced by my opponent in Chapter I.

LIDDELL AND SCOTT. AS has already been observed, this belongs to the classical list, making incidental reference to the Septuagint and New Testament. It makes no discrimination between the classical and New Testament meaning of "psallo."

ROBINSON. This is a New Testament lexicon, giving first the classical meaning and then the New Testament meaning. "Psallo, in New Testament, to sing, and construed with a dative, to sing in honor or in praise of any one, to sing praises to, to celebrate in song (Rom. 15:9; Eph. 5:19; James 5:13; 1 Cor. 14:15). Psalmos, in New Testament, an ode, song, and spoken of odes in praise of God, a psalm." (Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament, 1825.) This definition differs from that given by my opponent. I challenge the correctness of his definition. Please give the date of the edition quoted.

PARKHURST. This is in the same class with Robinson. The New Testament meaning of "psallo," "to sing, sing praises or psalms to God, whether with or without instruments (Rom. 15:9; 1 Cor. 14:15; Eph. 5:19; James 5:13)." It will be noted that Parkhurst says that *"psallo"* in the New Testament means "to sing, . . . whether with or without instruments."

YONGE. This is a classical lexicon giving reference to the New Testament, but says that *"psallo"* means "to sing psalms (Rom. 15:9)."

BRETSCHNEIDER. This belongs to the same class with Robinson and Parkhurst. "Psallo, to produce music, either to a musical instrument or with the voice alone." To make music "with the voice alone" is to sing, hence "to glorify in songs."

ZORELL. This belongs to the New Testament class. "Psallo, sing, sing sacred hymns."

THAYER. This is a New Testament lexicon giving first the classical meaning and then the New Testament meaning. He says: "In the New Testament, to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praises of God in song."

ABBOTT-SMITH. This belongs to the New Testament class of lexicons. "Psallo, in the New Testament, to sing a hymn, sing praise."

When the evidence of these eight lexicons is properly classified, we see that they do not sustain my opponent's proposition. Five of them say that "in the New Testament" *"psallo"* means "to sing."

My opponent concluded Chapter I with the following language: "We now have before us the evidence of eight of the best Greek lexicons in existence.... What is their combined testimony? It is this: that 'psallo' in the New Testament allows, permits, the use of instrumental accompaniment in Christian worship." In this statement he very adroitly evades the issue and seeks to divert the mind of the reader from the logical issue of his proposition to another proposition. The "combined testimony" of these eight "best Greek lexicons" is not that "instrumental accompaniment in

Christian worship" is "allowed" or "permitted ;" neither is that what "the proposition calls on" him "to prove." He has not reasoned logically; neither has he drawn a legitimate conclusion. Even if he had proved just what he claims that he has proved—namely, that instrumental accompaniment is "allowed" or "permitted" in the New Testament— that is the width of the heavens from what his proposition calls on him to prove. But since he thinks he has proved that instrumental music is "allowed" or "permitted" in the New Testament, now I want him to prove his proposition— namely, "Instrumental Music in Christian worship is Scriptural."

CHAPTER V

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

It is with genuine regret that we are compelled to notice the spirit in which the negative is proceeding in this discussion. We had hoped that he would meet the issue between us in a frank, candid, courteous manner. It looks now as if we are to be disappointed in our expectation. From the first he has been raising irrelevant issues and accusing the affirmative of insincerity, in such terms as "quibbling," "sophistry," "playing with technicalities," "evading," "equivocating," etc. Of course, he must have some object in all this. Just what his purpose is, however, we leave the readers to conjecture. We are perfectly willing to trust their intelligence and fairness in making proper discrimination.

My opponent challenges the accuracy of the definition I gave from Robinson's New Testament lexicon and substitutes another. I have on my desk the edition of 1850—the last, I think, of Robinson's lexicon. On page 791 the definition of *"psallo"* and "psalmos" will be found. It is needless to add that I quoted it exactly as it is there. I may add that the lexicon which Brother Boles substitutes is not Robinson's at all. It is, as Robinson says, his first venture in translation, being Wahl's "Clavis Philologica Novi Testamenti." It is strange that Brother Boles did not discover this in time to save himself from this embarrassment.

What our opponent says in his effort to classify the Greek lexicons is so confused and misleading that we feel we must take space to clear it up; and it is a very simple thing to do. We have consulted Greek lexicons for over thirty-five years, and it is our conviction that it is as easy, if not easier, to consult a Greek lexicon as it is an English dictionary. Any one who knows enough Greek to consult a lexicon at all has absolutely no difficulty in knowing what the lexicon says.

This is true in all cases, and in the case of *"psallo"* and "psalmos," as the lexicons given have defined them, there is no possibility of anybody making a mistake, who is willing to take what these lexicons plainly say.

The real distinction between a general Greek lexicon, such, for instance, as Liddell and Scott's, and a New Testament lexicon, such as Robinson's, is briefly and simply this: a general lexicon covers the whole field of Greek literature, while the New Testament lexicon deals only with words found in the New Testament. Each gives a full and complete definition of the words it defines, and each is equally accurate and reliable.

To say, as our opponent does, that Liddell and Scott's lexicon gives only "incidental reference to the New Testament meanings of words" is an assertion which has not one single fact to support it. If this greatest of all Greek lexicons could be proved unreliable and inaccurate in its definitions of New Testament words, it would instantly lose its high place in the confidence and esteem of the world's best scholarship. My opponent's statement is simply absurd.

Brother Boles' handling of the lexicons is, to say the least, surprising. He faces eight witnesses of the very highest integrity and scholarship, seven of whom testify in the most specific and definite way, and one by the fairest implication, that *"psallo"* and "psalmos" indicate instrumental accompaniment in the New Testament. And he is not able to see anything in this combined testimony, which is as clear as sunlight, that contradicts his pet theory.

Let us review the definitions of these eight lexicons, taking note only of their references to the New Testament meaning of *"psallo"* and "psalmos." Let the reader note very carefully what each one says.

LIDDELL AND SCOTT: "Psallo, to sing to the harp. Eph. 5:19."

"Psalmos, a song sung to the harp, New Testament."

Robinson: "Psallo, to sing, to chant, properly as accompanying stringed instruments. New Testament."

"Psalmos, a song, properly as accompanying stringed instruments. New Testament."

PARKHURST: "Psallo, to sing, to sing praises or psalms to God, whether with or without instruments. Eph. 5:19."

"Psalmos, a psalm, a sacred song, or poem, properly such a one as is sung to stringed instruments. 1 Cor. 14:26."

YONGE: "Psallo, in the New Testament, to sing, while touching the chords, while accompanying one's self on a stringed instrument, to sing psalms. Rom. 15:9."

"Psalmos, a song sung to the accompaniment of music."

BRETSCHNEIDER: "Psallo, to produce music, either to musical instruments or with the voice alone, and only of a joyful music, hence to glorify in song."

ZORELL: "Psallo, sing a hymn to the notes of the lyre."

"Psalmos, a song to be sung to the sound of the lyre, to be sung in honor of God."

THAYER: "Psallo, Septuagint for niggen and much oftener for zamar; to sing to the music of the harp; in the New Testament, to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praise of God in song. James 5:13; Eph. 5:19; Rom. 15:9."

"Psalmos, a pious song, a psalm."

ABBOTT-SMTTH: "Psallo, later to sing to a harp, sing psalms; in New Testament, to sing a hymn, sing praise. James 5:13; Rom. 15:9; Eph. 5:19;1 Cor. 14:15."

"Psalmos, in Septuagint chiefly for mizmor, . . . and hence in later writers, a sacred song sung to musical accompaniment, a psalm. Eph. 5:19 et al."

We have placed together the definitions of Thayer and Abbott-Smith, because they each use the phrase, "in the New Testament," in the same way. In Thayer, this expression has been construed to exclude instrumental accompaniment. In 1911, J. B. Briney addressed the following to Prof. J. H. Ropes, the successor of Thayer in Harvard University: "After giving the general meanings of the word (psallo) as found in Greek literature, Thayer's lexicon says: 'In the New Testament, to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praises of God in song.' It is contended that the phrase, 'in the New Testament,' is intended to convey the notion

that in its New Testament use the word does not admit of the use of an instrument in connection with singing. My understanding of the matter is that the phrase in question simply indicates that in the New Testament 'psallo' is limited to sacred singing, and does not mean that instrumental accompaniment is excluded. Am I, in your opinion, right or wrong?"

To this, Professor Ropes replied: "You are entirely right in your understanding of the definition of 'psallo' in Thayer's lexicon. . . . In a word, the term in the New Testament use has substantially the meaning of our word 'sing,' which is used of vocal music both with and without accompaniment. If the writers had intended to speak of accompanied singing, they would have used 'psallo.' "

We have a personal letter from Abbott-Smith, dated August 19, 1925. Dr. Abbott-Smith is the author of one of the latest New Testament Greek lexicons, and it is one of the best. He says: "I am sure that Thayer, like myself, does no more than group the New Testament passages together. If he meant to say that the idea of instrumental music was excluded, he surely ought to have plainly said so." It is thus perfectly clear that, in the judgment of these two eminent scholars, Thayer does not exclude instrumental accompaniment from his New Testament definition of "psallo."

Confronted with this array of witnesses, what does my opponent do? I will enumerate.

First. He attempts to prejudice the reader against them by holding up the English Bible and shouting in CAPITALS: "ANYTHING THAT CANNOT BE PROVED BY OUR ENGLISH BIBLE CANNOT BE PROVED. Brother Clubb has left the Bible and tried off after the Greek lexicons." This will have no effect on the intelligent reader.

Alexander Campbell, in the Campbell and Rice debate, appealed to this same class of witnesses as to the action of baptism, and Dr. Rice was just as uncomfortable, when he did it, as my opponent is now when I do the same thing in regard to "psallo."

Dr. T. W. Brents, in his debate with Herod (page 6), said: "The King James Version, as it is called, is made the standard of authority in this discussion. I would have preferred it otherwise. While I believe it, on the whole, about as good as any other version, yet I know there are manifest errors in it, and in discussions of this kind it should be the aim of all parties to get at the truth; and when there are errors in translation, known to be such, we ought to be at liberty to correct them by any light we can get, either from critics or commentators who have given us the benefit of their labors or by an appeal to the original for ourselves." Dr. Brents was a leader among our conservative brethren.

Again, in the "Query Department" of the Gospel Advocate of December 10, 1925, my opponent deposes as follows: "Some versions are better than others; some express more clearly the thought than others. The scholarship of to-day is better than the scholarship of four hundred years ago. Scholars to-day have access to manuscripts and resources which were not known then. Therefore, the translation or version of to-day is better in many respects than the version which was made four hundred years ago. It is dense ignorance on the part of any one to claim that one is leaving 'the old Bible' simply because he quotes from the Revised Version." Is my opponent willing to live up to this pronouncement? We have several versions of the New Testament by the scholars of to-day. In the present discussion I heartily and unreservedly accept them all. Will he accept Moffatt's, made in the light of the most recent researches in Greek? Dr. Moffatt is considered the greatest New Testament Greek scholar in the world. Will my opponent accept the Riverside edition of the New Testament, by Dr. Ballantine? He is a present-day scholar of undoubted ability in the field of New Testament criticism. Will he accept the Twentieth Century New Testament, which met with such a cordial reception from scholars twenty years ago? Will he accept Rotherham's translation of the New Testament? Dr. Rotherham is highly regarded as a scholar, both in England and America. None of these contradict the American

Standard Revision, but in the present discussion they throw some very clear light on it.

Second. My opponent says that I admit his practice and teaching on music in the worship, and this, too, with the plain statement to the contrary right before him. This discussion ought to show the reader that the very opposite is the truth. I call in question, with all the energy I can command, the position of Brother Boles and the conservative brethren on the subject. Let that suffice.

Third. His garbling of the definitions of my witnesses is wholly unwarranted and deceiving. It is an unheard-of procedure in honorable discussion for a man to remove the testimony of a witness and substitute something else for it. This Brother Boles did in the case of Robinson. I cheerfully accord him the right to challenge the accuracy of the testimony of any of my witnesses, but he has no right to make any substitutions. I do not question my opponent's honesty here, but I question the ethics of his action.

Again, in handling the definitions of some of my witnesses, he leaves out that part of their definitions which plainly contradicts his position in this discussion, and thus makes them say exactly the opposite to what they do say. Examples:

1. YONGE. This is what Brother Boles says: "This is a classical lexicon, giving reference to the New Testament, but says that 'psallo' means 'to sing psalms (Rom. 15:9).' " Now, here is what Yonge actually does say: "Psallo, in the New Testament, to sing while touching the chords, while accompanying one's self on a stringed instrument, to sing psalms. (Rom. 15:9.) Psalmos, a song sung to the accompaniment of music." All that Brother Boles quotes from Yonge is that he "says sing psalms." But let the reader note that he omits that part of Yonge's definition which tells us how to sing psalms. Yonge says: "A psalm is a song sung to the accompaniment of music."

2. ZORELL. Brother Boles says: "This belongs to the New Testament class. 'Psallo,' 'sing, sing sacred hymns.' " Now, here is what Zorell actually says: "Psallo," sing a

hymn to the notes of the lyre; sing, sing sacred hymns in honor of God. Psalmos, song to be sung to the sound of the Iyre, to be sung in honor of God."

I protest against this unfair handling of my witnesses. That these witnesses testify to singing as a meaning of *"psallo"* in New Testament times, no one denies. That is not the point at issue. The real question is: Do they, or do they not, include instrumental accompaniment in their New Testament definitions of *"psallo"* and "psalmos?" And the answer to this question they have given with one accord, in words plain enough for anybody who wants to know.

CHAPTER VI

THIRD NEGATIVE

Brother Clubb in Chapter III quarreled with his proposition and quibbled with its issue; now in Chapter V he seeks to wrangle with his opponent. He informs us that he is displeased with his opponent. Well. I am not seeking to please my opponent. I know that when I expose his fallacies and hold him to the issue, that he will not love me. As this discussion continues, his aversion to me will augment more and more, because I am determined to hold him to the issue and let the public see that he is failing to measure up to the requirements of his proposition.

My sweet-spirited brother complains that I have accused him of "quibbling," "evading," etc. Either he is evading the issue, or else he does not know what the issue is. I give him credit for being an intelligent man; others may look upon his efforts with leniency if they can. While he is displeased at my using the words "quibbling," "evading," etc., yet he does not hesitate to charge me with "attempting to prejudice the reader," "garbling definitions," "deceiving," etc. I suppose my opponent's standard of ethics permits him to use such expressions without marring this discussion.

I have asked my opponent to discuss the issue of his proposition. He has promised to prove that the Scriptures teach that instrumental music is "in Christian worship"—that is, it is "Scriptural" for instrumental music to be "in Christian worship." I leave it to the readers' candid judgment whether he is proving his proposition. He did not quote a single Scripture in Chapter I; he quoted only one (Eph. 5:19) in Chapter III; and he has not quoted a single Scripture in Chapter V. I ask again: How can he prove that instrumental music "in Christian worship" is "Scriptural," when he does not quote any Scripture? The New Testament

Scriptures do not mention instrumental music "in Christian worship," and, therefore, he cannot prove his proposition to be Scriptural. I challenge him to give one New Testament Scripture that mentions instrumental music "in Christian worship." I know that he would gladly quote the verse if he could find one.

A few words more need to be said about Robinson's lexicon. He says I did "not quote from Robinson's lexicon at all." I quoted from the 1825 edition of Robinson's "Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament." He says that the definition I quoted is from "Wahl's 'Clavis Philologica Novi Testamenti.' " Again he is mistaken. Wahl's lexicon was written in Latin. Dr. Robinson used Wahl's lexicon as a basis for his own lexicon. However, he did not use Wahl's definitions for New Testament words. In his preface Dr. Robinson says: "It became necessary to recur constantly to the original Greek, and to form the definitions from the New Testament itself, rather than from the very general Latin definitions either of Wahl or Schleusner." Robinson formed his "definitions from the New Testament itself" and not from "the very general Latin definitions either of Wahl or Schleusner." Brother Clubb says that the definition given "is not Robinson's at all," but Robinson says that he formed his definitions "from the New Testament itself" and not from Wahl. Which shall we believe, Robinson or Brother Clubb? Brother Clubb is afraid of Robinson's definition of *"psallo"* as given by him in his 1825 edition; hence, he tries to discredit that edition of Robinson's lexicon.

I have asked my opponent this question: "Is singing commanded in the New Testament?" Brother Clubb forgot to answer this. I hope that he will remember it in his next chapter.

Brother Clubb for some cause misquoted me. I have stated in all of my previous chapters that "any proposition in the realm of religion that cannot be proved by our English Bible is not true—it cannot be proved." The reader may refer to page 36 and see how he has misquoted my statement. He leaves out the words, "any proposition in the

realm of religion," and substitutes the word "anything." Surely it was not an oversight, as I have written the statement in capitals in each chapter. He cannot prove his proposition by the English New Testament. He has retreated to the Greek lexicons, and has sought under the cover of the Greek lexicons to confuse the mind of the reader and obscure the real issue of the proposition. He is to prove that instrumental music is "in Christian worship."

A word should be said about Liddell and Scott's lexicon. This does not claim to be a New Testament lexicon. I have before me the third and eighth editions of this lexicon. In each of these there is subjoined "an alphabetical catalogue of authors quoted, with a note of the edition used' when the reference is made by pages." (Preface, eighth edition.) The third edition has a list of more than three hundred authors quoted, and the eighth edition more than five hundred and fifty. The Septuagint is mentioned in both lists of authors quoted, but the New Testament not mentioned in either list. Now, why is the New Testament not mentioned? The references to the New Testament meaning of words in the body of the lexicon is only incidental, as is shown by the New Testament's not being tabulated in the list of authors quoted.

Brother Clubb does not quote Brother Briney's question accurately, neither does he quote Dr. Ropes' answer to Brother Briney accurately or fully, as the reader can see by referring to Brother Briney's book, "Instrumental Music in Christian Worship," pages 40-42. Brother Clubb did not quote this part of Dr. Ropes' answer concerning "psallo:" "The word implies nothing whatever with regard to accompaniment." The reader can see very clearly why Brother Clubb did not quote the above sentence from Dr. Ropes. However, what Dr. Ropes and Abbott-Smith say in private letters about what they think Thayer means does not in the least change what Thayer says. He says that *"psallo"* means, "in the New Testament, to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praise of God in song." The reader will have to see Dr.

Abbott-Smith's letter in full before much weight can be given to the quotation offered by Brother Clubb.

My opponent is rapidly establishing the reputation of handling authors and quotations very carelessly and inaccurately. He boasts that he has been consulting "Greek lexicons for over thirty-five years." The reader will wonder if he has always been so inaccurate in quoting them. Some of his definitions given in Chapter V differ from the definitions which he gave in Chapter I. I quote the definitions which he gave in Chapter I and ask the reader to compare them with the ones which he now gives in Chapter V. Of course, we are comparing only the parts of his definitions as he gave them in Chapter V.

LIDDELL AND SCOTT: "Psallo, to sing to a harp; Septuagint." (In Chapter V he leaves out "Septuagint.")

"Psalmos, a song sung to the harp, a psalm, Septuagint, New Testament." (In this he leaves out "a psalm, Septuagint.")

ROBINSON: "Psallo, in Septuagint and New Testament, to sing, to chant, properly as accompanying stringed instruments." (Here he leaves out "Septuagint and New Testament" and puts in "New Testament" at the last.)

"Psalmos, a song, properly as accompanying stringed instruments." (Here again Brother Clubb added "New Testament.")

ZORELL: "Psallo, sing a hymn to the notes of the lyre, sing, sing sacred hymns in honor of God." (Here Brother Clubb left out "sing, sing sacred hymns in honor of God.")

ABBOTT-SMITH: "Psallo, later to sing to a harp, sing psalms (Septuagint); in New Testament, to sing a hymn, sing praises, James 5:13 et al." (Here he leaves out "Septuagint.")

"Psalmos, in Septuagint chiefly for mizmor; 1. a striking, . . . and hence in later writers, 2. a sacred song sung to musical accompaniment, a psalm (Septuagint), 1 Cor. 14:26 et al." (Here he left out "Septuagint" again in order that it may appear to be a New Testament meaning.)

He garbles the quotation from the Gospel Advocate, as

the reader can see by turning to page 1190, December 10, 1925, of the Advocate, and misapplies the quotation. His quotation from Dr. Brents is not accurate and full enough. See "A Theological Debate" between Brents and Herod, page 6. Brother Clubb, why did you not quote the next sentence from Dr. Brents? You stopped too short. The next sentence reads: "But with all its [King James Version] defects in translation, we believe it sufficiently clear to enable us to understand the will of the Lord and be saved." Brother Clubb does not think that the English Bible is "sufficiently clear to enable us to understand the will of the Lord" on singing God's praises "in Christian worship."

He says he does not admit my practice as being true. In Chapter III he said this about my practice: "His practice of singing without instrumental accompaniment, of course, no one questions. I sing without the instrument frequently." Brother Clubb's position is on trial; mine is not. He admits my position to be right and even practices it himself, so he says.

Again, he quotes Alexander Campbell in regard to lexicons; yet he will not take what Mr. Campbell says on the question of instrumental music. Reader, is it not strange that he would introduce a witness and accept what he says on everything else except the very point at issue Mr. Campbell, who knew lexicons and their value, said of instrumental music: "I presume, to all spiritual-minded Christians, such aids would be as a cowbell in a concert." Brother Clubb will not take Mr. Campbell's testimony on instrumental music.

We have established the fact that there is a difference between the use of words in classical Greek and in the New Testament Greek. My opponent now admits this distinction, but in Chapter I he tried to confuse the mind of the reader by quoting a classical meaning with the New Testament meaning of the word "psallo." He also admits now that there are classical lexicons and New Testament lexicons, and that some New Testament lexicons give first the

classical meaning of *"psallo"* and then the New Testament meaning.

The history of *"psallo"* shows that it gradually dropped off some of its original meaning and took on new meaning. In classical Greek it first meant "to touch," "to pluck the hair," then "to pluck the strings of a bow," then "to pluck the strings of an instrument," then "to sing with the instrument," and finally "to sing." The following lexicons show that it came to mean "to sing:"

1. GREEK LEXICON (A.D. 1816): "Psallo, . . . by a change of use, it also refers to singing songs, singing psalms."
2. HESYCHIUS: "Psallein, to sing songs; to pluck; to set in motion."
3. SCAPULA: "Psallo, . . . likewise, metaphorically, psallo with songs and glorify the Lord with hymns. I sing praises to the Lord."
4. SOPHOCLES: "Psallo, to chant, sing, as religious hymns." (This is the only definition Sophocles gives for "psallo.")
5. GREENFIELD: "Psallo, . . . by implication, to sing, and with a dative of person, to sing in honor or praise of, sing praises to, celebrate in song or psalm (Rom. 15:9 et al.) ."
6. JONES: "Psallo, . . . sing; sing to a name; celebrate."
7. GROVES: "Psallo, . . . to sing to the harp; to praise, celebrate."
8. DUNBAR: "Psallo, . . . to sing; to celebrate with hymns."
9. HAMILTON: "Psallo, . . . play on stringed instrument, sing."

The nine authors quoted above are given only to show that the word *"psallo"* finally came to mean "to sing." The reader will note that I have not given the definition in full; just enough to show its latter use. I now submit eleven standard Greek lexicons which give the New Testament use of the word "psallo." Only that part of the meaning of

"psallo" which belongs to the New Testament use is quoted here.

1. THAYER: "Psallo, . . . in the New Testament, to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praises of God in song. James' 5:13 et al."

2. GREEN: "Psallo, . . . in New Testament, to sing praises. Rom. 15:9 et al."

3. BAGSTER: "Psallo, . . . in New Testament, to sing praises. Rom. 15:9 et al."

4. ROBINSON: "Psallo, . . . in New Testament, to sing, and construed with a dative of person, to sing in honor or in praise of any one, to sing praises to, to celebrate in song."

5. CONTOPOULOS: "Psallo, . . . to sing, to celebrate."

6. HARDEN (Dictionary of the Vulgate New Testament, 1921): "Psallo, sing, sing hymns. 1 Cor. 14:15 et al." (This is the only definition that Dr. Harden gives.)

7. ABBOTT-SMTTH: "Psallo, . . . in New Testament, to sing a hymn, sing praise."

8. DR. A. T. ROBERTSON (Commentary on James, page 253): "Psalletto, the word originally meant to play on a stringed instrument, but it comes to be used also for singing with the voice and the heart (Eph. 5:19; 1 Cor. 14:15), making melody with the heart also to the Lord."

9. ENGLISHMAN'S GREEK CONCORDANCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT (1868 edition): "Psallo, . . make melody, sing psalms, sing."

10. ZORELL: "Psallo, . . . sing, sing sacred hymns in honor of God."

11. ANALYTICAL GREEK LEXICON: "Psallo, . . . in the New Testament, to sing praises."

The eleven standard New Testament Greek authorities confirm the definitions given above by the nine classical Greek lexicons. The nine quoted show that the latter use of the word *"psallo"* came to mean "to sing," and the eleven authorities quoted show that this was the New Testament meaning of the word. Brother Clubb cannot claim the greatest number of Greek New Testament lexicons in sup-

port of his proposition. He has hopelessly failed to establish a point by Greek lexicons. He should now attempt to prove that "Instrumental Music in Christian worship is Scriptural." May we hope that he will attempt in the next chapter to give Scripture for the use of instrumental music "in Christian worship?"

CHAPTER VII

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Whether the lexicon from which Brother Boles quoted is Robinson's or Wahl's, we will let Dr. Robinson himself tell us. In the "Preface" to his lexicon of 1850 he says: "The author's earliest effort in the department of New Testament lexicography was a translation of Wahl's 'Clavis Philologica Novi Testamenti,' with some additions, published in 1825. This was followed in 1836 by his own Greek and English lexicon." Observe he calls the first a "translation," the second he calls his own.

In 1850 Dr. Robinson brought out a new edition of his lexicon, which was his last. It was from this edition, made twenty-five years after his translation of Wahl's, that I took his definition of "psallo." M. C. Kurfees did the same. (See *"Instrumental Music in* the Worship," pages 9, 10.) Brother Kurfees placed Robinson's lexicon on the affirmative side of this discussion. He could not have done otherwise and been true to the facts.

In common fairness, Brother Boles should recognize the validity of Robinson's definition as I gave it, certified to, as it is, by Brother Kurfees; and he should plainly admit that the definition he gave was taken from the translation of Wahl's lexicon, made by Robinson.

Brother Boles says that I do not think the English Bible is sufficiently clear to enable us to understand the will of the Lord on singing God's praises in Christian worship. Yes, I do. I think the English Bible is perfectly plain on that subject. I accept what it says, without any reservations; but I do not accept Brother Boles' interpretation of what it says. There is a vast difference between what Paul says on the subject of singing God's praises in worship and what Brother Boles interprets him as saying.

Brother Boles submitted some lexical authorities in Chapter VI in support of his claim that at the time the New Testament was written *"psallo"* had lost its instrumental meaning and had come to indicate vocal music only. Robinson and Zorell say specifically, in their lexicons, that instrumental accompaniment is in the New Testament meaning of "psallo." Abbott-Smith says that his definition does not exclude instrumental accompaniment in the New Testament. Professor Ropes, as quoted in Chapter V, and Dr. Abbott-Smith both say that no such construction as my opponent gives it should be placed on Thayer's definition. These four, then, should not be counted in his list.

Now let the reader carefully scan Brother Boles' authorities for the faintest indication of any evidence in the entire list to support his claim. Which one of them says or implies that instrumental accompaniment is excluded from his New Testament definition of "psallo?" Not one. The combined evidence of these authorities is at best simply neutral. It says nothing one way or the other. They all say "to sing," but they leave the question of accompaniment absolutely untouched.

How different is the testimony of the witnesses I have presented to show that instrumental accompaniment is in the New Testament meaning of *"psallo"* and "psalmos!" Look at it.

LIDDELL AND SCOTT: "Psallo, to sing to the harp; Eph. 5:19."

Robinson: "Psallo, to sing, to chant properly as accompanying stringed instruments."

PARKHURST: "Psallo, to sing, whether with or without instruments."

YONGE: In the New Testament, "psalmos, a song sung to the accompaniment of music."

BRETSCHNEIDER: "Psallo, to produce music either to musical instruments or with the voice alone."

ZORELL: "Psalmos, a song sung to the sound of the Iyre, to be sung in honor of God."

THAYER AND ABBOTT-SMITH, properly interpreted, say the same.

Here is positive evidence—evidence that would be accepted as final by any jury of Greek scholars in the world. It is clear, explicit, convincing. It leaves no room for uncertainty or doubt in any unprejudiced mind. With one voice, these truthful, impartial, accurate Greek scholars, whose testimony, says Alexander Campbell, "is the most learned and competent evidence in the world," declare that *"psallo"* and "psalmos" indicate instrumental accompaniment in the New Testament.

And this does not exhaust the list by any means. Note these:

SOUTER, the most recent of New Testament lexicons: "Psalmos, a psalm that is sung, that is, a song of praise to God with an accompaniment on the harp."

EWING, Greek and English lexicon: "Psallo, . . . sing praises or psalms to God, whether with or without instruments."

STEPHANUS, Thesaurus Graecae Linguae, Paul in Eph. 5:19: "Psallontes (making melody), that is, striking the cithara, or Iyre, playing."

YOUNG: Dr. Robert Young was the author of the large concordance which bears his name, a great and learned man. Under "sing" in his concordance he says: "Psallo, to sing praise with a musical instrument; Rom. 15:9; 1 Cor. 14:15."

HASTINGS, Bible Dictionary: "Psalmos, properly a song to the accompaniment of a stringed instrument."

TRENCH, New Testament Synonyms (no similar work ranks above this): "Psalmos, from 'psao,' properly a touching of the harp or other stringed instrument with the fingers or with the plectrum, was next the instrument itself, and last of all the song sung with musical accompaniment."

The following question was sent to a number of outstanding Greek scholars: "Is there any authority for the position that 'psallo' had lost the idea of instrumentation at the time the New Testament was written, and had come

to mean only vocal music?" We received the following replies:

DR. ABBOTT-SMITH, author New Testament Greek Lexicon: "There is no evidence that I know of."

DR. A. T. ROBERTSON, Professor New Testament Greek, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville: "Not as far as I know."

PROF. BENJAMIN W. BACON, Professor New- Testament Greek, Yale University: "In the New Testament the word 'psallein' and its derivatives still retains its original sense 'to pluck the strings' (of a stringed instrument of music), hence 'to harp.' "

PROF. R. C. H. LENSKI, dean of the Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary: "If there is any such authority, then in my almost forty years of New and Old Testament exegetical and in general theological study it has escaped me."

DR. W. G. BALLANTINE, author Riverside Version of the New Testament: "There is absolutely no proof."

DEAN J. HEINRICHS, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago: "There is no authority that 'psallo' had -lost the idea of instrumentation at the time the New Testament was written."

Conclusion. In the words of DR. LOUIS F. BENSON, a learned Greek scholar and a specialist in the field of research: "If the apostles had wished to enjoin that church songs must be without musical accompaniment, or to indicate that in fact they were, is it conceivable that they should employ a word with such a history and such a meaning?"

THE SEPTUAGINT AND CONTEMPORANEOUS WRITINGS

We come now to our second class of witnesses that *"psallo"* carries its instrumental significance in the New Testament. This evidence is given to show that the current meaning of *"psallo"* outside of the New Testament, at the very time that Paul and James used it, still retained its classical and later meanings "to play an instrument" or "to sing to musical accompaniment." The universal law of language, says Greenleaf, the great interpreter of law, is "that

words are to be understood in their plain, ordinary, and use." If we find that *"psallo"* was used by the people of Paul's day in the sense of "to play an instrument" or "to sing to musical accompaniment," then it is positively certain that he used it in this sense—in which he knew it would be understood.

I. THE SEPTUAGINT. The Septuagint is a translation of the Old Testament from Hebrew into Greek. It was made by Jews, and in thought and spirit shows strongly the Hebrew idiom. The New Testament was also written by Jews, aiming to express Jewish thoughts, conceptions, and feelings in the Greek tongue. The similarity of style and expression is as close as could be between a translation and original writings. Dean Alford says of the New Testament, humanly speaking, could not have keen written, unless the Septuagint had provided for it a language. Prof. C. L. Loos, a distinguished Greek scholar and president of Kentucky University, said that the Septuagint may be regarded as the mother, religiously, of the New Testament Greek; that both are in the same diction; and, therefore, the testimony it offers as to the meaning of a Greek word in the NewTestament is decisive.

What, then, is the testimony it has to offer as to the meaning of "psallo?" Over fifty times this word is used in the Septuagint. It carries over into the Greek the meaning of the Hebrew words it translates. There are three Hebrew words that refer to music. They are nagan, shir, and zamar. What do these words mean? I shall give what the Hebrew scholars say. Nagan means to play an instrument, but never means to sing. Shir means to sing, but never means to play. Zamar means to play, or to sing to musical accompaniment.

Bet the reader follow me closely. *"psallo"* is used in the Septuagint to translate nagan, which means only to play, and it is used also to translate zamar, which means to play, or sing to musical accompaniment; but it is never used to translate stair, which means only to sing. This is in perfect keeping with the classical and later meanings of "psallo."

Now, zamar, means to sing to musical accompaniment in Ps. 18:49. It reads: "Therefore I will give thanks unto thee, O Jehovah, among the nations, and I will sing praises zamar, unto thy name." Zamar was translated into Greek in the Septuagint by "psallo." This Scripture was a prophecy that one day the Gentiles should rejoice and glorify God. Paul takes this prophecy and brings it over into the New Testament in Rom. 16:9. Now, whatever zamar meant in Hebrew, *"psallo"* meant in the Septuagint; and whatever *"psallo"* meant in the Septuagint, sing or sing praises means in Rom. 15:9. So say Parkhurst and Yonge in their lexicons, and so says that great scholar, Dr. Robert Young, in his monumental concordance. All of them refer to Rom. 15:9 as an example of the meaning of "psallo," to sing to musical accompaniment.

Our Lord used the Septuagint frequently, and so did the apostles. It was the Bible of the Greek-speaking Christians of the early church for many years. When Paul visited the churches at Ephesus, Colosse, Corinth, and Rome, he found the Septuagint in their assemblies. These Christians were familiar with the psalms in the Septuagint, and certainly knew what the word *"psallo"* as used there meant. It is inconceivable that the apostle Paul should have used this word, both in its verb and noun form, in writing his epistles to these churches, in a sense different to that to which they were accustomed, unless he made it clear that he was so doing, and of this we have no evidence.

2. JOSEPHUS. The testimony of Josephus is of the very highest value in determining the meaning of *"psallo"* in the New Testament. Josephus was a Jew, and was born and educated in Palestine. He was born about thirty-seven years after Christ. He wrote in the time when the New Testament was written, and wrote in the same diction, and in its best form. He wrote as a cultivated scholar. His testimony on "psallo," therefore, is decisive. How does he use the word?

"Antiquities" (Book XI, Chapter 3, 9): "Being played to on the Iyre (psallomenoi) and flute, and surrounded by

the voice of cymbals." Robinson's New Testament lexicon refers to this as an example of the use of the word in its instrumental sense in Josephus.

"Antiquities" (VI, 3, 2): "That if there is any one person could charm those passions by singing (exadrin) and playing upon the harp (psallein)."

"Antiquities (IX, 13, 3): "While the Levites stood round about them, with their musical instruments, and sang (adon) hymns to God, and played (epsallon) on their psalteries."

3. PLUTARCH. The value of Plutarch's testimony lies in the fact that he also wrote at the same time that Paul did. Plutarch's "Lives" will endure as long as time lasts as a monument to the greatness of the man. He used the word *"psallo"* many times in his "Lives." We have space for only a few examples. Both Thayer and Robinson in their lexicons refer to Plutarch's use of *"psallo"* in its instrumental signification, thus showing that they knew that the word had not lost its classical meaning in New Testament times.

PERICLES I. "And so Philip once said to his son, who as the wine went round, plucked the strings (pselanta) charmingly and with a master touch."

ARATUS 6. "To play the Iyre (psallein) and the flute."

POMPEY 36. "Stratonice . . . playing the harp (pselasa) at the banquet, captivated Mithridates."

Here are indisputable examples of the use of *"psallo"* with instrumental meaning by authors writing at the very time when the apostle Paul was writing his Epistles. It follows, therefore, with absolute certainty, as Professor Bacon says, that *"psallo"* retained its instrumental signification in the New Testament.

CHAPTER VIII

FOURTH NEGATIVE

Brother Clubb is having a hard time. He first quarreled with his proposition; next he attempted to evade the issue; and then he tries to wrangle with his opponent. In the last chapter he does not discuss his proposition or its issue. He has forsaken his proposition in the hour of need.

He is to affirm that the New Testament teaches that instrumental music is "in Christian worship." I should like for him to analyze "Christian worship" and tell us what else he thinks is "in" it besides instrumental music. "Christian worship" as an integral or complete whole is made up of parts; the whole of anything is the sum of all of its parts. If any of its parts are lacking, the nature of the whole is destroyed. Brother Clubb's proposition says that instrumental music is one of the parts of "Christian worship." Will Brother Clubb kindly tell us what other items compose "Christian worship?" May "Christian worship" have more parts at one time than at another? Can any of its parts be left off without destroying the nature of "Christian worship?" If instrumental music is "in Christian worship," then there can be no "Christian worship" without instrumental music.

I have tried to get Brother Clubb to answer these questions: "Is singing commanded in the New Testament?" And: "Is singing in Christian worship?" The reasons for his not answering these questions are obvious. I repeat: "Any proposition in the realm of religion that cannot be proved by our English Bible is not true—it cannot be proved." I have also challenged him to give a New Testament Scripture that mentions instrumental music "in Christian worship." He has failed to meet the challenge.

Brother Clubb is still disturbed about Robinson's Greek

Lexicon (1825 edition). He says "we will let Dr. Robinson himself tell us" if he is the author of it. He then quotes from the "Preface" of the 1850 edition, in which the author says that his 1825 edition "was a translation of Wahl's 'Clavis Philologica Novi Testamenti,' with some additions." Yes, "with some additions." What were those "some additions?" We will let Dr. Robinson tell us what those "additions" were. As quoted in Chapter VI, Dr. Robinson says of the 1825 edition: "It became necessary to recur constantly to the original Greek, and to form the definitions from the New Testament itself, rather than from the very general definitions either of Wahl or Schleusner." So we see that the "some additions" which Dr. Robinson made were those "definitions" which he "formed from the New Testament itself." I quoted Dr. Robinson's definition of *"psallo"* as used only in the New Testament. It is as follows: "Psallo, in the New Testament, to sing, and construed with a dative of person, to sing in honor or in praise of any one, to sing praises to, to celebrate in song." It is very obvious why Brother Clubb is afraid of this definition.

I gave nine classical lexicons showing that *"psallo"* finally came to mean "sing ;" and then eleven New Testament lexical authorities were quoted showing that its New Testament meaning was "sing" or "praise." Brother Clubb does not even show enough respect to these twenty lexical authorities to examine what they say. This is an admission that he cannot dispute such an array of lexical authorities which are opposed to his proposition. He makes a feeble effort to discredit Thayer's definition, which betrays the death struggle which he is making in order to save his proposition. Any reader can pick up Thayer's Lexicon and read the New Testament meaning of "psallo." I quote it again: "Psallo, in the New Testament, to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praises of God in song." I remind him again that Liddell and Scott's Lexicon is not a New Testament lexicon; it does not even claim to be a New Testament lexicon. It is a classical lexicon.

Thayer and Abbott-Smith both claim the same for

"psallo"—namely, "in the New Testament, to sing a hymn, sing praise." Again he quotes A. Campbell on the authority of Greek lexicons, yet he will not take what Mr. Campbell says on instrumental music. Mr. Campbell said: "I presume, to all spiritual-minded Christians, such aids would be as a cowbell in a concert." He has introduced Mr. Campbell, but will not take Mr. Campbell's testimony on the very point which is at issue.

He does not quote Trench fully on "psalmos." On page 143 of his book, "Synonyms of the New Testament," in speaking of "psalmos," "humnos," and "ode," Trench says that "the words, even at the time when he [Paul] wrote, may have been often promiscuously, confusedly used." That is, these words were used synonymously. All know that "ode" never had an instrumental accompaniment, and yet "psalmos" is used synonymously with "ode."

He refers to a number of private letters. The reader will have to see more than Brother Clubb's brief excerpts of these private letters before any weight can be given them. But suppose that his private letters bear the testimony which he claims, what of it? He only makes them contradict the twenty lexical authorities that have been given. He puts the authors of his private letters in direct opposition to the standard New Testament lexicons which have been quoted.

He has appealed to the scholarship of the world to help him support his proposition, and has been groping in the darkness of confusion, garbling quotations, and misapplying the testimony of standard authorities. I respect scholarship and revere consecrated scholars. This proposition cannot be proved by an appeal to scholarship. *It must be proved by the word of God.* He has agreed to prove his proposition to be "Scriptural." May I again plead with him to cease rambling around in the musty volumes of human wisdom and return to the refreshing source of infinite wisdom, the Bible? He knows that the English Bible does not support his proposition; he ought now to admit that the scholarship of the world is against him.

Brother Clubb assumes that because the Septuagint Version uses a word in a certain sense, that the writers of the New Testament must use that word in the same sense. The fact that a word is used in the Septuagint and then used in the New Testament by no means proves that the word has the same meaning in the New Testament that it had in the Septuagint. He assumes the very point which he must prove. An examination of a few words will show the fallacy of this assumption. Take, for example, "circumcision." It is used in the Septuagint and also in the New Testament. Its New Testament use shows that it has a new and different meaning to that which it had in the Septuagint. The same is true of "altar," "sacrifice," "priest," "temple," "incense," etc. The same Greek word for each of these is used both in the Septuagint and the New Testament, yet their meaning in the New Testament differs widely from their meaning in the Septuagint.

He mentions three Hebrew words—nagan, stair, Zamar— which refer to music in the Septuagint. Of course these words are not used in the Septuagint, as they are Hebrew words, but they are translated by *"psallo"* in the Septuagint. *"nagan"* in the Hebrew meant only to play an instrument; "stair" meant only to sing; and *"zamar"* meant to sing, or sing with an instrumental accompaniment. Dr. Clinton Lockhart, J. C. Stark, and 0. E. Payne all admit that *"psallo"* is used to translate all three of these words in the Septuagint. This is an admission that *"psallo"* in the Septuagint meant to "sing."

Brother Clubb finds that in the Hebrew text of Ps. 18:49 *"zamar"* is used, and he assumes that *"zamar"* included the instrument in that Scripture; he further finds that *"zamar"* is translated with *"psallo"* in the Septuagint, and that Paul quoted Ps. 18:49 in Rom. 15:9. Therefore, he concludes that *"psallo"* in Rom. 15:9 includes instrumental music. There are two or three assumptions in his reasoning here which make his argument very fallacious. First, he assumes that *"zamar"* included the instrument in the Hebrew text of Ps. 18:49. This assumption is without proof, be

Translations	*Rom. 15: 9*	*1 Cor. 14: 15*	*Eph. 5: 19*	*James 5: 13*
Tyndale (1534)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
Cranmer (1540)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
Genevan (1560)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
Rheims (1582)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
Douay (1610)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
King James (1611)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
Macknight (1795)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
Rhemish (1833)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
German and Eng. (1853)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
Anderson (1864)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
Bible Union (1865)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
Ellicott (1866)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
Tischendorf (1868)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing

cause *"zamar"* meant to sing with or without instrumental accompaniment. His second assumption is that *"psallo"* in the Septuagint in Ps. 18:49 included the instrument. This is a mere assumption, as I have before me the Septuagint with English translation, and *"psallo"* in this Scripture is translated with "sing." Ezek. 36:25 uses the word "sprinkle," and the writer of the Hebrew letter (10:22) uses the word "sprinkle." The same Greek word used in Ezekiel is used in Hebrews. Will Brother Clubb conclude that the meaning of "sprinkle" in Hebrews means the same as "sprinkle" used in Ezekiel?

As rebuttal evidence, I submit forty-seven translations of all of the Scriptures where *"psallo"* is found in the New Testament. The following tabulation will show how *"psallo"* is translated by these translations. The reader will note that *"psallo"* as here translated by these forty-seven translations occurs in its translated form more than two hundred and twenty-five times. It is translated "sing" one hundred and fifty-nine times; "praise," twenty-six times; "make melody," twenty-three times; "strike the strings," five times; "psalm," five times; "make music," five times; "play the harp," two times; "playing," three times; "sing to the harp," two times; "dancing," "chanting," and "sing and play," one time each. These translations represent more than two hundred and sixty scholars. They had the Septuagint before them and knew the New Testament meaning of "psallo." As will be seen from this list of translations, the mighty weight of scholarship is against Brother Clubb.

0

Translations	*Rom. 15: 9*	*1 Cor. 14: 15*	*Eph. 5: 19*	*James 5: 13*
Conybeare & H. (1869)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
Living Oracles (1873)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
Eng. R. V. (1881)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
Bible Union R. (1883)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
American R. V. (1901)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
Worrells (1904)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
Modern R. B. (1907)	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
Newcome's N. T.	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
Newberry Bible	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
Polyglott Bible	Sing	Sing	Make melody	Sing
Gr. Int., Eng.	Praise	Praise	Praising	Praise
Gr. Int., Handy	Praise	Praise	Praising	Praise
Gr. Int., Barry	Praise	Praise	Praising	Praise
Goodspeed (1924)	Sing	Sing	Sing praise	Sing
Weymouth (1902)	Sing Ps.	Praise	Offer praise	Sing P
Moffatt (1918)	Sing	Sing P.	Praise H. W. M.	Sing P
Shorter Bible (Kent)	Omitted	Praise	Praising	Sing P
Montgomery (1924)	Sing	Praise	Make music	Play H
Twentieth Cen. (1902)	Sing	Sing	Make music	Sing
Emphatic Diaglott (1864)	Sing	Sing P	Make music	Sing P
Rotherham (1872)	Sing	Sing	Make music	Sing H
Hayman	Sing	Praise	Make music	Sing
Ferrar Fenton's (1905)	Sing	Sing	Dancing	Sing
Syriac Peshito	Sing	Sing Ps.	Sing	Sing P
Doddridge (1821)	Sing P.	Sing P	Sing and chant	Sing P
Rotherham (1897)	Str. strings	Str. strings	Strike strings	Str. st.
Wycliffe (1380)	Sing	Sing	Sing Ps.	Sing P
Coptic	Sing	Sing	Chanting	Sing P
Vulgate	Sing	Psalm	Psalming	Psalm
Ballantine (1923)	Sing	Sing	Playing harp	Sing H
Luther's	Sing	Sing	Playing	Sing
Coptic Version (1905)	Sing	Sing	Playing	
Alford's	Sing	Sing	Playing	Sing
Weizsaker	Sing	Sing	Sing and play	Sin

CHAPTER IX

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE

I want to refer the reader again to the five passages which have to do with the present discussion, this time quoting what each one has to say.

Rom. 15:9 says: "I will . . . sing [psallo] unto thy name." 1 Cor. 14:15, 26 says: "I will sing [psallo] with the spirit, and I will sing [psallo] with the understanding. . . . When ye come together, each one hath a psalm [psalmos], hath a teaching," etc. Eph. 5:19 says: "Speaking one to another in psalms [psalmoi] and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody [psallontes] with your heart to the Lord." Col. 3:16 says: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly; in all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another with psalms [psalmois] and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto God." James 5:13 says: "Is any cheerful, let him sing praise [psalleto]."

Now, is it not clear that whatever *"psallo"* in its noun, verb, and participial forms means in these passages, our English words, "sing," "psalm," and "making melody" must mean, in order to convey the sense of Paul's words? Therefore, we must go back to the Greek to find out what these words must mean in the above passages. And this is exactly what we have always done when in doubt about the interpretation of any New Testament word or passage. This is what Alexander Campbell did in his debates on what our English word "baptize" means. He went to the Greek word "baptizo," and produced evidence from lexicons, classical writers, the Septuagint, contemporaneous writings, etc., to show what "baptizo," means in the Greek New Testament, and, therefore, what our English word "baptize" must mean. President Loos did the same thing in a series

of articles on the same subject in the Millennial Harbinger of 1870. John S. Sweeney in all his discussions did likewise. These great men made their appeal to the word of God as interpreted by the best scholarship available. Scholarship is not infallible, but its conclusions are the most authoritative we know, in our search for truth in the Bible and in every other realm of human interest.

It is a strange thing for a college president, in this day, to say: "This question [instrumental music in worship] cannot be settled by scholarship. It must be settled by the word of God." This statement means, in the judgment of Brother Boles, that scholarship can give us no help in seeking to know the will of God as revealed in his word. On the contrary, the simple truth is that this and all other religious questions must be settled, as far as human judgment can settle them, by the word of God, as interpreted and explained by the most enlightened scholarship we have. A man who puts a premium on ignorance in his approach to the study of the Bible will not get very far in knowing what it teaches on any subject.

My use of the Septuagint, Josephus, and Plutarch, in Chapter VII, was to show that outside of the New Testament *"psallo"* carried its instrumental meaning at the very time the New Testament was written. As this is very important evidence, I must notice the feeble attempt of my opponent to answer it. I quoted from Dean Alford and President Loos to show that the Septuagint and the New Testament are in the same diction, and that the meaning of a word in the Septuagint is decisive as to its meaning in the New Testament. Dean Alford says: "The Septuagint rendered to Christianity a most important service, for it formed the Greek of the New Testament both in its vocabulary and its grammar. The New Testament, humanly speaking, could not have been written unless the Septuagint had provided for it a language."

Dr. Abbott-Smith says, in a personal letter to me, that " 'psallo' is a distinctively Septuagint word." This can

only mean, as he goes on to say, that its meaning in the Septuagint is the same as it is in the New Testament.

Professor Loos says: "The Septuagint may be regarded as the mother, religiously, of the New Testament Greek. The testimony it offers, therefore, of the meaning of 'baptizo' is decisive as to its meaning in the New Testament, both using the same diction." (Millennial Harbinger, 1870.)

Brother Boles mentions "circumcision," "altar," "sacrifice," "priest," "temple," "incense," and says: "The same Greek word for each of these words is used in both the Septuagint and the New Testament, yet their meaning in the New Testament differs widely from their meaning in the Septuagint." Now, just the opposite is true. These words are repeatedly used in the New Testament in precisely the same sense as they are used in the Septuagint, as the following references clearly show: Gal. 5:6; 1 Cor. 10:18; Heb. 9:6; Matt. 4:5; Luke 1:10. That these words are used also in a secondary or figurative sense is true, but the context always makes this use clear. The plain, ordinary use of these words is exactly the same in the Septuagint as in the New Testament.

My opponent says that *"psallo"* is used in Ps. 68:25 to translate the Hebrew word stair, which means only to sing. I thought so, too, till my attention was called to the matter by Prof. Robert N. Pfeiffer, the distinguished Hebrew scholar, of Harvard University. In a letter, dated July 30, 1925, he says: "It is not true, as you say, that in Ps. 68:25 the Septuagint translates the particle of shir (sharim) with 'psallo ;' 'psallonton' of the Greek translates negonim (from nagan) of the Hebrew; sharim of the Hebrew was read sarim by the Greek and rendered accordingly arxontes (rulers, princes)." I have verified this statement in my own Hebrew Bible, and find that Professor Pfeiffer is correct. I repeat that *"psallo"* is never used in the Septuagint to translate a Hebrew word which means simply and only to sing.

Brother Boles says I assume that zamar in Ps. 18:49 includes the instrument. This is the prophecy which Paul

quotes in Rom. 15:9. This fact gives it its importance in this discussion. I am not assuming that zamar in this passage includes the instrument. I do not know of any scholar who denies it. I wrote to several Hebrew scholars on this point. In answer to my question, Professor Pfeiffer, of Harvard University, replied: "In Ps. 18:49 the word zamar means to sing with musical accompaniment; the Greek 'psallo' is a correct rendering." Prof. R. H. Gowen, University of Washington, a Hebrew scholar of rank, was asked by me: "What is the meaning of zamar in Ps. 18:49? Does it carry the idea of instrumental accompaniment there?" He answered: "Yes." Professor Kemper Fullerton, Oberlin College, a Hebrew scholar, was asked: "Does zamar ever mean to sing without musical accompaniment?" He answered: "I believe it always carries with it the idea of singing to instrumental accompaniment." I asked him: "What is the meaning of zamar in Ps. 18:49?" He answered: "It has its regular meaning; nothing in the context to suggest any other."

The evidence, then, from the Septuagint as to the meaning of *"psallo"* in the New Testament is overwhelming.

I must stop here and make an explanation. Brother

Boles and I had written and exchanged five chapters each, when we discovered that his eighth chapter, as well as his first, was very much too long to appear as written. It was necessary, therefore, that it should be redrafted. Of course, it was understood that neither one of us, in this redrafting process, could leave out or change any argument, reply, or rebuttal, which had been written. The shortening must be accomplished without that. I was surprised, therefore, when I got his redrafted Chapter VIII back for review and reply, to find that he had omitted his comment on my references to Josephus and Plutarch. That he had no right to leave this out goes without saying. He had already seen my reply to his comment in my original ninth chapter. In the language of the court, this act of Brother Boles is a "confession and avoidance." I must, therefore, give his com-

ment as it appears in his original eighth chapter, which I hold in my possession.

In Chapter VII I gave three references to -Josephus' use of the word "psallo." Brother Boles' comment on the second is in keeping with what he says about the other two; so there is need to notice only one, the second. He says: "The second reference (Antiquities, VI, 3, 2) refers to an event which occurred during the days of King Saul, long before New Testament times. Josephus is describing Saul's madness and David's ministering to him. He must use words with the meaning which they had in the days of Saul in order to describe the event at that time." (Italics mine.) I call attention to two or three things in connection with this remarkable statement. (1) Josephus was writing in Greek, and they did not speak Greek in King Saul's day. This takes all the wind out of Brother Boles' sail. There was neither a Greek language nor a Greek people in existence at that time. (2) Josephus was not writing for the people that lived in King Saul's day, but for those who were living at the time he was writing, and, therefore, he must use words which were in common use by them, or they would not understand him. They knew what *"psallo"* meant, and he used the word in the sense in which he knew he would be understood. In describing an event which took place in Chaucer's time, would it be necessary to use Old English with which to do it? This is the logic of Brother Boles' position. (3) He concedes that Josephus did use the word *"psallo"* with its instrumental meaning, and thus really surrenders the whole question; for if Josephus used the word in this sense, then it is absolutely certain that this was its current meaning at the very day when Paul was writing his Epistles.

Professor Loos' opinion of Josephus and the value of his testimony as to the meaning of the Greek of the New Testament is of great importance. He says: "Josephus was born about thirty-seven years after Christ. He wrote in the time the New Testament was written, and wrote in the same diction—Hellenistic Greek—and in its best form. He

wrote as a cultivated scholar." He goes on to speak of the Greek which Josephus used thus: "And this is Hellenistic Greek, immediately, in all respects as to time, author, country, alongside New Testament Greek. The force of this testimony is as complete as evidence can possibly be." (Millennial Harbinger, 1870.)

As to Plutarch, from whom I quoted in Chapter VII, and who lived and wrote in the days of Paul, only a word more is needed. Thayer and Robinson both, in their New Testament lexicons, in defining "psallo," refer to Plutarch's use of the word with instrumental signification. The incontestable fact that both Josephus and Plutarch were using *"psallo"* with its instrumental meaning, at the very time when Paul was writing his Epistles, is proof beyond all doubt that it carried the idea of instrumental accompaniment in the New Testament. This fact so well established, all opposition to its use to-day should be abandoned.

THE VERSIONS

We come now to the third class of witnesses that *"psallo"* carries its instrumental meaning in the New Testament. First, I must notice the long list of versions given by Brother Boles in Chapter VIII. Not one of these gives the slightest support to his contention, for the evident reason that twelve of them are outspoken against him, and the rest have not a word to say in his behalf. Why he should have run on ahead of the affirmative and referred to them at all is not clear. What he needs is just one standard Greek lexicon or version of the New Testament that explicitly, or by implication, excludes instrumental accompaniment in the New Testament. He counts two hundred and sixty authorities, he says, that favor him, the names of whom he does not know, and of whose opinion on the subject we are discussing he is equally ignorant. This wholesale counting of supposed authorities is a very lame excuse for an argument in a discussion which calls for something definite and to the point.

Brother Boles, in his use of the versions, assumes the very

point at issue. He assumes that "psalms," "sing," and "singing and making melody," as used in these versions, excludes instrumental accompaniment, and that the authors of these versions intended this to be understood. This assumption is without proof. All the evidence there is, is to the contrary.

Three of the members of the American Standard Revision Committee have spoken right on this point. Let us hear them.

Dr. Philip Schaff, president of the committee, commenting on 1 Cor. 14:15, "I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also," says: "A proof that the prayer was accompanied with song and harp also." (Crit. Doc. and Hom. Com.)

Prof. M. B. Riddle, a member of the Revision Committee, wrote the following letter to J. B. Briney, dated October 16, 1911:

MY DEAR MR. BRINEY:

The word psallo occurs five times in the New Testament. The Revisers render it twice "sing praises," twice, "sing," and once "make melody." Originally the Greek word meant striking the strings of a musical instrument, but afterwards got the more general sense of singing, the use of an accompanying instrument not being necessarily implied. I have no recollection of any purpose on the part of the Revisers to preclude the use of an instrument. My own opinion is that the word does not preclude the use of an instrument.

Yours truly,
M. B. RIDDLE.

Timothy Dwight, another member of the committee, wrote J. B. Briney as follows:

NEW HAVEN, CONN., November 23, 1911.

DEAR SIR:

I beg your kind indulgence for not having given you an earlier reply to your letter. I would say, in answer to your question, that I do not think the Revisers meant to imply, by their rendering of psallo, that at the time of the writing of the New Testament the word pre-

eluded the use of an instrument. The use of such an instrument is regarded, I think, by scholars, as altogether probable. Again asking your kind indulgence, I am,

Very respectfully yours,
TIMOTHY DWIGHT.

These men, all great scholars, have given very conclusive testimony as to the attitude of the Revisers, both English and American Committees, as to the meaning of "sing," "sing praises," and "make melody," in the English and American Standard Revised Versions of the New Testament.

CHAPTER X

FIFTH NEGATIVE

Brother Clubb makes a lame excuse for not quoting Scripture in support of his proposition. No Scriptures are in dispute. His proposition is in dispute; and the Scripturalness of it cannot be proved. The reader will have no trouble in deciding that the English Bible as given by the scholarship of the world is right and that Brother Clubb's proposition is wrong. We must choose between the English Bible and Brother Clubb's proposition. Both cannot be right, for they are contradictory. If Brother Clubb claims to believe his proposition, he cannot believe the English Bible to be true. He does claim to believe his proposition, and he seeks to destroy the force of the English Bible.

He admits that he cannot prove his proposition by the American Revised Version. Therefore, he says: "We must go back to the Greek to find what our English words must mean." This is a strange sentence or declaration. We go to a Latin dictionary to learn the meaning of Latin words; we turn to a French dictionary to learn the meaning of French words; we go to a Greek lexicon to learn the meaning of Greek words; and we go to an English dictionary to learn the meaning of English, words. But Brother Clubb says that he goes to Greek lexicons to find the meaning of English words. No wonder he is so confused. He violates all laws of language. He does not think that the translators used clear, definite terms in translating "psallo."

His position forces him to say that the average church member cannot learn how to sing God's praises from the standard English versions. This is an insult to the intelligence of the average reader of our English New Testament and a futile attempt to impeach and repudiate the standard English translations of the English New Testament. Again

let me repeat that any proposition in the realm of religion that cannot be proved by our English Bible is not trueit cannot be proved.

There is something fundamentally wrong with a proposition when it is claimed that the American Standard Revision of the New Testament cannot be understood until we get the private opinion in private letters from men as to what they think was "in the mind" of the translators when they gave us the Revised Version. It does not matter what others may think was "in the mind" of the translators, the fact still remains that they translated *"psallo"* by "sing." All the private letters that Brother Clubb can collect cannot change this fact. The Revised Version in the translation of *"psallo"* excludes mechanical instruments.

Brother Clubb asserts that "the Septuagint and the New Testament are in the same diction, and that the meaning of a word in the Septuagint is decisive as to its meaning in the New Testament." Dr. Goodspeed differs from Brother Clubb. He says: "The New Testament was written, not in classical Greek, nor in the Biblical Greek of the Greek version of the Old Testament [Septuagint], not even in the literary Greek of its own day, but in the common language of everyday life." (Preface, New Testament.) Brother Clubb's assertion is also contradictory to Dr. A. T. Robertson's statement. Dr. Robertson says: "The New Testament Greek is not translation Greek, and thus differs radically in most respects from the Septuagint.... In general the New Testament stands on a very different plane from the Septuagint as to its language, though like it in many idioms." (Short Grammar of Greek New Testament' page 6.) According to these authorities, there is a wide difference between the Greek of the Septuagint and the Greek of the New Testament. Which shall we believe, Dr. Goodspeed and Dr. Robertson or Brother Clubb?

He claims to have a private letter from Dr. Abbott-Smith from which he gets some encouragement. I confess that I have but little confidence in his claim based on private letters. Dr. Abbott-Smith has published in book form to the

world: "It is now abundantly clear that the diction of the apostolic writers is not a peculiar isolated idiom, characteristic of Jewish Hellenists, but simply a common speech of the Greek-speaking world at the time when the New Testament books were written." (Preface, Greek Lexicon of New Testament.) If Brother Clubb has a private letter from Dr. Abbott-Smith contradicting what he has published to the world in book form, he puts Dr. Abbott-Smith in an embarrassing situation.

Brother Clubb contends that because a word is used in the Septuagint with a certain meaning, that it must be used in the New Testament with the same meaning. Attention was called to "circumcision," "altar," "sacrifice," "temple," "incense," etc. He says that these words have "precisely the same" meaning in the Septuagint and in the New Testament. Again he is in error. Does "circumcision" in Ex. 4:25 and Col. 2:11 mean the same? "Altar" in Ex. 20:25 and Heb. 13:10? "Sacrifice" in Ex. 34:25 and Heb. 13:16? "Temple" in 1 Kings 6:3 and 2 Cor. 6:16? "Incense" in Ex. 37:29 and Rev. 8:3? Brother Clubb knows that the same Greek word is used both in the Septuagint and in the New Testament. He also knows that these words are used with different meanings in the above references. The same is true with respect to "psallo," as has been abundantly proved.

Brother Clubb makes reply to some things which are not in the last chapter. He gives a quotation from a manuscript which he claims to hold. I suppose he thought that he could do better in replying to something which was not published than he could to reply to what was published. This is a confession on his part that he was unable to meet some things presented in Chapter VIII. Brother Clubb, why did you not answer my questions which were published in Chapter VIII? I asked: Is singing commanded in the New Testament Is singing in Christian worship He should have given some attention to these questions; but, instead of doing so, he replies to something that is not published.

But I wish to notice his comment on that which was not published. He gave three references to Josephus, trying to show that Josephus used *"psallo"* in the same sense that the New Testament writers used it. The best translators of Josephus translate the three references which Brother Clubb gave by "sing." In one reference Josephus is describing an event in the days of Saul. Brother Clubb says, "There was neither a Greek language nor a Greek people in existence at that time"—that is, during the days of King Saul. Now, that is a very bold statement. "Aristotle and Aristarchus seem to have put Homer's date about 1044 B.C." (The Encyclopedia Britannica, Eleventh Edition, Volume 12, page 508.) All know that Homer was a great Greek poet. "King Saul began his reign 1023 B.C." (The Chronology of the Bible, by Philip Mauro, page 57.) According to this chronology, the Greek poet Homer wrote twenty-one years before King Saul began reigning. This has nothing to do with the proposition; it is irrelevant; but I suppose Brother Clubb must occupy space with such things, as he cannot give any Scripture in support of his proposition.

Attention is called to a quotation which Brother Clubb says is from Dr. Philip Schaff. I regret to expose Brother Clubb on this point. The quotation is not from Dr. Schaff. Brother Clubb's great eagerness to discredit the American Revised Version caused him to make this blunder. Dr. Lange, with a number of European scholars, wrote in German, "A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures—Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical." Dr. Lange as editor in chief assigned to other scholars different books of the Bible upon which to write a commentary. He assigned First Corinthians to Dr. Kling. Dr. Schaff as editor in chief, with other American scholars, translated Dr. Lange's commentary from the German into the English. Dr. D. W. Poor translated Dr. Kling's commentary on First Corinthians from the German into English. Brother Clubb's quotation is Dr. Poor's translation of Dr. Kling's comment on 1 Cor. 14:15.

Next he quotes from a private letter of M. D. Riddle, a member of the American Standard Revision Commitee, try-

ing to show that the Revision Committee did not translate *"psallo"* correctly when it translated *"psallo"* by "sing." Unfortunately for Brother Clubb, Dr. Riddle has published in book form to the world the following statement: "It is perhaps impossible to distinguish these [psalms, hymns, songs] very exactly; but 'psalms' would include Old Testament Psalms and probably sacred songs of a similar character. The original idea of the word [psalmos], that of musical accompaniment, would hardly be retained at this time." (A Popular Commentary on the New Testament, Volume III, comment on Eph. 5:19, by M. D. Riddle.) The reader may put in contrast Dr. Riddle's published statement to the world, in book form, with his scholarship at stake, with what Brother Clubb claims that he said in a private letter. The two statements contradict each other. Which should we believe?

Brother Clubb says that *"psallo"* is never used in the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew word shir. Again he is not supported in this assertion by sound scholarship. Rotherham, Clinton Lockhart, J. C. Stark, and O. E. Payne all say that shir in Ps. 68:25 is translated with *"psallo"* in the Septuagint. Frequently forms of shir are translated with forms of "psallo."

(1) "Psaltodein, to sing, is a translation of shir in 2 Chron. 5:13, 'when the trumpeters and singers were as one.' (2) Psaltdos, singers, is a translation of shir (verbal form) in 1 Chron. 6:33; 9:33; 15:16; 15:19; 15:27; 2 Chron. 5:12; 20:21; 35:15. It is a translation of shir (noun form) in 1 Chron. 13:8; 2 Chron. 29:28. (3) Psalmos, a noun, is a translation of stair, a noun, in the title of three Psalms—that is, 46, 48, 66." (Dr. H. B. Carre, Vanderbilt University.)

It should be remembered that shir always means to sing and never to play or to be accompanied with an instrument.

It is amusing to know how Brother Clubb could "verify" what is in the different editions of the Septuagint (a Greek text) by looking "into my own Hebrew Bible." What he should have done was to "verify the statement" by looking

"in his own Septuagint [Greek] Bible." Brother Clubb looked into the wrong book to "verify" what he claims that he did verify. I suppose it sounds more "learned and scholarly" to say, "I looked into my own Hebrew Bible."

Will Brother Clubb take the definition of "baptizo" as given by some of the authorities which he quotes on "psallo?" Some of the authorities that he quotes on *"psallo"* give the meaning of "baptizo" to "sprinkle." Why take the definition of his scholars of *"psallo"* and not take their definition of "baptizo"?"

Brother Clubb contends that the mechanical instrument is in "psallo." God commands us to "psallo." I admit that we must do whatever is commanded in "psallo." If the mechanical instrument is in "psallo," then Brother Clubb cannot do what God commands in *"psallo"* without using the mechanical instrument. He has committed himself to this inevitable conclusion. He cannot now consistently say that instrumental music is "a mere aid" or "an expedient." If he is consistent in his practice with his reasoning, he must use a mechanical instrument in all of his worship.

A word further should be said about the references to Josephus and Plutarch. The best translations of these two authorities translate *"psallo"* in the quotations by "sing." Robinson does not refer to Josephus and Plutarch in giving the New Testament meaning of "psallo." Thayer does not refer to Josephus at all in defining "psallo," not even in giving its classical meaning. Again Brother Clubb commits the crime of confusing the classical meaning of *"psallo"* with its New Testament meaning.

Forty-seven translations have been given. These represent more than two hundred and sixty scholars. A list of commentators with their comments is now submitted.

DR. FINDLAY: "Through its Septuagint use, especially in the title 'psalmoi,' the word came to signify the singing of praise to God; but the connection indicates a larger reference than to the singing of the Old Testament Psalms." (Expositor's Greek Testament, 1 Cor. 14:15.)

DR. WHEDON: "Psalm. . . . By the derivation of the

word it signifies a sacred poem to be chanted in accompaniment with an instrument. But during the period of churchly inspiration, when each one had an improvised psalm (Cor. 14:26), the psalm lost the instrument." (Commentary on New Testament, Eph. 5:19.)

DR. J. A. BEET: "Paul first bids his readers speak in their songs one to another, and then bids them sing to the Lord. To him they can and must sing in their hearts, both in vocal praise and when their song is silent." (A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, Eph. 5:19.)

BLOOMFIELD: "Accordingly such psalmoi differed in no material respect from humnoi." (Greek New Testament, with English Notes, Eph. 5:19.)

AMERICAN COMMENTARY ON NEW TESTAMENT: "Personal enjoyment of singing, which is all that James here specifies, would lead to congregational singing." (Comment on James 5:13.)

CONYBEARE AND HOWSON: "When you meet, let your enjoyment consist not in fullness of wine, but fullness of the spirit; let your songs be, not the drinking songs of heathen feasts, but psalms and hymns; and their accompaniment, not the music of the Iyre, but the melody of the heart; while you sing them to the praise, not of Bacchus or Venus, but of the Lord Jesus Christ." (Comment on Eph. 5:19.)

MACKNIGHT: "But as the precept concerning our singing psalms when cheerful does not imply that we are not to pray then, so the precept concerning prayer in affliction does not imply that we are not to express our joy in suffering according to the will of God, by singing psalms as Paul and Silas did in the jail at Philippi." (Comment on James 5:13.)

BURKITT'S NOTES ON NEW TESTAMENT, Volume II: "Singing these with the mouth, and also making melody in your heart to the Lord.... That in singing these, there must be an inward harmony and musical melody, in the soul and heart, as well as in the tongue. Besides a melodious tuning of the voice, the exercise of the understanding and the orderly motions of the affection must accompany

them that will make melody in the heart to the Lord in their singing." (Comment on Eph. 5:19.)

ADAM CLARKE: "I further believe that the use of such instruments of music in the Christian Church is without the sanction and against the will of God; that they are subversive of the spirit of true devotion, and that they are sinful.

I am an old man, and an old minister; and I here declare that I never knew them productive of any good in the worship of God, and have had reason to believe that they were productive of much evil. Music, as a science, I esteem and admire; but instruments of music in the house of God, I abominate and abhor. This is the abuse of music; and here I register my protest against all such corruptions in the worship of the Author of Christianity. The late venerable and most eminent divine, the Rev. John Wesley, who was a lover of music and an elegant poet, when asked his opinion of instrumental music being introduced into the chapels of the Methodists, said, in his terse and powerful manner: 'I have no objection to instruments of music in our chapels, provided they are neither heard nor seen.' I say the same, though I think the expense of purchase had better be spared." (Comment on Amos G.)

CHAPTER XI

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE

We found in Chapter IX that three of the members of the Revision Committee stated that the Revisers had no thought of excluding instrumental accompaniment from the meaning of "psallo," as translated "sing" and "make melody" in the English and American Standard Revised Versions of the New Testament. The three men who testified to this fact were all outstanding scholars on the committee. Dr. Philip Schaff, the great church historian, was president of the American section of the committee. Timothy Dwight was president of Yale University and the author of many critical works, including a commentary on Colossians. Professor Riddle was a distinguished scholar. The character and weight of this testimony is of the greatest importance. If anybody on earth knew what was in the minds of the Revisers, these three men did.

I want to introduce the testimony of twelve men to substantiate what these members of the Revision Committee have stated. The judgment of these scholars puts the matter absolutely beyond dispute. These men are among the finest Greek scholars in the world. They have access to the most adequate and up-to-date means of information. If they do not know the Greek New Testament and how it should be translated into English, it is useless to look elsewhere.

The following question was sent to each: "Do you think the Revision Committee of the English and American Standard Versions intended to convey to the mind of the reader the idea that mechanical musical instruments are excluded by their translating the words 'psallo,' 'psallontes,' and 'psalleto,' to 'sing,' 'sing psalms,' and 'making melody?' " They replied as follows:

PROF. JAMES HARDY ROPES, New Testament Greek, Harvard University: "No. 'Psallo' seems in the New Testament to have been used to mean 'sing' without regard to the question of whether the singing was accompanied or not."

PROF. JULIAN PRICE LOVE, New Testament Department, Lane Theological Seminary: "I do not imagine for a moment that the Revisers had in mind excluding such musical instruments by their translation. I do not suppose the matter occurred to them at all. The English versions do not limit the meaning of 'psallo' to vocal music."

PROF. R. C. H. LENSKI, New Testament Exegesis, Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary: "I answer no. They knew too much Greek."

DEAN J. HEINRICHS, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary: "The Revisers did not intend to exclude the use of mechanical instruments in their translations of this word (psallo) in the above passages."

PROF. HARRY RANSTON, New Zealand: "No."

PROF. JAMES STALKER, Scotland, author of the Life of Christ, also the Life of Paul: "The derivation of the Greek, so far from excluding, suggests instrumental accompaniment."

REV. J. R. DUMMERLOW, Cambridge University, England, author of the One-Volume Commentary of the Bible: "No."

PROF. EDGAR GOODSPEED, Chicago University: "No."

PROF. WALTER LOCK, Oxford University, England: "No."

DR. A. T. ROBERTSON, New Testament Greek, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary: "No." (Brother Boles says Dr. Robertson is the greatest living Greek scholar. See Chapter II.)

PROF. BENJAMIN W. BACON, New Testament Greek, Yale University: "No."

PROF. WILLIAM G. BALLENTINE, author Riverside Version of the New Testament: "No."

Where is there in all the world a recognized scholar who denies the testimony of these fifteen men? In the light of this evidence by the world's finest New Testament scholars,

it is perfectly clear that, both in the King James and the American Standard Revised Versions, "sing," "sing praises," and "making melody" do not exclude instrumental accompaniment from the singing in worship.

But now, let us go a step further, We have some modern versions which are very emphatic and illuminating as to the meaning of "psallo," the word which Paul used.

1. TWENTIETH CENTURY NEW TESTAMENT: Eph. 5:19, "Sing and make music in your hearts to the Lord."
2. MONTGOMERY: Eph. 5:19, "Singing and making music in your hearts to the Lord."
3. ROTHERHAM, Emphasized New Testament: Eph. 5:19, "Singing and striking the strings with your heart unto the Lord."
4. MOFFATT'S NEW TESTAMENT: Eph. 5:19, "Praise the Lord heartily with words and music." This is a new translation from the original, and is a marvel of accurate scholarship. Dr. W. G. Ballantine, whose translation I give next, says Moffatt is the finest Greek New Testament scholar in the world. The following question was addressed to Dr. Moffatt: "Does your translation limit the meaning of 'psallo' to vocal music?" He replied: "No, certainly not."
5. RIVERSIDE NEW TESTAMENT, by W. G. Ballantine, translated from the original, 1923: Eph. 5:19, "Singing and playing the harp heartily to the Lord."

How could testimony be more conclusive than this?

One step more in the versions. How is *"psallo"* translated into other languages than our own? How do the Christians of other countries read the word of God in their tongue? Let us see.

1. THE COPTIC BIBLE for the Egyptian Christians reads: Eph. 5:19, "Praising and playing to the Lord in your hearts."
2. THE NORWEGIAN NEW TESTAMENT for the Christians of Norway reads: Eph. 5:19, "Sing and play for the Lord in your hearts."
3. LUTHER'S BIBLE for German Christians reads: Eph. 5:19, "Sing and play to the Lord in your hearts."

4. WEIZSAECKER'S TRANSLATION for the Christians of his land reads: Eph. 5:19, "Singing and playing with your heart to God the Father."

5. SCANDINAVIAN NEW TESTAMENT for the Christians of that country reads: Eph. 5:19, "Sing and play in your heart to the Lord."

The testimony of the versions is complete. The King James, the English and American Standard Revised, the modern versions, and the versions of other lands—all unite in saying that *"psallo"* in the New Testament indicates singing with instrumental accompaniment.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM SCHOLARS

We next present the fourth class of witnesses that *"psallo"* carries its instrumental meaning in the New Testament. The scholars now to testify are representative of the best scholarship of the world. They are all distinguished men, and what they say is of the greatest importance. They are neither partial nor prejudiced. The question we are discussing is a matter of no special concern to them, one way or the other. They bring to us their unbiased, disinterested judgment. These men are qualified to speak with authority. They are in possession of all the facts in the case.

This question was asked each of these men: "Does the Greek word 'psallo,' as used in Rom. 15:9; Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; and James 6:13, permit the use of mechanical instruments in connection with the singing in Christian worship?" They replied as follows:

PROF. JAMES H. ROPES, of Harvard University: "They certainly do not forbid it."

PROF. EDGAR GOODSPEED, Chicago University: "It does not exclude it."

PROF. WILLIAM N. BATES, University of Pennsylvania: "Yes."

DR. DUMMERLOW, Cambridge University, England: "Yes."

PROF. WALTER LOCK, Oxford University, England: "Yes."
PROF. A. T. ROBERTSON, Louisville, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary: "Yes."

Dr. Robertson wrote me the following letter, dated January 18, 1926:
MY DEAR BROTHER CLUBB:

I have your favor of January 18. If you have my books, you can easily see whether I have been correctly quoted and understood. I am not responsible for inferences that people draw. Liddell and Scott and Thayer's lexicons are still the standard among scholars. I do not care to be a party to your disputes about "psallo." I can only say that I see no objection to the use of instrumental music in worship. Sincerely yours,

A. T. ROBERTSON.

PROF. BENJAMIN W. BACON, New Testament Greek, Yale University:
DEAR MR. CLUBB: September 18, 1925.

It is certainly unfortunate that union among Christian bodies should be made to depend on childish questions; but since the case is such, you are entitled to all the information I can give.

In the New Testament the word "psallein" and its derivatives still retains its original sense "to pluck the string" (of a stringed instrument of music), hence "to harp." In the passages cited (Rom. 15:9; Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; James 5:13) this sense has become merged in the more general sense, "offer a hymn," just as to-day, in communities where the use of church organs is universal, a reporter would state that "the congregation joined in a hymn" without making special mention of the organist's part, though doubtless hymns often are sung without accompaniment among ourselves, and also were in New Testament times.

Neither Thayer, nor Sophocles, nor the American Revisers give any ground for the statement that the New Testament use of the words in question excludes instrumental accompaniment.

Very sincerely yours,
BENJAMIN W. BACON.

PROF. W. G. BALLANTINE, author Riverside New Testament. Here is a remarkable letter, showing the marks of the most painstaking scholarship:

DEAR MR. CLUBB:

In reply to your letter of the 16th, I would say: The Greek word psallo means primarily "to touch the strings of a harp and make them vibrate." In the Greek Old Testament it is used to translate the Hebrew words that mean this. From this it came to mean the whole performance, words and music. The words were called psalms because they were the words sung with the harp. The word psalm is a noun derived from the verb psallo, and the only reason for using it, and not some other word, was that harp music was used with those words.

In Eph. 5:19 Paul first says "singing," using the word adontes, which refers to the voice alone, and then adds psallontes. Why did he do this? Did he desire merely to say the same thing over? No; he meant "singing and playing the harp."

The Old Version says, "singing and making melody." How can melody be made? If the performer is already singing, he can make melody only by using an instrument.

Moffatt, who in my opinion is the best Greek scholar among modern translators, renders Eph. 5:19, "praise the Lord heartily with words and music." How can music be made in addition to singing the words? Only with an instrument.

In Col. 3:16 the verb psallo does not occur, but the noun psalmos does, and I think that that implies an instrument.

The word psallo occurs four times in the New Testament. In two of these places I have brought in the word harp in the Riverside New Testament (Eph. 5:19 and James 5:13). Twice I have not introduced the word harp, although I believe that it is meant, because it would make the sentence heavy and distract the reader's attention from the apostle's main point. These passages are Rom. 15:9 and 1 Cor. 14:16.

Some claim that the word psallo had come to mean singing without an instrument. There is absolutely no proof of this.

Cordially yours,
W. G. BALLANTINE.

I must use the rest of my space in noticing a few of my opponent's statements in Chapter X. His reply to my reference to Philip Schaff only makes the case stronger for the affirmative by adding the weight of three other scholars— Lange, Kling, and Poor. Kling was the author of the words I quoted, but Schaff, as general editor of the Scribner edition of the "Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletic Commentary," gave them his approval.

Brother Boles refers to my statement that *"psallo"* is not used in the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew word stair, and says: "Frequently forms of shir are translated by forms of 'psallo.' " He cites "psaltodein" and "psaltdos" as examples of such use in the Septuagint. But these words are not forms of "psallo." They are forms of "psaltodeo," a different word. "Psaltodeo" is a compound word, made from *"psallo"* and "ado." The word "ado" means to sing, as in Eph. 5:19. Of course, this compound word may be used in the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew word shir. Let him find an example of *"psallo"* alone doing it, and he will have something to the point. But this he cannot do.

He says "psalmos, a noun, is a translation of stair, a noun in the title of three psalms." Well, what of that? Professor Pfeiffer, of Harvard University, a Hebrew scholar of first rank, says: "A shir (a noun) was a poem in music, accompanied by musical instruments." This being true, "psalmos" in the title of these psalms could stand for stair, a noun, which means a "poem in music, accompanied by musical instruments."

My opponent says: "Robinson does not refer to Josephus and Plutarch in giving the New Testament meaning of 'psallo.' " Of course not, because they were not New Testament writers. But Robinson does refer to Josephus and Plutarch as examples of the use of *"psallo"* with instrumental meaning, in their day, which was the New Testament period. And Thayer refers to Plutarch in the same way. Both Thayer and Robinson say that right at the very time the New Testament was being written, Josephus and Plutarch were using the word *"psallo"* with instrumental signification.

ABBOTT-SMITH says: "It is now abundantly clear that the diction of the apostolic writers is not a peculiar isolated idiom, characteristic of the Jewish Hellenists, but simply the common speech of the Greek-speaking world at the time when the New Testament books were written."

Josephus and Plutarch, both living in the New Testament period, were writing, therefore, in the common speech of

the very day in which the New Testament was written. This is as positive and complete as evidence can be that Josephus, Plutarch, and Paul used *"psallo"* in the same sense. There is no escape from this conclusion. There is absolutely no proof that Paul used the word in any other sense than the one it had in the common speech of the day, which was its simple, ordinary meaning.

CHAPTER X11

SIXTH NEGATIVE

Brother Clubb is in a dilemma. He must either repudiate the standard English versions of the New Testament and say that the translators did not translate *"psallo"* correctly when they translated it "sing," or he must acknowledge that he cannot prove his proposition by the New Testament. He has attempted to do the former; the latter would have been more honorable. The mechanical use of an instrument has never been in the New Testament meaning of "psallo," and, therefore, the translators did not have to exclude it. They could not exclude a thing that was never included in the New Testament use of "psallo."

The New Testament Scriptures which authorize and describe Christian worship are both inclusive and exclusive. They include everything that is commanded or authorized in Christian worship, and they exclude everything not authorized. No Scripture has been found or quoted by Brother Clubb authorizing or describing instrumental music "in Christian worship." I challenge Brother Clubb to quote a single Scripture from the New Testament that even mentions instrumental music "in Christian worship." It is excluded by the Scriptures which describe and authorize Christian worship.

There are three, and only three, ways by which man can make music: (a) with the voice singing, vocal music; (b) with an instrument—playing; (c) with the voice and instrument combined—singing and playing. God teaches man to praise him. Do the New Testament Scriptures designate which one of these three ways man should praise God? If the New Testament does not designate which kind of music man should make in praising God, man may use any or all of the ways; but if the New Testament specifies

which kind of music man should use in praising God, then man must use that kind of music or be in rebellion against God. All standard translations of the New Testament designate singing, or vocal music, as the kind to be used in praising God. He who uses any other kind of music not only does so without any divine authority, but he rejects the very kind that God authorizes.

Brother Clubb occupies the same attitude toward the standard versions of the New Testament that O. E. Payne did. O. E. Payne said: "Is error so venerable, when it chances to be three hundred years old, that it must be termed sacrilege to point to such blunders as those in relation to 'psallo' and "baptizo" by King James' translators and slavishly followed by the revisers (not translators), whose hands were tied in advance by the State Church of England?" ("Instrumental Music is Scriptural," page 198.) Again, he says that "King James' translators, and their too servile revisers' must bear a portion of the blame for the strife in regard to baptism and acceptable music." (Ibid., 216.) Again, he says apologetically: "Lest he [Bacon] and the author shall seem to censure the revisers unduly for inadequately translating 'psallo,' etc." (Ibid., 308.) Brother Payne was frank enough to state boldly that the King James Version and the Revised Version did pot translate *"psallo"* correctly when they translated it "sing." This is what Brother Clubb is trying to say, but lacks courage. Payne is consistent; Brother Clubb is not. I repeat: Any proposition in the realm of religion that cannot he proved by our English Bible is not true—it cannot be proved.

Let us now notice Brother Clubb's question which he sent to twelve scholars. The question is very adroitly framed. Its drafting is similar to one asked by a shrewd lawyer or designing politician. It is not asked to elicit truth, but technically to prove a point. It does not call for the unbiased scholarship on the New Testament use of "psallo," but it asks what; one thinks the Revision Committee "intended to convey to the mind of the reader" by translating *"psallo"* by "sing." Why ask what was "in the mind" of

the translators? Their words express what was "in their mind," and they say "sing," not "play," nor "play and sing." Suppose we substitute the word "baptize" in his question and ask the same scholars if they think that the translators meant to exclude sprinkling and pouring by translating "baptizo" with baptize. Will Brother Clubb take the testimony of all twelve of his scholars? Brother Clubb is afraid to answer this question. He knows that some of his twelve scholars say that sprinkling is baptism. Why take these twelve scholars as authority on the New Testament use of *"psallo"* and not take them as authority on "baptizo"

Brother Clubb claims to have private letters from three members of the Revision Committee, trying to weaken the force of the American Revised Version. He ought to know that the Revisers could not consistently contradict the translation as given in the Revised Version. He ought also to know that the testimony of any or all living scholars to-day cannot change the fact that the American Revision Committee translated *"psallo"* to "sing." His twelve men might bear witness as to what is "in their own minds," but they cannot tell what was "in the mind" of the translators except by what the translators said in the Revised Version, and they have said in that version that *"psallo"* means to "sing."

In Chapter IX he gave a quotation which he said was from Dr. Philip Schaff, trying to prove that Dr. Schaff did not indorse the Revised Version. His attention was called to the fact that the quotation was not from Dr. Schaff. I want the reader to look at these two statements. First: "Dr. Philip Schaff, president of the Committee, commenting on 1 Cor. 14:15, 'I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also,' says: 'A proof that the prayer was accompanied with song and harp also.' " (Clubb, in Chapter IX.) Second: "Kling was the author of the words I quoted." (Clubb, in Chapter XI.) The last statement is true; the first one is not true. Brother Clubb admits now that his first statement was not true. He is to be commended in this admission; but the ugly thing about it is that he says that he knew it was not true when he made it. He

is too careless with his quotations. He is an unsafe teacher. Dr. Schaff's published statements all harmonize with the American Revised Version. He says: "The song passed immediately from the temple and synagogue into the Christian Church along with the Psalms.... The Lord himself sang with his disciples at the institution of the Holy Supper, . . . thus consecrating the singing of psalms as an act of the new Christian worship. Paul (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16) expressly enjoins the use of psalms and hymns and spiritual songs for social edification." ("History of the Apostolic Church," page 563.) Dr. Riddle has published to the world, as quoted in Chapter X, the following: "The original idea of the word [psalmos], that of musical accompaniment, would hardly be retained at this time." ("A Popular Commentary on the New Testament," Volume III, comment on Eph. 5:19, M. D. Riddle.)

The reader can refer to Chapter VIII and see that I quoted all the translations that Brother Clubb gives in Chapter XI, except two. Four of the five translations quoted by Brother Clubb are made by individuals. None of them are standard translations. These individual translations are not to be compared with the King James Version and Revised Version. They have no weight in comparison with the Revised Version.

A private letter from Prof. James H. Ropes is quoted as saying that *"psallo"* in the New Testament includes "the use of mechanical instrument." Unfortunately for Brother Clubb's private letter, Dr. Ropes has published in book form to the world the very opposite of what is claimed he said in a private letter. "Psalleto,'let him sing a hymn;' properly, 'play the harp,' hence, frequently in the Old Testament, . . . especially in Psalms (forty times), for zamar, 'sing to the music of a harp,' e. g. Ps. 7:17; 98:4. But the word does not necessarily imply the use of an instrument." ("Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of James," by Dr. James H. Ropes, page 303.)

Shir in the Hebrew never meant to play or accompany with instrumental music; it always meant to sing. The in-

contestable fact still remains that *"psallo"* and its forms are used frequently to translate shir and its forms. Sound scholarship has been given as proof, and other speakers and writers on Brother Clubb's side of this question have admitted it.

Brother Clubb assumes that the translation of a sentence means the indorsement of that sentence. He says that Dr. Schaff and Dr. Poor translated Dr. Kling's statement about Cor. 14:15 from the German into English and thereby indorsed it. This is a fatal blunder. Students studying the classics in the original Latin and Greek are not held responsible as indorsing the thought when translated into English. Brother Clubb would not want to be charged with indorsing all that he may have translated from Greek into English. He should not claim that Dr. Schaff and Dr. Poor indorsed Dr. Kling's statement unless he can find where they have so stated their indorsement.

Both Thayer and Robinson refer to Plutarch in defining the classical meaning of "psallo;" Robinson refers to both Josephus and Plutarch in giving his classical meaning; but neither of these lexicons refers to Josephus and Plutarch in giving the New Testament meaning. Both of these lexicons refer to Paul's writings in giving the New Testament use of "psallo." "This is as positive and complete as evidence can be that Josephus and Plutarch" use *"psallo"* with its classical meaning, while Paul uses *"psallo"* with the New Testament meaning. Indeed, "there is no escape from this reasonable conclusion."

Brother Clubb tries to claim that instrumental music is "only an aid" or "a Christian expediency." This is not his proposition; his proposition places the mechanical instrument "in Christian worship." However, he makes two fatal blunders in this claim from which he cannot recover. The first one was made in stating his proposition and putting instrumental music "in Christian worship ;" the second blunder was made in introducing "psalm." In discussing "psallo," he has contended that the mechanical instrument is in "psallo," and by this contention he commits himself to

the inevitable conclusion—namely, that he must use the mechanical instrument if he "psallos." This contention puts the mechanical instrument "in Christian worship" as an essential part of it, and whatever is an essential part of worship can never be "an aid to worship" or an "expediency." Brother Clubb tries to evade meeting this conclusion by declaring that he is only trying to find in *"psallo"* a "permit" to use the mechanical instrument. Such reasoning is ridiculous, for how could God command us to *"psallo"* and it be only a "permit;?"

Brother Clubb is in another dilemma. If he leaves his proposition and tries to argue that instrumental music is a "Christian expediency," he repudiates all that he has said on "psallo ;" if he stays with his proposition and argues that the mechanical instrument is in "psallo," he commits himself to the inevitable conclusion that he must use the instrument if he does what God tells us to do in "psallo."

He has insisted that he be permitted to substitute the classical meaning of *"psallo"* for its New Testament meaning. I have refused to let him do this. But if he should make this substitution and say that the meaning of *"psallo"* is "to play on a stringed instrument," he could not use the organ in Christian worship, for the organ is not "a stringed instrument." He would be permitted to use only "stringed instruments" in his worship.

I wish now to continue the testimony of commentators.

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON: "In the earliest times these suppers were hallowed by the solemn 'breaking of the bread,' followed by singing, exhortations, and prayers." ("Exposition and Notes on Ephesians.")

DR. A. T. ROBERTSON: "The word (psalleto) originally meant to play on a stringed instrument (Sir. 9:4), but it comes to be used also for singing with the voice and heart (Eph. 5:19; 1 Cor. 14:15), making melody with the heart also to the Lord." ("Studies in the Epistle James," comment on James 5:13.)

INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY: "Psallo, originally meant playing on a stringed instrument; then singing

to the harp or Iyre; finally singing without accompaniment, especially singing praise." (Comment on First Corinthians by Drs. Robertson and Plummer.)

DR. JOHN GILL: "It is not a mental praising of God, for it is called speaking and teaching and admonishing; but it is a praising of God with the modulation of the voice, and is rightly performed when the heart and voice agree; when there is a melody in the heart as well as in the tongue; for singing and making melody in the heart is singing with or from the heart, or heartily." ("Exposition of New Testament," comment on Eph. 5:19.)

OLSHAUSEN: "Aidein kai psallein is to be viewed as a collective idea, by which the inward spiritual joy is denoted." ("Biblical Commentary," comment on Eph. 5:19.)

THOMAS SCOTT: "That the inward melody of holy love and gratitude unto the Lord might unite with the outward melody of poetry and singing." ("Commentary," comment on Eph. 5:19.)

ALBERT BARNES: "Psallo . . . is used, in the New Testament, only in Rom. 15:9 and 1 Cor. 14:15, where it is translated sing; in James 5:13, where it is rendered sing psalms, and in the place be-fore us. The idea here is that of singing in the heart, or praising God from the heart." ("Notes on New Testament," comment on Eph. 5:19.)

DR. CHARLES J. ELLICOTT: "The term psallein is here properly used without any reference to any instrument

(comp. James 5:13), but as denoting the singing of praise." (Comment on 1 Cor. 14:15.)

JOHN CALVIN: "Musical instruments in celebrating the praises of God would be no more suitable than the burning of incense, lighting up of lamps, and the restoration of the other shadows of the law." (Comment on Ps. 33.)

DEAN ALFORD: "Literally, play on an instrument; but used in reference, Romans, and First Corinthians, and elsewhere, of singing praise generally." (Comment on James 5:13.)

DR. J. H. ROPES: "Psalmos. . . . But the word does

not necessarily imply the use of an instrument." (Comment on James 5:13.)

MOSES E. LARD: “When David represents himself as among the Gentiles as confessing to God, and singing with them, he foreshows that the time was coming when the Jews and Gentiles would mutually accept each other. Nay, more, that they would be so completely one as to recognize the same God and sing the same songs.” (“Commentary on Romans,” page 435.)

J. W. McGARVEY: “And if any man who is a preacher believes 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 that he wishes to believe. When the wish is father to the thought, correct exegesis is like water on a duck's back.” (“Biblical Criticism,” page 116.)

ROBERT MILLIGAN: “The word 'psalm' is from the Greek noun psalmos, and this is again from the verb psallo, to touch, to feel, to play on a stringed instrument with the fingers, and, finally, to make music or melody in the heart, as in Eph. 5:19. . . . It is evident that the word 'psalm' may or may not refer to instrumental music. Its proper meaning, in any and every case, must be determined by the context. And, according to this fundamental law of interpretation, it is pretty evident that in Ephesians and Colossians the term psalmos has no reference whatever to instrumental music; for in both cases it is the strings or chords of the heart, and not of an instrument, that are to be touched.” (“Scheme of Redemption,” page 381.)

CHAPTER XIII

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE

The subject of worship, which my opponent introduces in Chapter XII, will receive attention later. We mention it here only to say that, so far as instrumental music as an accompaniment to the singing is concerned, he assumes without proof the very point in dispute. Has he produced a single passage of Scripture which excludes instrumental accompaniment to the singing? Not one. Can he? Nay, verily. But he can assume, and this is what he has been doing all along—assuming without proof.

He challenges me to give the Scripture which authorizes instrumental accompaniment to the singing in worship. This I will do in Chapter XV, and with overwhelming proof that the interpretation I give to it is in accord with the will of God. The conclusion reached will not be my own unsupported assumption; it will be the result of the combined judgment of the best and most enlightened scholarship of the world on the subject.

THE COMMENTARIES

We now come to the fifth class of witnesses that *"psallo"* carries with it its instrumental meaning in the New Testament. The evidence from this source is overwhelming in support of the affirmative. The reader will be struck with the clear-cut, definite testimony each witness gives as to the meaning of *"psallo"* in the passages containing that word in the New Testament.

But before I proceed, I must notice the commentaries submitted by Brother Boles to support his claim that the New Testament excludes instrumental accompaniment to the singing in worship. He gives twenty-three in all. Seven-

teen of them have not a word to say on the point at issue. Some of the seventeen are decidedly on the affirmative, when the facts are known. Take the first in the list submitted, DR. J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON. Brother Boles quotes him as follows: "In the earliest times these suppers were hallowed by the solemn 'breaking of the bread,' followed by singing, exhortations, and prayers." ("Exposition and Notes on Ephesians.") Is there anything there excluding instrumental music as an accompaniment to singing in worship? Not a word. But why did Brother Boles leave out of Dr. Robinson's comment on Eph. 5:19 the following: "While the leading idea of psalmos is a musical accompaniment, and that of humnos praise to God, ode is the general word for song, whether accompanied or unaccompanied, whether of praise or of some other subject?" Dr. Robinson quotes these words from Bishop Lightfoot with approval, and as a part of his comment on Eph. 5:19. This puts Dr. Robinson squarely on the affirmative side of this discussion.

Take another, DR. A. T. ROBERTSON: "The word (psalleto) originally meant to play on a stringed instrument, but it comes to be used also for singing with the voice and heart." Anything there excluding instrumental music as an accompaniment to the singing in worship? Not a word. Here is what Dr. Robertson says in a personal letter of January 18, 1926: "I can see no objection to the use of instrumental music in worship." There is no conflict in these two statements. They are both true.

CONYBEARE AND HOWSON'S "Life and Epistles of Paul" is quoted. Does this quotation exclude instrumental accompaniment? The contrast which the apostle makes in Eph. 5:18, 19 is very clear, and this contrast is what this quotation is stressing. The heathen relied on the mere sound of both vocal and instrumental music in their festivals and religious rites. The Christians were not to do this, but depend for their enjoyment upon the devotional sentiments of the heart. No distinction is drawn between accompanied and unaccompanied singing in worship, but reference is made to the character of the worship itself,

whether it was mere sound for entertainment and revelry, or the devout feelings and sentiments of the heart. "Be not drunk with wine, but be filled with the Spirit." These words of Paul make clear all that follows, and show that the contrast suggested is the true one.

ADAM CLARKE is quoted. Not much weight can be given to Adam Clarke, for three reasons: First, he held that instrumental music in worship was never divinely authorized; that David sinned when he introduced it in the temple service. This flatly contradicts the plain statement of the Bible. (See 2 Chron. 29:25.) Second, he misses the point of the prophet's words entirely, as any one can see from a casual reading of the passage (Amos 6:1-6). Third, when he said, "Instruments of music in the house of God, I abominate and abhor," he displayed a prejudice which disqualified him from expressing an unbiased opinion. The temple at Jerusalem was as much the house of God as any modern church building, and there were instruments of music in it by divine authority, and the Savior and his apostles frequented that house of God, and yet no word of "abomination and abhorrence" ever fell from their lips concerning it.

ROBERT MILLIGAN is quoted. He says: "It is evident that the word 'psalm' may or may not refer to instrumental music. Its proper meaning, in any and every case, must be determined by the context." There is nothing in the context in Ephesians and Colossians to preclude the idea that "psalms" does not have the meaning which the Jewish Christians were accustomed to give it. "Everything," says James Stalker, "so far from excluding, suggests instrumental accompaniment" in those passages.

J. W. McGARVEY: is quoted. Here is what he says: "And if any man who is a preacher believes 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 that he wishes to believe." Professor McGARVEY: was my teacher for five years. I loved him as a father, and I revere his memory. As most people know, he was opposed to instrumental music in the

worship. But remember this: He never made it a test of fellowship, as my good Brother Boles is doing. His son, J. T., said to his father, when he had decided to go to Chestnut Street Church: "Suppose they put an organ in at Chestnut Street, what will you do then?" He answered: "If I cannot find a place where they do not have it, I will worship where they have it." He went to Chestnut Street because he preferred to worship without the instrument, not because he could not fellowship those who used it.

I do not believe Brother McGARVEY: would call men like James Moffatt, W. G. Ballantine, Dr. A. T. Robertson, Professor Bacon, "smatterers" in Greek. These men are among the finest Greek scholars in the world. Professor McGARVEY: was not a Greek scholar. He had only a working knowledge of Greek. President Robert Graham, a colaborer and lifetime friend of Brother McGARVEY: deeply regretted his stand on the music question. He said to me: "Brother McGARVEY: made the mistake of his life when he espoused the cause of the opposers of instrumental music in worship." Robert Graham was the equal of McGARVEY: in scholarship.

We are now to hear what the commentaries have to say on the affirmative side of the question we are discussing. I shall quote no witness who does not testify to the point. Every one of these men speaks clearly and definitely. They are all scholars of international reputation. What they say, therefore, is decisive.

H. C. G. MOULE, of Cambridge University, England, in Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, comment on Eph. 5:19: " 'Making melody'—literally, 'playing instruments.' This seems to assume the use of the lute or flute on such occasions. 'In your heart.' Both voice and instrument were literal and external, but the use of them both was to be spiritual, and so 'in the heart.' No other use of either, in and for worship, can be truly according to the will of God (John 4:24)."

JAMIESON, FAUSSETT, AND BROWN, Eph. 5:19: "Psalms, generally accompanied by an instrument.... 'Making melody'—Greek, 'playing and singing with an instru-

ment.' 'In your heart'—not merely with the tongue, but the serious feeling of the heart accompanying the singing of the lips." Then Conybeare and Howson are quoted, to which I have referred, showing that they agree as to the contrast I pointed out above.

PREACHERS' HOMILETIC COMMENTARY, Eph. 5:19: "The psalms of the Old Testament were sung, accompanied by musical instruments. 'Singing and making melody' means singing and playing, the voice and instrument blending in joyous strains of praise. . . . There might not be much artistic taste in the music, either of voice or instrument; but the sincerity of the heart was the true harmony."

MATTHEW HENRY'S COMMENTARY, Eph. 5:19: "By psalms may be meant David's psalms, or such composures as were fitly sung with musical instruments."

JAMES MACKNIGHT ON THE EPISTLES, Eph. 5:19: " 'Speak to one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs.' Estius says 'psalms' in profane authors denotes songs in general, especially those which were sung with the harp. Beza thinks 'psalms' in this passage denotes those poetical compositions in which David uttered his own complaints and prayers." On Col. 3:16: "'Psalms and hymns and spiritual songs.' (See Eph. 5:19, notes.) Odai are poems which were composed to be sung, accompanied with a lyre or other musical instrument." Note this: Macknight says that odes or spiritual songs were composed to be sung with accompaniment. According to Macknight, then, both psalms and odes, or spiritual songs, were accompanied with the instrument. And to this agree both Thayer in his lexicon and also Bishop Lightfoot in his commentary on Colossians, as we shall see. Thayer, in connection with his definition of "humnos" (hymns) says: "While the leading idea of psalmos is a musical accompaniment, and that of humnos praise to God, ode is a general word for a song, whether accompanied or unaccompanied, whether of praise or on any other subject." Thayer quotes these words from Lightfoot. EXPOSITOR'S GREEK TESTAMENT, Eph. 5:19: "Psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs are mentioned again in Col. 3:

16. What the distinctions are, if any, between the three terms has been considerably disputed. Psalmos is a religious song, especially one sung to musical accompaniment, and par excellence an O. T. psalm; humnos is, properly speaking, a song of praise; ode (spiritual song) is the most general term, applicable to all kinds of songs, secular or sacred, accompanied or unaccompanied."

BISHOP LIGHTFOOT'S COMMENTARY ON COLOSSIANS: On Col. 3:16, after quoting the definition of Gregory of Nyssa, of psalms, odes, and hymns, Bishop Lightfoot adds: "In other words, while the leading idea of psalmos is a musical accompaniment, and that of humnos is praise to God, ode is the general word for song, whether accompanied or unaccompanied, whether of praise or of some other subject. Thus it was quite possible for the same song to be at once psalmos, humnos, and ode."

MEYER, who ranks with the world's greatest exegetes, says on Eph. 5:19: "Properly, psalmos (which originally means 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 psalms of the Old Testament."

CRITICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND HOMILETICAL COMMENTARY (Schaff, editor), 1 Cor. 14:15: " 'I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also,' a proof that the prayer was accompanied with song and harp also."

GODET, one of the greatest exegetes of his day, on 1 Cor. 14:15, says: "The verb psallein strictly signifies to touch the chord of the instrument, hence to sing with accompaniment. . . . Edwards, agreeably to the sense of psallein, thinks the singing might be accompanied in public worship with the sound of the harp."

E. H. PLUMPTRE, in Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, on James 5:13, says: "The verb (psalleto) is used by St. Paul. (Rom. 15:9; 1 Cor. 14:15; Eph. 5:19.) Primarily it was used of instrumental string music, but, as in the word 'psalm,' had been transferred to the words of which that music was the natural accompaniment. It is,

perhaps, specially characteristic of St. James that he contemplates what we may call the individual use of such music, as well as the congregational, as a help to the spiritual life."

DR. HODGE, on Eph. 5:19, says: "'Singing and making melody' are two forms of expressing the same thing. The latter is more comprehensive; as, adein is to make music with the voice; psallein is to make music any way; literally, to play on a stringed instrument, to sing in concert with such an instrument, and then to chant or sing."

DR. ALFRED PLUMMER, in "Expositor's Bible," on James 5:13, says: "The word used by St. James for 'to sing praise' (psallein) is worthy of notice. Originally it meant simply to touch, especially to make to vibrate by touching; whence it came to be used of playing on stringed instruments. Next it came to mean to sing to the harp; and finally to sing, whether with or without a stringed accompaniment. This is its signification in the New Testament."

BISHOP ELLICOTT, in "Handy Commentary," Eph. 5:19, says: "The psalm, as the word itself implies, is music with instrumental accompaniment, and can hardly fail to refer to the Old Testament psalms, familiar in Jewish worship, and, as we know, used in the first instances we have of apostolic worship (Acts 4:24)."

DEAN ALFORD, on Eph. 5:19: "Psalms are not to be confined to hymns. The word properly signified those sacred songs which were performed with musical accompaniment.

. . 'Hymn' is the word for song without accompaniment." On James 5:13 he says: "Psalleto—let him sing praise; literally, let him play on an instrument; but in Romans, First Corinthians, and elsewhere, of singing praises generally."

PROF. G. G. FINDLAY, in "Expositor's Bible," on Eph. 5:19, says: " 'Singing and playing,' says the apostle. For music aided song; voice and instrument blended in His praise whose glory claims the tribute of all creatures. But it was 'with the heart,' even more than with the voice or tuneful strings, that melody was made. For this inward

music the Lord listens. Where other skill is wanting and neither voice nor hand can take its part in the concert of praise, He hears the silent gratitude, the humble joy that wells upward when the lips are still or the full heart cannot find expression."

CHAPTER XIV

SEVENTH NEGATIVE

But little progress can be made in this discussion if the issue is not kept clear. The proposition expresses the exact point of issue namely, the Scriptures teach that the mechanical instrument is "in Christian worship"—that is, that the mechanical instrument is a part of Christian worship. The Scriptures are plain and simple so far as they relate to the praise of God in worship. The discussion would be more profitable to the average reader if Brother Clubb would confine himself to the Scriptures. Let me repeat again that any proposition in the realm of religion that cannot be proved by our English Bible is not true—it cannot be proved.

Attention is called to a general law governing the use of words—namely: "Every word in a given passage has, in that place, one fixed meaning, and no more." This law is the foundation of all lexicography. It is axiomatic that a word has one meaning, and one only, in a given sentence. Let this rule be applied to "psallo." The New Testament use of *"psallo"* either includes the mechanical instrument or it excludes the instrument; it cannot include the mechanical instrument and exclude it in the same passage. Such would be a violation of the fundamental law of interpretation. Yet this is Brother Clubb's position. He contends that *"psallo"* in the New Testament means to "sing with or without the mechanical instrument."

There is another law governing the interpretation of Scripture—namely: "Whatever be the true sense of a word under any given set of circumstances, it will in all cases retain that sense under the same circumstances." The five instances of *"psallo"* in the New Testament must mean one and the same thing, as the same set of circumstances belongs

to each instance of the word in the New Testament. If Brother Clubb should succeed in establishing his contention that the New Testament use of *"psallo"* includes the mechanical instrument, then the mechanical instrument should always be used in Christian worship, since we are commanded to "psallo ;" but if he fails to establish his contention, then *"psallo"* does not include the mechanical instrument and his proposition is found to be false. Again, if he should admit that the New Testament use of *"psallo"* does not always include the mechanical instrument, then he surrenders his proposition. These facts force upon Brother Clubb the inevitable conclusion that he must use the mechanical instrument if he "psallos," or give up his proposition.

It will be remembered that Brother Clubb has agreed to prove that the Scriptures place the mechanical instrument "in Christian worship." *"psallo"* may retain the figurative idea of an instrument in the New Testament use, but it is not the mechanical instrument; it is the instrument of the human heart. As proof of the above statement, the following authorities are quoted: "It is a praising of God with the modulation of the voice, and is rightly performed when the heart and voice agree; when there is a melody in the heart as well as in the tongue." (Dr. John Gill, in "Exposition of New Testament," Eph. 5:19.) "Aidein kai psallein is to be viewed as a collective idea, by which the inward spiritual joy is denoted." ("Biblical Commentary," Eph. 5:19.) "That the inward melody of holy love and gratitude unto the Lord might unite with the outward melody of poetry and singing." (Thomas Scott, "Commentary," Eph. 5:19.) "It is pretty evident that in Ephesians and Colossians the term 'psalmos' has no reference whatever to instrumental music; for in both cases it is the strings or chords of the heart, and not of an instrument, that are to be touched." (R.. Milligan, "Scheme of Redemption," page 381.) This will help the reader to understand many of the authorities which Brother Clubb has quoted. The instrument is the human heart.

Brother Clubb is not a competent judge when he says that seventeen of the twenty-three commentators which I gave "have not a word to say on the point at issue." The reader can refer to the quotations and see what they say. He says that Dr. J. Armitage Robinson was not quoted fully. Let me say that Brother Clubb added a sentence to the quotation which he gave from Dr. Robinson. I have before me Dr. Robinson's book, "St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians," second edition, published 1922; and Dr. Robinson does not give the clause, "whether accompanied or unaccompanied, whether of praise or of some other subject." I challenge Brother Clubb's quotation from Dr. Robinson. It seems hard for Brother Clubb to give accurate quotations.

Again, he says that there is not a word in Dr. A. T. Robertson's quotation which excludes instrumental music. Again he is in error. Let the reader judge. Here is the quotation: "The word (psalleto) originally meant to play on a stringed instrument, but it comes to be used also for singing with the voice and the heart (Eph. 5:19; 1 Cor. 14:15), making melody with the heart also to the Lord." Dr. Robinson puts the original use of "psalleto" in contrast with its New Testament use. The former meant "to play on a stringed instrument," but the latter use is "singing with the voice and the heart."

Again, he says that Conybeare and Howson do not "exclude instrumental accompaniment." Again he is in error. I repeat a part of the quotation that the reader may see whether instrumental music is excluded. It is as follows: "When you meet, let your enjoyment consist not in the fullness of wine, but fullness of the spirit; let your songs be, not the drinking songs of heathen feasts, but psalms and hymns; and their accompaniment, not the music of the lyre, hut the melody of the heart." There are four pairs of words contrasted in this quotation; they are "fullness of wine" and "fullness of spirit ;" "drinking songs" and, "psalms and hymns ;" "the music of the lyre" and "the melody of the heart." The accompaniment of the "drinking songs" was

"the lyre," but the accompaniment of the "psalms and hymns" is "the melody of the heart."

Brother Clubb's railing against the testimony of Adam Clarke shows that he feels the mighty force of Dr. Clarke's testimony. Let the reader review it as given in Chapter X, and it will appear clear why Brother Clubb tries to discredit such a competent and profound scholar as Dr. Clarke.

The next reference is made to the quotation from Robert Milligan. Brother Clubb is very unfair in the way that he suppresses a part of the quotation which was given from Dr. Milligan. Let the reader refer to that part of the quotation given by Brother Clubb in Chapter XIII and then read the following, which is the next sentence: "And, according to this fundamental law of interpretation, it is pretty evident that in Ephesians and Colossians the term 'psalmos' has no reference whatever to instrumental music." It will be seen that Robert Milligan states positively that "psalmos" in Ephesians and Colossians "has no reference whatever to instrumental music." Now, what does the reader think of one who would willfully suppress this part of the quotation and claim that Robert Milligan is on the affirmative side of this question? I regret to mar this discussion with such unpleasant references, but it would not be right on the part of the negative to let such go unchallenged and unexposed.

His next reference is to the quotation from the lamented J. W. McGarvey. I must say that Brother Clubb does himself no honor and his own cause an injury by trying to impeach the scholarship and integrity of Brother McGARVEY: when he says that "McGARVEY: was not a Greek scholar." All know that Brother McGARVEY: was a Greek scholar, and that he was very careful to state facts in writing his articles. The venerable W. T. Moore said that he was "regarded as one of the safest and truest men in the church of Christ." ("The Living Pulpit," page 325.).) Again, he said: "That which most distinguishes him as a writer and speaker is his clearness; there is never the slightest confusion in his ideas. He has very little imagination, and relies

almost exclusively on facts for effect." (Ibid., page 326.) So it does not matter what Brother McGarvey's son says about his father, nor what any one else may say about him. The fact still remains that Brother McGARVEY: said: "And if any man who is a preacher believes that the apostle teaches the use of instrumental music in the church by enjoining the singing of songs, he is one of those smatterers in Greek who can believe anything that he wishes to believe. When the wish is father to the thought, correct exegesis is like water on a duck's back."

Twenty-three commentators have been quoted who are on the negative side of this question. Others are now submitted.

B. W. JOHNSON: "'Singing and making melody.' While the lips sing, the heart must join in the melody by an uplifting to God." ("New Testament with Notes," Eph. 5:19.)

JOHN WESLEY: "It is evidence that the promise of the Holy Ghost to believers in the last days was, by his larger effusion, to supply the lack of it; singing with your hearts, as well as your voices, to the Lord." ("Notes on New Testament," Eph. 5:19.)

A. MACLAREN: "The best praise, however, is a heart song. So the apostle adds, 'singing in your hearts unto God.'" ("Expositor's Bible," Col. 3:16.)

JAMIESON, FAUSSETT, AND BROWN: "Sing psalms—of praise. St. Paul and Silas sang psalms even in affliction." ("Bible Commentary," James 5:13.) We know that the -psalms that Paul and Silas sang in prison were not accompanied with a mechanical instrument, and yet they are the kind that James instructs Christians to sing.

F. C. COOK: " 'Singing and making melody in your heart.' 'Singing' is the word from which 'song' is derived; 'making melody' (in the original), that from which 'psalm' is derived. Spiritual enthusiasm creates an inner music in the heart as well as the utterance aloud of psalm, hymn, and song." ("Bible Commentary," Eph. 5:19.)

J. B. MAYOR: "Psalleto, properly used of playing on a

stringed instrument. . . . We find it also used of singing with the voice and with the heart. (Eph. 5:19; 1 Cor. 14:15.) The word is only used of sacred music in the New Testament." ("The Epistle of St. James," James 5:13.)

HISTORY OF INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC

We have now seen that the Standard New Testament lexicons do not authorize the use of mechanical instruments "in Christian worship." Next we gave all the standard translations of the New Testament, and found that they did not so translate *"psallo"* as to include mechanical instruments. We have also given twenty-nine commentators, and find that they do not support the affirmative side of this proposition. We next submit the testimony of encyclopedias and histories of music which bear clear and emphatic testimony to the fact that the early church did not use instrumental music in the worship.

SCHAFF-HERZOG: "But this argument would prove that it is as much a duty to play as to sing in worship. It is questionable whether, as used in the New Testament, 'psallo' means more than to sing. . . . The absence of instrumental music from the church for some centuries after the apostles and the sentiment regarding it which pervades the writings of the fathers are unaccountable, if in the apostolic church such music was used." (Volume III, page 1961.)

W. D. KILLEN: "It is not, therefore, strange that instrumental music was not heard in their congregational services. . . . In the early church the whole congregation joined in the singing, but instrumental music did not accompany the praise." ("The Ancient Church," pages 193 and 423.)

E. S. LORENZ: "Yet there was little temptation to undue elaboration of hymnody or music. The very spirituality of the new faith made ritual or liturgy superfluous and music almost unnecessary. Singing (there was no instrumental accompaniment) was little more than a means of expressing in a practicable, social way, the common faith and experience. . . . The music was purely vocal. There was

no instrumental accompaniment of any kind.... It fell under the ban of the Christian church, as did all other instruments, because of its pagan association." ("Church Music," pages 217, 250, 404.)

ALFREDO UNTERSEINER: "It was exclusively vocal, for the Christian had an aversion to instruments which served at pagan feasts." ("A Short History of Music," page 28.)

DR. F. L. PITTER: "We have no real knowledge of the exact character of the music which formed a part of the religious devotion of the first Christian congregations. It was, however, purely vocal. Instrumental music was excluded, at first, as having been used by the Romans at their depraved festivities; and everything reminding them of heathen worship could not be endured by the new religionists." ("History of Music from the Christian Era to the Present Time," page 28.)

EDWARD DICKINSON: "While the Greek and Roman songs were metrical, the Christian psalms were antiphons, prayers, responses, etc., were unmetrical; and while the pagan melodies were always sung to an instrumental accompaniment, the church chant was exclusively vocal." ("History of Music," page 54.)

FRANK L. HUMPHREYS: "All the music employed in their early services was vocal, and the rhythmic element and all gesticulation were forbidden." ("The Evolution of Church Music," page 42.)

MCCLINTOCK AND STRONG: "The Greek word 'psallo' is applied among the Greeks of modern times exclusively to sacred music, which in the Eastern Church has never been any other than vocal, instrumental music being unknown in that church, as it was in the primitive church. . . . But students of ecclesiastical archaeology are generally agreed that instrumental music was not used in churches till a much later date." (Encyclopedia, Volume VIII, page 739.)

FESSENDEN'S ENCYCLOPEDIA: "That instrumental music was not practiced by the primitive Christians, but was an aid to devotion of later times, is evident from church history." ("Art, Music," page 852.)

GEORGE P. FISHER: "Church music, which at the outset consisted mainly of the singing of the Psalms, flourished especially in Syria at Alexandria." ("History of the Christian Church," page 65.)

DR. A. H. NEWMAN: "The worship of the early Christians was very free and informal. It consisted of prayer, the singing of psalms, and the reading and exposition of the Old Testament Scriptures (prophesying)." ("Manual of Church History," Volume I, page 140.)

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN: "The worship was simple and democratic. There was singing and prayer, reading from the Old Testament and the books of the New as they appeared, with exhortation. . . . The worship consisted of singing, Scripture reading, prayers, and informal preaching." ("The Course of Christian History," pages 18, 31.)

PHILIP SCHAFF: "The Lord himself inaugurated psalmody into the new covenant at the institution of the Holy Supper, and Paul expressly enjoined the singing of 'psalms and hymns and spiritual songs' as a means of social edification." ("History of the Christian Church," Volume I, page 121.)

J. . MOSHEIM: "TO these were added certain hymns, which were sung, not by the whole assembly, but by persons appointed for that purpose, during the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and the feasts of charity.... The psalms of David were now received among the public hymns that were sung as a part of divine service." ("Ecclesiastical History," pages 28, 98.)

J. W. McGARVEY: "To sum up these arguments, you can now see that this practice is one of recent origin among Protestant churches, adopted by them from the Roman apostasy; that it was one of the latest corruptions adopted by that corrupt body; that a large part of the religious world has never accepted it; that, though employed in the Jewish ritual, it was deliberately laid aside by the inspired men who organized the church of Christ; and that several precepts of the New Testament implicitly condemn it." ("What Shall We Do About the Organ?" pages 6, 7.)

CHAPTER XV

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE

The negative is still trying to read into the proposition the thing we are not discussing. He would have very little to say if he could not indulge in this. But he knows, and I know, and everybody else knows, that the question we are discussing is whether the general practice of accompanying the singing in worship with a musical instrument is, or is not, Scriptural. I am affirming that it is; he is denying it. That is all there is to the proposition.

My opponent accuses me of willfully suppressing a part of a quotation he made from Robert Milligan and then claiming Milligan as being on the affirmative side. That is a grave charge. Nothing is farther from the truth. The full quotation was already before the reader as given by Brother Boles. Milligan says: "It is evident that the word 'psalm' may or may not refer to instrumental music. Its proper meaning, in any and every case, must be determined by the context." My comment on this was: "There is nothing in the context in Ephesians and Colossians to preclude the idea that 'psalm' does not have the meaning which the Jewish Christians were accustomed to give it. 'Everything,' says Stalker, 'so far from excluding, suggests instrumental accompaniment' in those passages." Instead of claiming Milligan, I took issue with him, and in this I am sustained by the weight of scholarship.

Brother Boles says Robinson's quotation from Bishop Lightfoot does not contain the phrase, "whether accompanied or unaccompanied," etc. He is right in this, I find by investigation. In consulting this commentary, I noted that Robinson quoted Lightfoot, and so jotted down in my notebook: "Robinson quotes Lightfoot with approval." Being in a hurry to leave the library, I failed to read the quota-

tion entire. But this does not affect the point I made. Robinson quotes from Lightfoot with approval: "While the leading idea of psalmos is a musical accompaniment, and that of hymnos praise to God, ode is the general word for song." I still ask: Why did Brother Boles omit this? It is the only part of Dr. Robinson's comment which bears on the question, and it places him squarely on the side of the affirmative.

My opponent adds six more commentaries to his list, and the strange thing is that not one of them says a word in favor of the negative, and five of them are outspoken advocates of instrumental accompaniment. Let us notice them briefly.

B. W. JOHNSON utters not a syllable which can be construed as excluding instrumental accompaniment from singing in worship.

JOHN WESLEY says nothing in the words quoted from him, on the subject. But in his journal he goes on record as favoring instrumental music in worship. He says in Volume VIII: "Sunday, April 2, 1786. We had a large and serious congregation at the new church, both morning and afternoon. The organ is one of the finest-toned I ever heard, and the congregation singing with it make a sweet melody."

A. MACLAREN is quoted as saying: "The best praise, however, is a heart song. So the apostle adds, 'singing in your hearts unto God.'" ("Expositor's Bible," page 332.) Is it not strange that Brother Boles overlooked the following, on page 330 of the same volume: "The distinction between 'psalms' and 'hymns' appears to be that the former is a song with a musical accompaniment, and that the latter is vocal praise to God?" He must have seen it, for it was right before him. I must confess I do not understand how he could quote Dr. Maclaren as being opposed to instrumental music, with these words right before his eyes.

JAMIESON, FAUSSETT, AND BROWN'S COMMENTARY is quoted on James 5:13. But Brother Boles forgets to look up this commentary on Eph. 5:19, which we quoted in

Chapter XIII. Here it is: "Psalms, generally accompanied by an instrument. . . . 'Making melody'—Greek, 'playing and singing with an instrument.' 'In your heart'—not merely with the tongue, but the serious feeling of the heart accompanying the singing of the lips." How did he happen to miss this, which completely destroys the force of the impression he seeks to make?

He quotes the "Bible Commentary" on Eph. 5:19, but strangely overlooks the following on the same page and immediately above what he quotes: "Others explain the difference between the three words: 'Psalms,' they say, are songs with musical accompaniment, 'hymns' are without accompaniment, and 'spiritual songs' are lyrical effusions." This puts a different construction on the passage.

J. B. MAYOR, on James 5:13, is quoted: "Psalleto, properly used of playing on a stringed instrument. . . . We find it also [italics mine] used of singing with the voice and with the heart. (Eph. 5:19; 1 Cor. 14:15.) The word is only used of sacred music in the New Testament." Note the word "also." This tells the story. The well-known reference to Lucian, which Brother Boles omits, confirms the fact that Mayor is on the affirmative, and not the negative, in this discussion.

To sum up, Brother Boles has given twenty-eight commentaries, and what do we find? Ten of them are neutral— that is, in the comments quoted, they have nothing to say one way or the other. Only six definitely support the negative. They are: Adam Clarke, Dr. Whedon, John Calvin, Moses E. Lard, J. W. McGARVEY:, and Robert Milligan. I give Lard, not because he says anything against instrumental music, in the passage quoted, but because he was opposed to it, as I freely concede.

Twelve of the authorities are definite and clear-cut in their advocacy of instrumental music in worship. They are: G. G. Findlay, Jamieson, Faussett, and Brown, John Wesley, Dr. A. Maclaren, F. L. Cook in "Bible Commentary," J. B. Mayor, James Macknight, Bishop Ellicott, J. Armitage Robinson, Prof. J. H. Ropes, Dean Alford, and

Dr. A. T. Robertson. I have quoted from each of these men a positive declaration, except Mayor. What they say cannot be misunderstood. They advocate instrumental music in worship, and they base their attitude on the plain teaching of the New Testament. What is the reader to think of a position which has to be supported by such tactics as are being employed by the negative in this discussion?

I have a few more authorities to quote before summing up what the commentaries have to say.

ARCHBISHOP TRENCH, in "New Testament Synonyms:" "Psalmos, from psao, properly 'a touching' and then 'touching of the harp' or other stringed instrument, with the fingers or with the plectrum; was next the instrument itself, and last of all the song sung with musical accompaniment."

DR. ROBERT YOUNG, in his great concordance, says: "Psallo, to sing praise with a musical accompaniment." And he refers to Rom. 15:9 as an example of this use.

WEYMOUTH, in "The New Testament in Modern Speech," says in a note on First Corinthians regarding psallo: "The word may imply instrumental accompaniment."

PROF. SAMUEL BASSETT says: "In the Septuagint and New Testament, it (psallo) means to sing as one sings a psalm. In Eph. 5:19 it is coupled with ado, and apparently means 'playing the lyre' ('singing and making music'). In Rom. 15:9 and 1 Cor. 14:15 certainly the accompaniment is not precluded any more than our 'sing a hymn' precludes an instrument."

S. W. DUFFIELD says: "Did the early Christians use any instruments? In reply, it can be noted that psallein, 'to make melody,' is usually taken to refer to a musical accompaniment. In Rom. 15:9 it is a quotation from Ps. 18:50, where it means, 'I will sing psalms.' In 1 Cor. 14:15 ('I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also') and in James 5:13 ('Is any merry? let him sing psalms') we have nothing decisive, except that we know the Jewish method of 'singing psalms' was to the accompaniment of musical instruments."

LANGE, one of the greatest of commentators, on Eph. 5:

19, says: "Luther is incorrect by 'psalms.' Since psalmos is something historical, the word should here retain the meaning of 0. T. psalms, which were well known, and had been accepted in the public service." Duffield says we know the Jewish method of singing Old Testament psalms was to the accompaniment of musical instruments.

DR. A. T. ROBERTSON says: "Psallo originally meant to strike an instrument like a harp; then to sing to the music of the instrument. This was its common use, and the psalms were sung with musical accompaniment. The early Christians seem to have followed Jewish usage in the use of musical instruments in praising God." This is the testimony of the man whom Brother Boles declares to be the greatest living Greek scholar. I do not dispute the claim. Dr. Robertson is certainly a great scholar, and his opinion has great weight. In a letter to me he said: "I can only say, I see no objection to the use of instrumental music in worship."

DR. ALEXANDER MACLAREN, in "Expositor's Bible," commenting on Col. 3:16, says: "The distinction between 'psalms' and 'hymns' appears to be that the former is a song with musical accompaniment, and that the latter is vocal praise to God. . . . The onward march of the church has ever been attended by music of praise; 'as well the singers as the players on instruments' have been there." Dr. Maclaren quotes these words from Ps. 87, which is said to be a prophecy of the church.

I have now given twenty-four authorities under the head of commentaries. Each speaks with clearness and to the point. Every one of them indicates instrumental accompaniment to the singing in worship. These commentators are among the greatest of the world's Biblical scholars. If we cannot trust to their combined judgment, it is useless to look elsewhere.

Here I rest my case, so far as the meaning of the word or words which Paul and James used in connection with singing in worship is concerned. The evidence presented, to my mind, is as strong and conclusive as evidence can be 8

that the New Testament sanctions the use of instrumental music as an accompaniment to the singing in worship. I do not say it commands it, but I do say it permits it.

I am now ready to produce the passages on which I rely in support of my proposition.

Rom. I 5:9 "Therefore will I give praise unto thee among the Gentiles, and sing [psalo] unto thy name."

1 Cor. 14:15, 26: "What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing [psalo] with the spirit, and I will sing [psalo] with the understanding also.... What is it, then, brethren? When ye come together, each one hath a psalm [psalmos], hath a teaching, hath a revelation, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation."

Eph. 5:19: "Speaking one to another in psalms [psalmos] and hymns [humnos] and spiritual songs [ode], singing [adontes] and making melody [psallontes] with your heart to the Lord."

Col. 3:16: "Teaching and admonishing one another with psalms [psalmos] and hymns [humnos] and spiritual songs [ode], singing [ado] with grace in your hearts unto God."

James 5:13: "Is any cheerful? Iet him sing [psalleto]."

The words "psalms," "sing," "make melody," and "spiritual songs" all carry with them the permission to accompany the singing they indicate with instrumental music. There is no doubt of this, if we accept the voice of the best Biblical scholarship in the world. Professor Ropes says: "If the writers of the New Testament had INTENDED to speak of accompanied singing~ they would have used 'psallo.' " And that is the word they did use.

My opponent in Chapter XIV stated a law of interpretation thus: "Whatever be the true sense of a word under any given set of circumstances, it will in all cases retain that sense under the same circumstances." Brother Boles says, in the light of this law: "The five instances of 'psallo' in the New Testament must mean one and the same thing, as the same set of circumstances belongs to each instance of the word in the New Testament." And then he admits, in so

many words, that *"psallo"* means "to play" in Eph. 5:19, but claims that the instrument is the human heart. Therefore, the music is silent music. It cannot be audible, if it is made only in the heart. Now, since *"psallo"* means the same thing in each instance of its use in the New

Testament, as he says it does, and as he says it means "silent music" in Eph. 5:19, the inescapable conclusion is that it means "silent music" in the three other instances of its use. This is the ridiculous position in which Brother Boles has placed himself in order to shield his pet theory.

Let us look for a moment at Eph. 5:19: "Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody [psallontes] in your heart to the Lord." It would be perfectly plain to all who are seeking for the truth in this passage that wherever the "making melody" is done, the singing is done also. If the singing is audible, so is the playing. They may both be said to be done in the heart, but not one to the exclusion of the other. They go together, the singing and the making melody (playing the harp). If one is external, so is the other; if one is in the heart, so is the other. They may both be external and both internal. Professor Moule says: "Both voice and instrument were literal and external, but the use of them both was to be spiritual, and so 'in the heart.' " Professor Findlay says: "Singing and playing, for music aided song, and voice and instrument blended in his praise." "In the heart" simply means heartily. So say Chrysostom, Moffatt, and Ballantine. The latter's translation of this passage reads: "Singing and playing the harp heartily to the Lord."

CHAPTER XVI

EIGHTH NEGATIVE

"The negative is" not "trying to read" anything "into the proposition," but is trying to keep the affirmative from obscuring and evading the issue as set forth in the proposition. The negative is trying to keep the issue before the readers. Let us place the proposition and what Brother Clubb claims to be affirming side by side, so that the readers may see how the affirmative is evading.

Proposition: "Instrumental Music in Christian worship is Scriptural."

Brother Clubb claims: "The question we are discussing is whether the general practice of accompanying the singing in worship with a musical instrument is, or is not, Scriptural;"

There is a wide difference between the two statements. In his statement he places "singing in worship," while his proposition puts the mechanical instrument "in Christian worship." The reader can see that Brother Clubb is trying to substitute another proposition for the one that he has agreed to prove. He shall not evade the issue, neither shall he muddy the water so as to obscure it. He has agreed to prove that the Scriptures teach that the mechanical instrument is "in Christian worship." This he -must do or else surrender his proposition.

It has been pointed out several times in this discussion that a mechanical instrument cannot be "in Christian worship" and at the same time be merely an accompaniment to "the singing." Brother J. B. Briney says: "Thus it appears that an organ may be lifted from the plane of a mere help in the worship to the position of a means of worship— an instrument by which a heart that is full of devotion may exhibit its adoration and manifest its sentiments of worship

as did David with his harp." ("Instrumental Music in Christian Worship," page 214.) David's harp was an instrument by which or through which he worshiped. Brother Briney says that "an organ may be lifted from the plane of a mere help in the worship to the position of a means of worship." That is to say, the mechanical instrument is "a means of worship," or the mechanical instrument is "in Christian worship." He further says that worship consists of two parts—(1) "internal conditions" and (2) "external expressions." "The external expression" is one part of Christian worship and may be performed with the mechanical instrument—that is, "the internal conditions" of the heart may be expressed with the mechanical instrument, thus making the instrument a part of the worship; or, as stated by Brother Clubb's proposition, the mechanical instrument is "in Christian worship."

I still charge Brother Clubb with suppressing a part of the quotation from R. Milligan. Even in Chapter XV he fails to give the quotation which expresses Milligan's point It is the following: "And, according to this fundamentaI law of interpretation, it is pretty evident that in Ephesians and Colossians the term 'psalmos' has no reference whatever to instrumental music; for, in both cases, it is the strings or chords of the heart, and not of an instrument, that are to be touched." This is a quotation which I gave from Milligan, and that which Brother Clubb suppressed and tried to place Milligan as authority on his side of the question.

He now admits that he garbled the quotation from Dr. Robinson and offers a lame excuse for it. He is an unsafe teacher. Robinson did not use the clause, "whether accompanied or unaccompanied," as Brother Clubb quoted him as saying in Chapter XIII. Inasmuch as Dr. Robinson did not quote that clause from Lightfoot, it shows that he did not approve of Lightfoot's statement of it.

The negative has made the argument that God's commands are both inclusive and exclusive; they exclude, and therefore forbid, what is not included. When God tells his

people to sing, that is specific, and includes only that which is necessary to sing, and it excludes everything that is not necessary to the carrying out of the command. Brother Clubb says: "B. W. Johnson utters not a syllable which can be construed as excluding instrumental accompaniment from singing in worship." Johnson says, in commenting on Eph. 5:19: "While the lips sing, the heart must join in the melody by an uplifting to God. Too much singing in the churches is only of the lips." He is giving his interpretation of "singing and making melody;" and when he tells what it means, he excludes the mechanical instrument. The same point may be made of all other quotations which Brother Clubb tries to place in "the neutral list."

JOHN WESLEY is quoted as favoring instrumental music, but the quotation does not say that Wesley indorses instrumental music. He does say, as I have already quoted, in commenting on Eph. 5:19: "Singing with your heart, as well as your voices, to the Lord." He also says: "I have no objection to instruments of music in our chapels, provided they are neither heard nor seen." (Clarke's "Commentary," Volume IV.)

JAMIESON, FAUSSETT, AND BROWN are quoted as commenting on Eph. 5:19, but Brother Clubb stops before the comment closes. (See page 111.) I will not repeat the part of the comment which Brother Clubb gives, but will begin with the very next sentence, which reads as follows: "The contrast is between the heathen and the Christian practice. 'Let your songs be not the drinking songs of heathen feasts, but psalms and hymns; and their accompaniment, not the music of the lyre, but the melody of the heart.' " Here CONYBEARE AND HOWSON are quoted approvingly, and they state that the accompaniment is "not the music of the lyre," or musical instrument, but "the melody of the heart." Now, why did Brother Clubb not give the full comment? It was before his eyes; he could not help seeing it.

ARCHBISHOP TRENCH is next quoted, yet Brother Clubb does not give all that Trench says. I wonder how it happened that Brother Clubb did not see the following: "It may

reasonably be doubted whether we can draw very accurately the lines of demarcation between the 'psalms and hymns and spiritual songs' of which the apostle makes mention, or whether he drew them for himself with a perfect accuracy; the words, even at the time when he wrote, may have been often promiscuously, confusedly used." Archbishop Trench states that it is very doubtful if the line of demarcation can be drawn between psalms and hymns and spiritual songs; he says that these words in the days of Paul were used "promiscuously," "confusedly"—that is, synonymously. Since no instrumental accompaniment belonged to hymns and odes, and "psalms" is used synonymously with these words, no mechanical instrument accompanied the psalms with the early Christians.

DR. A. T. ROBERTSON, in his "Studies in the Epistle of James," says: " 'Psalleto,' the word originally meant to play on a stringed instrument (Sir. 9:4), but it comes to be used also for singing with the voice and the heart (Eph. 5:19; 1 Cor. 14:15), making melody with the heart also to the Lord." Here Dr. Robertson puts the "original" meaning in contrast with the New Testament meaning. Its original meaning included the "stringed instrument," but the New Testament meaning is "singing with the voice and heart." I let the readers judge whether Brother Clubb has handled Dr. Robertson's testimony fairly.

He now leaves the definition of *"psallo"* and turns to the New Testament Scriptures. It is to be remembered that he started out trying to show that *"psallo"* in the New Testament meant to play on a mechanical instrument. He has been forced to the same position that 0. E. Payne was finally forced to take. Payne was frank enough and bold enough to face the inevitable conclusion, and said: "Henceforth we must unite in agreeing that if we forego musical instruments, we cannot conform to the divine injunction to 'psallein.' " This is the conclusion that Brother Clubb's logic has forced him to take or abandon his first position. If he does not take this inevitable conclusion, he must repudiate all that he has said in discussing the meaning of "psallo."

Brother Clubb cannot argue his proposition from the New Testament meaning of *"psallo"* without coming to the conclusion that he must use the instrument if he does what he claims *"psallo"* means. Soon after this discussion began Brother Clubb saw this inevitable conclusion, and instead of boldly facing the logical conclusion, he began to shy, equivocate, and evade the issue of his proposition, and has sought to substitute another proposition which would help him to escape, if possible, the crushing and inevitable conclusion—namely, that he must use the instrument if he- does what God commands in "psallo," if *"psallo"* included a mechanical instrument.

I have been stating in each chapter that any proposition in the realm of religion that cannot be proved: by our English Bible is not true—it cannot be proved. I am glad that he has now decided to attempt to prove his proposition by the New Testament. I am sure that the average reader cares nothing about his gyrations in the Greek lexicons. He has written: eight chapters, more than three-fourths of the entire discussion, without quoting Scripture; but he says: "I am now ready to produce the passages on which I rely in support of my proposition." His proposition calls upon him to show that his affirmation is Scriptural. All along through his meanderings of Greek lexicons I have impressed upon him that he could not prove anything to be Scriptural without using the Scriptures. He now quotes five passages of Scripture on which he relies "in support of his proposition." I wish to examine each Scripture in the order in which he gives them; and if it should be found that these Scriptures do not support his proposition, then his proposition must fall.

Rom. 15:9

"Therefore will I give praise unto thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy name." Here *"psallo"* is used the first time in the New Testament. Every standard translation of the New Testament translates *"psallo"* in this passage by "sing." In Chapter VIII will be found a tabulated list of forty-seven translations, representing more than two

hundred and sixty scholars, and every one of the forty-seven except five translate *"psallo"* by

"sing"—that is, forty-two translations translate *"psallo"* by "sing;" three of the five others translate it by "praise." Only Rotherham (not a standard translation) renders it "strike strings;" in his twelfth edition he translates-it by "sing." So, according to the scholarship of the world, Rom. 15:9 excludes the mechanical instrument.

1 Cor. 14:15

"What is it then I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also." Let us examine this Scripture as we did the one above. In this passage *"psallo"* is used twice, but it is translated by the same word in every instance. Again referring to the tabulated list of translations in Chapter VIII, we find that out of the forty-seven translations, thirty-eight of them render "psallo" in this passage by "sing." Only Rotherham translates *"psallo"* with "strike strings;" but in his twelfth edition he translated in "sing." The scholarship as represented by these translations says that the mechanical instrument is not in this passage.

Eph. 5:19

"Speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord." In this quotation "psalmos" and "psallontes" are used. Again referring to the list of translations, twenty-three out of the forty-seven render "psallontes" by "make melody." Four translate it "praising;" five, by "make music-;" four, by "sing;" four, by "playing;" one, by "dancing;" one (Rotherham), by "strike strings." The translations which give "playing" and "dancing' are not standard translations. Again the scholarship of the world as represented by the translators excludes the mechanical instrument. This Scripture, like the others, does not support the affirmative of this proposition.

Col. 3:16

"Teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto God." In this Scripture the noun "psalmos" is used, and it is rendered in nearly every instance by "psalms." We have seen that the New Testament use of "psalms" does not have the mechanical instrument as an accompaniment. Even in the Septuagint "psalms" did not always have instrumental accompaniment. So this Scripture does not support the affirmative side of this question.

James 5:13

"Is any cheerful? let him sing praise." Again referring to the list of forty-seven translations, we find that "psalleto" as used here is translated "sing" by forty out of the forty-seven translations. It is rendered once by "play ;" once, "strike strings;" by others, "praise." Montgomery renders it in this place by "play" and Rotherham by "strike strings," but neither of these translations is standard. This Scripture does not support the affirmative side of this proposition.

We have now examined all the Scriptures which Brother Clubb "relies upon to prove his proposition," and have found that not one of them as translated by the scholarship of the world supports his proposition. There is nothing in either one of these passages which even remotely hints at a mechanical instrument. No one can read these Scriptures and see in them the mechanical instrument; no one can read into them the mechanical instrument. It would be much easier for an affusionist to read into the New Testament use of baptism sprinkling than for any one to read the mechanical instrument into these Scriptures. Now, since these are the only Scriptures which he claims as supporting his proposition, and since they do not, his proposition falls.

CHAPTER XVII

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE

In Chapter XIV, Brother Boles introduces a number of encyclopedias and histories of music to show that the early church did not use instrumental music in worship. For lack of space, we cannot dwell at length on the character of this evidence. As usual, several of his witnesses have not a word to say which has any bearing on the issue—e. g., Fisher, Newman, McGlothlin, Schaff, and Mosheim. Those who do speak to the subject give no proof, merely make unsupported assertions. Some are vague and indefinite—e. g., Ritter. He says: "We have no real knowledge of the exact character of the music which formed a part of the religious devotion of the first Christian congregations." From his statement, he is evidently not referring to the Jewish congregations, and most likely not to the New Testament times.

It cannot be shown by authentic historical facts that the first Jewish congregations did not use instruments. The Jewish custom for centuries, and the meaning of "psallo," which the best scholarship unmistakably declares permitted them to use instruments, and the further fact that they were under no prohibition not to use them, all go to show that they did use them, when circumstances were favorable.

We shall now use two or three undisputed authorities among the encyclopedias to show that the early church was not only permitted to use instrumental accompaniment to the singing, but that in all probability they did use it.

McCLINTOCK AND STRONG: This great work speaks very clearly and to the point. It says: "The early Christians used the Jewish psalms in their worship, which would almost certainly be sung to their traditional temple music. G. B. Martini says: 'This is the Hebrew chant of the psalmodies which ever since the time of David and Solomon has

been transmitted from one generation to another, and therefore goes beyond the first half of the first age of the church. These have not materially varied, but have been substantially preserved by the Hebrew nation. Is it not sufficient to convince us that the apostles—who were born Hebrews, brought up in the customs of their nation, wont to frequent the temple and engage in the prayers and divine praises therein recited—should retain the same method and use the same chants with which the people used to respond to the Levitical choir?' " In referring to the distinction between psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, we note: "According to some, the distinction between them was one of subject; according to others, it was merely of form, having respect to the manner in which they were sung. . - . . By some, who take this view, the distinction is supposed to lie in this, that the psalms were compositions which were chanted to the accompaniment of an instrument, the psalterion; the hymns, songs of adoration uttered by the voice alone." Supporting this view, Augustine, Basil, and Gregory of Nyssa are mentioned. (Volume VIII, on Psalmody.)

DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES: "In such a matter, what every Israelite was familiar with, the Christian church would be likely to continue. Basil the Great (and after him other writers) explains two of the names that occur in the titles of the Psalms as having reference to the mode of their execution. A psalm, he says, is a composition which is instrumentally accompanied." (Volume II, page 1746.)

HASTINGS' ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS: "All authorities are agreed that the music of the early church was of Hebraic origin. It is known that the apostles, as Hebrews, engaged in prayer and praise in the temple, and they would undoubtedly utilize the same chants used there by; the people in response to the Levitical choir.

Music must have played an important part in the early Christian worship, if we judge by Paul's references to in in his epistles, written not very long after the ascension of Christ, since he repeatedly admonishes the adherents to

sing and make melody in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs." (Volume IX.)

HASTINGS' DICTIONARY OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH: "Our study of the ideals of praise in the apostolic church would be incomplete without some reference to the music, both vocal and instrumental, in which pious hearts desired to express it. The earliest Christian hymns were sung, no doubt, like the psalms, but we know very little about the vocal methods of the Hebrews." Again: "In Rev. 15:2, 'the harps of God' are sounded with pointed allusion

to the Sabbath services in the temple, when special canticles were sung, to which the song of Moses and the Lamb corresponds when sung by the church at rest. There was a certain prejudice against the music of flutes, but they seem to have been used at Alexandria to accompany the hymns at the agape, until Clement substituted harps about A.D. 190." (Volume II, page 256.)

Referring to Dr. Robinson's quotation from Bishop Lightfoot, Brother Boles says, in Chapter XVI, that inasmuch as Dr. Robinson omitted the words, "accompanied or unaccompanied," from his quotation, it shows that he did not approve of Lightfoot's statement. - Let us look at the statement. Lightfoot says: "While the leading idea of 'psalmos' is a musical accompaniment, and that of 'humnos' praise to God, 'ode' is the general word for song, whether accompanied or unaccompanied." Now, it is perfectly clear that the words, "accompanied or unaccompanied," have reference to "ode" alone, and have nothing whatever to do with "psalmos." Lightfoot says, "The leading idea of 'psalmos' is a musical accompaniment,)' and Dr. Robinson quoted this with approval.

the man who tries to place John Wesley, Jamieson, Faussett, and Brown, Archbishop Trench, and A. T. Robertson on the negative in this discussion is surely hard pressed for something to say.

I quote Dr. A. T. Robertson once more: " 'Psallo, originally meant to strike an instrument, like a harp; and then to sing to the music of an instrument. This was its common

use, and the Psalms were sung with musical accompaniment. The early Christians seem to have followed Jewish usage in the use of musical instruments in praising God." Is that clear enough? That is Dr. Robertson's position to-day on the question we are discussing. In a letter to me, dated January 18, 1926, he said: "I can only say I see no objection to the use of instrumental music in worship." Brother Boles says that Dr. Robertson is the greatest living Greek scholar. I do not dispute it. Why does he refuse to accept his testimony?

I called attention in Chapter XV to the fatal admission of Brother Boles in Chapter XIV. He laid down the following law of interpretation: "Whatever be the sense of a word under any given set of circumstances, it will in all cases retain that sense under the same circumstances." Then he says: "The five instances of 'psallo' in the New Testament must mean one and the same thing, as the same set of circumstances belongs to each instance of the word in the New Testament." He then admits that " 'psallo' may retain the figurative idea of an instrument in the New Testament use, but it is not the mechanical instrument; it is the instrument of the human heart." He says this is its meaning in Eph. 5:19. Note the admission that *"psallo"* means to play in that passage; and since it means to play in Eph. 5:19, it means the same thing in each of the other instances of its use in the New Testament, according to Brother Boles' admission. So *"psallo"* never means anything else than "silent music" in the New Testament, according to Brother Boles. There is no escape from this. Either *"psallo"* may have both a literal and a figurative sense, or the music it indicates is silent music in each instance of its use in the New Testament. But he says it is silent music c in Eph. 6:19

therefore, according to his interpretation, it means the same thing in each instance of its use. This is the predicament his false reasoning has brought him to, and here his whole contention fails. To say, as he does, that *"psallo"* may mean figuratively to play is a virtual surrender of the whole question.

"psallo" and "ado" both have a literal and figurative sense in Eph. 6:19. "Singing and making melody" are both literal and external, says Professor Moule; but both are spiritual, and so "in the heart."

APOSTOLIC EXAMPLE

We have found very clear teaching by precept in the New Testament on the subject of instrumental music in worship. If we are to trust the judgment of the finest Biblical scholarship of the world as to the teaching of the New Testament, then we need not be in any doubt as to the Scripturalness of instrumental music as an accompaniment to the singing in Christian worship. There is not an outstanding Biblical scholar in the world to-day who supports the negative in this discussion. I challenge Brother Boles to name one just one. But their name is legion who support the affirmative.

We now turn to the second main line of testimony in support of the proposition—apostolic example. If we find that the apostles and the church at Jerusalem were in the habit of attending and participating in the devotional services of the temple, where all admit instruments were used, then we have strong ground for their use in worship to-day. It will not be difficult to determine whether they did or not, if we are willing to accept what the New Testament plainly says.

It is certain that the apostles and the early Christians were in the habit of going to the temple, both before and after Pentecost. Luke (24:53) says that after the ascension the disciples returned to Jerusalem, "and were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God." In Acts 2:46, 47 we have: "And day by day, continuing steadfastly with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread at home, they did eat their food with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people." Again, in the third chapter, we read: "Now Peter and John were going up into the temple at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour." These passages show us unmistakably that the apostles and the church at Jerusalem frequently and regularly went to the temple.

Now, why did they go? If they went to worship, that settles the question of apostolic example, and no amount of, false reasoning can explain it away. Take the first passage. It says that they "were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God." What they did in the temple tells us plainly why they went there. Going to the temple for this purpose had been their custom all their lives. Take the second passage. This was after the church was founded, and these people were the church. What does the passage say they continued to do? They "continued in the temple." What were they doing? "Praising God" in those very same devotional services to which they had been accustomed al} their lives. The third passage says that Peter and John went to the temple at the hour of prayer, or, as it has been suggested, for the hour of prayer. Why did they go to the temple? Unless we are burdened with some needy theory, the reason will be right before our eyes. They went, as: was their custom, to worship. The fact that they preached the gospel on that occasion grew out of an occurrence that neither of them anticipated when they started for the temple. The healing of the lame man called for explanation. This led to the first trouble they had had in the temple, which clearly shows that it was the first time they had attempted to preach the gospel in those devotional services. And this attendance upon the devotional services of the temple continued till its destruction, twenty-five years later. These obvious facts have never been questioned, so far as know, by any reputable Biblical scholar. The case is too plain to admit of controversy.

We raise this question: Did the fact that the apostles and; early church engaged in the devotional exercises of the temple necessarily commit them to the ceremonial observances of the law of Moses, which were being performed daily by the priests in the temple proper? I answer, no, it did not, and for the very good reason that these exercises of prayer and praise were no part of the Levitical ritual of the temple. The ninth chapter of Hebrews tells us the elements of this ritual, which included offerings and sacrifices, the burning

of incense, etc. It was this ritual that Christ nailed to the cross, and instrumental music was no part of it. There is not a word said in the law of Moses about prayer or singing or instrumental music. We know that David, the poet-musician, introduced instrumental and vocal music in connection with the temple, and it is said that he did it by the commandment of God. (2 Chron. 29:25.) But it was no part of the Mosaic economy.

That prayer meeting in the temple precincts, with its vocal and instrumental music, was an indication of the growing sense of the spiritual in worship on the part of the people, and would seem a kind of foretaste, or prophecy, of the day when all would worship the Father "in spirit and in truth."

A word more. Various questions came up in the days of the apostles—questions about circumcision, sacrifices, observance of days, etc., among the Jewish Christians; and of eating meats offered to idols, etc., among the Gentile Christians. But never once was the validity of instrumental music in worship raised. No question of its propriety was ever even hinted at. Is it said in reply that the very silence of the New Testament is an argument against its use in the church? The New Testament is not silent, as we have seen. But if it were silent, that fact alone, instead of being an argument against it, would, on the contrary, be crushing proof in favor of it. The Jews had been using instruments in their worship for centuries; and if the Lord had intended that it should be omitted in Christian worship, he certainly would have said so in plain terms. The fact that it is not plainly forbidden shows that neither Christ nor the apostles said anything against it.

CHAPTER XVIII

NINTH NEGATIVE

Lest the reader forget the issue, we restate it. Brother Clubb is trying to prove that the New Testament Scriptures teach that "the mechanical instrument is in Christian worship " His proposition places upon him the burden of proving that the mechanical instrument is one of the essential elements "in Christian worship;" not that the instrument is a help or an aid to worship, but that it is in Christian Worship.

In Chapter XIV, fifteen standard authorities from encyclopedias and histories of music were quoted, showing

that the early church did not use instrumental music even an aid to worship or in any other way connected with Christian worship. Brother Clubb has a unique way of meeting this great array of scholarly witnesses which have borne testimony against his proposition; he dismisses these encyclopedias and histories with a wave of the hand. He says that some of them "do not speak to the point ;" that others "are vague and indefinite ;" and that still others "who do speak to the subject give no proof, merely make unsupported assertions." This is a very serious charge to make against standard authorities; and such a charge does not weaken the testimony of these authorities, but only shows the weakness of Brother Clubb's position or his reckless way of making assertions. I ask the reader to review the evidence as quoted from these standard authorities in Chapter XIV. For the convenience of the reader I reproduce some of the evidence:

SCHAFF-HERZOG: "It is questionable whether, as used in the New Testament, 'psallo' means more than to sing.

The absence of instrumental music from the church for some centuries after the apostles and the sentiment regarding it

which pervades the writings of the fathers are unaccountable, if in the apostolic church such MUSIC was used."

KILLEN: "In the early church the whole congregation joined in the singing, but instrumental music did not accompany the praise." It seems to me that this is very definite and to the point.

E. S. LORENZ: "The music was purely vocal. There was no instrumental accompaniment of any kind." This also seems to be to the point and is not "vague and indefinite."

UNTERSEINER: "It was exclusively vocal, for the Christian had an aversion to instruments which served at pagan feasts."

DICKINSON: "The pagan melodies were always sung to an instrumental accompaniment; the church chant was exclusively vocal."

HUMPHREYS: "All the music employed in their early services was vocal."

McCLINTOCK AND STRONG: "The Greek word 'psallo' is applied among the Greeks of modern times exclusively to sacred music, which in the Eastern Church has never been other than vocal, as it was in the primitive church."

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

Now, Brother Clubb says that these great scholars "merely make unsupported assertions." Of course, Brother Clubb would have us take his assertions rather than the testimony of these scholars. I prefer the scholars' evidence to Brother Clubb's assertions; hence, we conclude that the early church did not use the mechanical instrument.

Brother Clubb now states that he "will use two or three undisputed authorities among the encyclopedias to show that the early church was not only permitted to use instrumental accompaniment to the singing, but in all probabilities they did use it." His first witness from what he calls "undisputed authorities among encyclopedias" is McClintock and Strong. He gives a garbled quotation from Volume VIII, taking some sentences from one paragraph and then

a sentence from another paragraph, and, reversing the order, he gives us a hotchpotch which he thinks has some bearing on his-proposition. I wonder why Brother Clubb did not give this evidence from McClintock and Strong: "The Greek word 'psallo' is applied among the Greeks of modern times exclusively to sacred music, which in the Eastern Church has never been any other than vocal, instrumental music being unknown in that church, as it was in the primitive church." Encyclopedia, Volume VIII, page 739.) Here we have the statement from this "undisputed authority" that instrumental music was unknown "in the primitive church." Again, this same "undisputed authority" says: "Students of ecclesiastical archaeology are generally agreed that instrumental music was not used in churches till a much later date." (Encyclopedia, Volume VIII, page 739.)

Again, Brother Clubb refers to Dr. J. A. Robinson's testimony. He is not pleased with Dr. Robinson's evidence, as it is opposed to his proposition. He first perverted Dr. Robinson's evidence by adding a clause to it. I had to expose him on this, and he very humbly acknowledged that he had added to the testimony. He now tries to confuse the reader by his comments on it. In order to keep the record clear, I give space for a reproduction of Dr. Robinson's comment on Eph. 5:19. He says: "In the earliest times these suppers were hallowed by the solemn 'breaking of the bread,' followed by singing, exhortations, and prayer."

Again, Brother Clubb quotes from a private letter of Dr. A. T. Robertson, in which he says that he sees "no objection to the use of instrumental music in worship." Possibly Dr. Robertson wrote that to Brother Clubb. But what does it matter if he did? He has published in book form, in commenting on James 5:13, the following: " 'Psalleto,' the word originally meant to play on a stringed instrument (Sir. 9:4), but it comes to be used also for singing with the voice and the heart (Eph. 5:19; 1 Cor. 14:15), making melody with the heart also to the Lord." Brother Clubb cannot escape the force of this quotation.

Attention is called again to a general law governing the use of words—namely: "Every word in a given passage has, in that place, one fixed meaning, and no more." In this discussion Brother Clubb claimed that *"psallo"* in the same passage meant to include and also exclude the mechanical instrument—that is, "it meant to sing with or without the instrument." This law was quoted to show that his claim was both ridiculous and absurd. No word can mean two different things in the same passage Another law of interpretation was given—namely: "Whatever be the true sense of a word under any given set of circumstances, it will in all case. retain that sense under the same circumstances." This was given to show that *"psallo"* must mean the same thing in all five of the passages where it is used in the New Testament; and since a word has one, and only one, meaning under a given set of circumstances, and the circumstances were the same in all of the five passages, then it must retain the same meaning in all of the five instances. This defeats Brother Clubb's contention that *"psallo"* can mean to "sing with or without an instrument." Whatever *"psallo"* means in one instance, it must mean that in all five of these passages; it cannot mean to sing with an instrument in one place, and then mean to sing without in instrument in another place.

This reasoning puts Brother Clubb in a dilemma. He must use the instrument all of the time, or he must use only vocal music. Brother Clubb felt the force of this, but was hopeless and helpless, so he had to abandon his pet theory about "psallo."

The point was made that *"psallo"* may retain the figurative idea of an instrument in its New Testament use, but not the mechanical instrument; that it is the instrument of the human heart. As proof of this point, quotations were given from Dr. John Gill, "Biblical Commentary," Thomas Scott, and R. Milligan. Dr. Milligan said: "It is pretty evident that in Ephesians and Colossians the term 'psalmos' has no reference whatever to instrumental music; for in both cases it is the strings or chords of the heart, and not of an instru-

ment, that are to be touched." Absolutely nothing was said about "silent music;" neither was anything said from which any logical inference could be drawn about "silent music."

Brother Clubb makes the assertion that "we have found very clear teaching by precept in the New Testament on the subject of instrumental music in worship." I am sure that the reader smiled when this statement was read. It was made, not because it was true, but as an attempt to cover his failure to give a single passage of Scripture that even remotely hints at a mechanical instrument "in Christian worship." There is no Scripture in the New Testament that supports his proposition, and every one who is familiar with the New Testament Scriptures knows that there is no Scripture to support his proposition. He quoted five passages upon which he relied as support of his proposition; he does not claim that any other passage supports it. I showed that these five upon which he relies for his support do not mention the mechanical instrument "in Christian worship." He himself dose not believe that they do) for he has abandoned them and has gone into another field hunting for proof of his proposition.

Next he makes a display of false tactics by saying: "There is not an outstanding Biblical scholar in the world to-day who supports the negative in this discussion. I challenge Brother Boles to name one." What does such a challenge prove? May I say that "there is not an outstanding Biblical scholar in the world to-day who supports" the affirmative side of baptism for the remission of sins; but does that prove that baptism is not for the remission of sins? "There is not an outstanding Biblical scholar in the world to-day" but that recognizes denominational churches as Scriptural; but does that prove that they are Scriptural? Brother Clubb should see the fallacy of his own reasoning in attempting to answer these questions.

APOSTOLIC EXAMPLE

Brother Clubb calls this his "second main line of testimony in support of the proposition." He makes a few as-

sumptions and assertions which are not true to facts, and then claims to draw the conclusion that the apostles used the mechanical instrument "in Christian worship." His first assumption is that mechanical instruments of music were used in all acts of worship in the temple; second, he assumes that the apostles went into the temple and used these instruments; third, that the apostles continued to worship according to the Jewish ritual of worship. He makes the bare assertion "that the apostles participated in those very same devotional services to which they had been accustomed all their lives." Again, he asserts, without any proof whatever, that the apostles went after Pentecost; "as was their custom, to the temple to worship." Now, from these unsupported assumptions and bare assertions he would have the reader draw the conclusion that the New Testament teaches that the mechanical instrument is "in Christian worship." Such reasoning, if it may be called "reasoning," may be refuted by any tyro in logic. There is no grammatical or logical relation between his proposition and the conclusion; neither is there any logical relation between his unproved premises and his conclusion.; However, as we are in the negative, we wish to examine the Scriptures which he gives and his arguments. His first Scripture is Luke 24:58: "And were continually in the temple, blessing God." This refers to the acts of the apostles between the ascension of Christ and Pentecost. It was before the descent of the Holy Spirit and also before the church was established. So whatever was done by the apostles before Pentecost cannot be taken as a criterion for Christian worship after Pentecost. But let us look a little closer at this Scripture and see if it supports Brother Clubb's proposition. Brother Clubb assumes that the apostles went into the temple and participated in the Jewish worship; he also assumes that instruments of music were in the Jewish worship at this time; he further assumes that the apostles used mechanical instruments in their "blessing God." W. G. Ballantine translates this Scripture as follows: "Were constantly in the temple courts blessing God." Ac-

cording to this translation, the apostles were only in the courts of the temple, and not in the temple. Brother Clubb quoted Ballantine as one of his scholars on "psallo." I wonder if he will now take him on this Scripture.

His next Scriptures are found in Acts 2:46, 47; 3:1. These Scriptures say that the apostles and disciples were "with one accord in the temple," and, "Peter and John were going up into the temple at the hour of prayer." McGARVEY: commenting on the first Scripture, says: "This shows plainly that the temple was the daily meeting place of the church. Its courts were open at all times; all Jews had as free access to them as to the streets of the city." ("Commentary on Acts," Volume I, page 48.) H. B. Hackett says in commenting on Acts 3:1: "We have seen in the second chapter that, in connection with the worship of the temple, the believers at Jerusalem maintained separate religious worship among themselves." ("Commentary on Acts," page 57.) T. O. Summers, commenting on the same Scripture, says: "The court of the temple is meant." ("Commentary on Acts," page 66.) From this we learn that the apostles and other disciples met in the courts of the temple and formed separate groups of worshipers apart from the unbelieving Jews, who worshiped according to the Jewish ritual. The early Christians did not meet and participate in the worship according to the Jewish ritual; hence, they did not participate in the worship of the Jews. Even if it should be granted that the mechanical instrument was used in the Jewish worship at this time, it does not follow that the apostles worshiped with these instruments.

Brother Clubb's argument on apostolic example proves too much, and, therefore, proves nothing. If their going into the temple proves that they indorsed and used instrumental music, it also proves that they burned incense and indorsed the burning of incense as an act of Christian worship. If not, why not? I call upon Brother Clubb to answer. There is nothing in his "apostolic-example" argument, as the reader can see.

CHAPTER XIX

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE

A simple re-reading of Chapter XVII will be quite sufficient as an answer to most that Brother Boles says in Chapter XVIII in reply to it. Two or three points, however, I briefly note.

First, Brother Boles' interpretation of Eph. 5:19, in which he admits that "psallontes" in that passage has the figurative meaning of to play, the instrument being the human heart. But he denies that this music is silent music. Let the reader notice that "adontes" in this passage indicates singing; so they were already singing. Now, what else were they told to do by "psallontes"—singing and doing what? Brother Boles says in so many words that they were told to play on the chords of the heart. Is playing on the chords of the heart audible or inaudible? Why, anybody knows that it is silent, or inaudible. He has already said that *"psallo"* means the same thing in each instance of its use in the New Testament, and he says it means touching the chords of the heart in Eph. 5:19, which we see is silent music. Then it follows that it means silent music in Rom. 15:9; 1 Cor. 14:15; and James 5:13. There is no escape from this. But this conclusion is absurd. Yes, it is; but it is the only legitimate conclusion one can draw from his interpretation. Brother Boles has surrendered his whole contention, but seems unable to see that he has. The fact is that *"psallo"* in Eph. 5:19 is no more silent than "ado." Wherever the singing is done, the playing is done, and, according to Professor Moule, of Cambridge University, both singing and playing are literal and external; but both are said to be spiritual, and so in the heart. That is sensible and reasonable, and no other interpretation is.

Brother Boles' reply to my argument from apostolic ex-

ample is so weak and void of reason that I pass it by with one brief remark. My argument gives no countenance to the burning of incense. The ninth chapter of Hebrews plainly says that the censer (in which the incense was burned) was a definite part of the Levitical ritual which was done away in Christ. Nothing is plainer than this. We have very definite and positive instruction as to incense. But singing and prayer and instrumental music were no part of the Levitical ritual—no part of the Mosaic economy—and, hence, were not included in the things which had "waxed old and were ready to vanish away." Just here I remark that Professor McGARVEY: admits that the early Christians continued to worship in the temple after Pentecost, as they had been accustomed to do before. And to this agree both Prof. H. B. Hackett, a member of the American Committee of Revision till his death, and Prof. Bernard Weiss, of Berlin University. So far as I know, there is not a Biblical authority who takes any other position in regard to the matter. The case is too plain to admit of contradiction.

Any one who is willing to follow the example of the early Christians in the matter of worship in the temple will have no difficulty in knowing just what they did. To say that they did not attend that same old prayer meeting in the temple to which they had been accustomed in the past is absurd, and would never have been thought of but for the desperate need of an untenable theory.

One word more before I pass on. The reader will notice that Brother Boles passes up my challenge that he name one outstanding scholar that supports his contention. I want to assert that no scholar with a reputation to sustain among scholars has ever said, or ever will say, that *"psallo"* was restricted to vocal music in New Testament times—that is, that no outstanding scholar in the world has said or will say that the word means to sing to the exclusion of instrumental accompaniment. Their name is legion, however, who say that it carries with it instrumental signification.

CHRISTIAN EXPEDIENCY

We come now to the third main argument—that of Christian expediency. That there is a large class of things which come within the sphere of expediency in the work and worship of Christians is so clearly taught in the New Testament that it needs no special emphasis here. So many things are left to human discretion and choice in the practical details of the Christian life that one can scarcely move without feeling the need of the liberty of expediency. This liberty is recognized by all Christians of every name, and has always been.

In the large class of things which necessarily come within this sphere, we have the Sunday school, the Christian Endeavor Society, the Bible college, the publishing house, Sunday-school helps, tuning forks, the music scale in the hymn book, the hymn book itself, church buildings, methods of missionary work, etc. All of these are simple expedients, about which the New Testament is silent. They are neither commanded nor forbidden. The only legitimate question to be raised about any of them is a question of expediency. Are they helpful? Are they an effective means of doing what must be done? Is their use in conflict in any way with what is commanded?

The only law in the realm of expediency is that stated by Paul: "Let all things be done unto edifying." If the Sunday school is a good thing; if it serves a good end in teaching the word of God; if it is not inconsistent with what is required, then it is right to have a Sunday school. And let it be remembered that this is the only authority we have for a Sunday school.

Sunday-school helps can be justified only on the ground of expediency. The only question to determine is, are they helps in the study of the Scriptures? Is their use beneficial? Do they conflict with what is enjoined? E. G. Sewell said a sane thing in the Gospel Advocate of November 5, 1911: "Whenever people object to the use of written helps, they are simply uttering their own opinions. All such objectors

to helps written by Bible scholars, who teach the word of God in its own proper division and connection, should be required to show where the word of God is violated, or to hold their peace and cease to stir up strife, division, and confusion." These words apply with equal appropriateness to the subject we are discussing. Where is the passage of Scripture that is violated by the use of instrumental music as an accompaniment to the singing in worship? No one has ever pointed it out. No one ever can.

The tuning fork is justified by the opposers of instrumental music on the ground that its use is necessary to get the correct pitch in singing. The only real authority for its use is the law of expediency. It is not necessary to have the correct pitch in singing. For ages people sang without the tuning fork, and without notes, either. Is it a good thing to have the correct pitch? Surely it is. Does it violate any commandment? No. Then that is authority enough for its use. But you cannot justify it on the ground of necessity, for it is not necessary. But, now, if it is a good thing to get the correct pitch, it is equally a good thing to keep it. If it is right to use a mechanical instrument in getting the pitch, in starting a song, it cannot be wrong to use a mechanical instrument to keep the correct pitch all the way through.

If instrumental music is wrong in Christian worship, it must be on one or more of three grounds. (1) It must be sinful per se—that is, in itself. Nobody affirms this, for all know that God ordained it in the worship in the temple, and we are told that it is a part of the worship in heaven. It cannot, therefore, be sinful in itself. (2) It must be plainly prohibited in the New Testament. I have repeatedly called on my opponent to give the passage of Scripture which clearly prohibits its use as an accompaniment to the singing in worship. He has not even attempted to do it, because there is none. We have a right to ask the opposers of instrumental music to show where any Scripture is violated, to use Brother Sewell's words, or else "cease to stir up strife, division, and confusion." I have not said in this discussion

that instrumental music is commanded, nor have I said that singing is commanded as an ordinance in the sense in which, for instance, baptism is; for if singing be an ordinance in that sense, then everybody would have to sing or be in rebellion against God. We are exhorted to sing. To my mind, it is the character of the singing which is enjoined upon Christians; they are told to sing psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, because they are edifying. (3) It must interfere with what is enjoined in the Scriptures. Does instrumental music as an accompaniment to the singing interfere in any way with what we are exhorted to do? It certainly does not. Since instrumental music is neither commanded nor prohibited, is not sinful in itself, does not in any way interfere with what we are exhorted to do, then the only question we can legitimately raise concerning it is: Is it a help or a hindrance? Is it expedient? On this question the verdict is well-nigh unanimous.

What is the use made of instrumental music in the worship? First, to improve the singing; therefore, to better do what we are exhorted to do. It is the universal opinion of those who understand music that an instrument aids the voice in singing. This is the testimony of congregations and individuals. It does not need emphasis. Second, the enrichment of worship. It creates an atmosphere congenial to worship. An instrument, properly played, awakens the deepest feelings of the soul. As Prof. W. K. Pendleton said: "I love it with a love that passes expression. The grand tones of the organ lift any soul up with a power ineffably sublime." When the soul is lifted up thus, it becomes easy to pour it out in praise and adoration to God. We come to associate the words with the tune, and when we hear the tones of the organ sounding forth the tune, "Joy to the world, the Lord is come, let earth receive her King," the deepest emotions of our hearts are stirred, and once more we crown him King of our lives.

WORSHIP IN HEAVEN

We come now to the fourth and last main argument in favor of instrumental music in worship—worship in heaven. Each of the four is unanswerable, but I think this is the strongest of all. Let us grasp its full significance. "And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a 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." (Rev. 14:2, 3.) If instrumental music in worship is a sin on earth, is it not a sin in heaven? John, the beloved, in his old age, when his spiritual vision, free from all earthly dross, could pierce through the pearly gates, saw repeatedly the harpers harping upon their harps, and with an ear that could catch the spiritual sounds of heaven he heard the music around the throne of God. You say this language is figurative. HOW do you know it is? May there not be spiritual harps in heaven? Are spirits deaf and dumb? Is heaven an asylum for the deaf and dumb? God is not deaf. He who made the ear, can he not hear? But if it is a figure, would not the apostle have been very careful to have used a pure and appropriate figure? But it may be said that in Rev. 5:8 incense is spoken of as being in heaven. Yes, but it is specifically stated that the bowls of incense represent or symbolize the prayers of the saints, and of course those who offer the prayers do not need the symbols at the same time, and it would be out of place to use them. We are not to use incense here on earth, because we are taught to pray, and we do not need the symbol when we have the reality.

There are said to be four dispensations of religion—the patriarchal, the Mosaic, the Christian, and the heavenly. We know that instrumental music was in the patriarchal, the Mosaic, and is in the heavenly. Is it conceivable that God left it out of the church, or the Christian? If he had meant to do so, would he not have plainly said so? Where is the Scripture which plainly tells us that God purposely

left it out of the Christian dispensation? There is none. But the evidence is simply overwhelming to the contrary.

In closing this discussion, may I be permitted to express an honest conviction? In my researches, covering over a year of patient examination of everything bearing directly or indirectly on the subject of instrumental music in worship, I have been struck with the great amount of evidence in support of the affirmative side, and I have also been struck with how little there is to be said against instrumental music in worship. My opponent has done the best he could with the amount of material he has had. Perhaps some might have stated his case in a smoother, more gracious manner, but he has given all the arguments there are on his side. When summed up, they amount to this: the New Testament is silent on the subject. But the New Testament is not silent, as we have given overwhelming evidence to show.

One other conviction I want to express. After going through this discussion, I am wholly unable to understand how Brother Boles and his brethren can refuse to have fellowship with me. Surely they have no just grounds for this refusal.

Over the door of a great library in Europe are the words: "Read not to accept or reject, but to weigh and consider." I trust all who have followed me in this discussion have been moved by this spirit.

CHAPTER XX

TENTH NEGATIVE

We now come to the last and closing chapter of this discussion. Brother Clubb has been laboring to prove that the New Testament Scriptures teach that the mechanical instrument "is in Christian worship." He has closed his part of the discussion, and it is now in order to raise the question: Has he proved his proposition? What reader can turn to the New Testament and read the verse that even mentions a mechanical instrument "in Christian worship?" Brother Clubb has used ten chapters, with more than two thousand words in each chapter, using more than twenty thousand words, trying to tell the public and the patient reader where to find the Scripture that supports his proposition. But the public is no wiser, for no Scripture has been found. Time and space have been wasted in a labored effort to becloud the issue and hide his defeat.

Attention is called again to Eph. 5:19. Nothing is said about silent music. The only sense in which an instrument is referred to is; a figurative use. I quote again what the scholarly Christian, Dr. Milligan, in commenting on this Scripture, says. He says: "According to this fundamental law of interpretation, it is pretty evident that in Ephesians and Colossians the term 'psalmos' has no reference whatever to instrumental music; for, in both cases, it is the strings or chords of the heart, and not of an instrument, that are to be touched." Dr. Milligan is supported by an array of scholars in this interpretation. There is no mechanical instrument to be used in "singing and making melody in the heart."

Attention is called again to the argument made on "apostolic example." Brother Clubb assumed that the mechanical instrument was used in all acts of Jewish worship in the

temple; he also assumed that the apostles went into the temple and used these instruments; again, he assumed that the apostles continued to worship according to the Jewish ritual of worship. After making these bare assumptions, he makes the unsupported statement that the apostles used instrumental music in their worship. How does he know that the apostles used the mechanical instrument? He has no authority for saying that the apostles worshiped with the mechanical instrument. This is the very point that he should prove.

His argument on "apostolic example" proves too much; it proves that if the apostles' going into the temple indorsed instrumental music, that their example also indorsed the burning of incense in Christian worship. His argument here makes the early Christians have full fellowship with infidel Jews who worshiped in the temple.

The temple was a public meeting place, and the apostles went there because they had an opportunity to teach the people. They were told: "Go ye, and stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life." (Acts 5:20.) Again, the record states that "every day, in the temple and at home, they ceased not to teach and to preach Jesus as the Christ." (Verse 42.) These Scriptures show that they were commanded by the Holy Spirit to go to the temple, the general assembling place of the Jews, and there "teach and preach Jesus as the Christ," not to go and worship with the infidel Jews.

The baptized believers after Pentecost, who were in the temple, "continued steadfastly with one accord" and were of "singleness of heart." (See Acts 2:46.) "With one accord" means in harmony of sentiment, action, worship, etc. The control of the temple with its worship was in the hands of unbelieving Jews, infidel Jews, the murderers of the Son of God. The early disciples could not be "with one accord" and "singleness of heart" with these infidel Jews in their worship. Paul said: "What concord hath Christ with Belial? or what portion hath a believer with an unbeliever?"

(2 Cor. 6:5.) It is preposterous to contend that the early

disciples, led by the apostles, entered into fellowship with the murderers of Christ and worshiped with them. Yet this is what Brother Clubb claims the apostles did.

Brother Clubb claims that I "passed up" his challenge to name one scholar on my side of this question. Again, as usual, he is mistaken. His challenge proves nothing. Every standard translation of the New Testament is on my side of this question, for every standard translation translates *"psallo"* by "sing." Brother Clubb cannot find the mechanical instrument mentioned in any standard translation of the New Testament Scriptures.

His third argument is based on "Christian expediency." In discussing expedients, he says that they are good things "about which the New Testament is silent." He now puts instrumental music in the class of expediencies; hence, "the New Testament is silent" on the mechanical instrument in Christian worship. May I ask, how can "the New Testament be silent" on a thing and at the same time teach that thing? What a sad predicament he is in! He can never extricate himself from this tangle. He has forgotten the motto of the Campbells: "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; and where the Bible is silent, we are silent." He labored for seven chapters trying to show that "the New Testament is not silent," for it spoke through "psallo," and that the New Testament use of *"psallo"* included the mechanical instrument. He contended for seven chapters that Paul included the mechanical instrument in all five instances of the use of "psallo." Behold, now he says that "the New Testament is silent" on instrumental music! He now declares that the New Testament says absolutely nothing about instrumental music in Christian worship. He and I are agreed on this. Probably this is the first time throughout the discussion that we have agreed; but we both now proclaim loudly to the entire brotherhood that "the New Testament is silent" on the mechanical instrument in Christian worship. We both say that there is absolutely no Scripture in the New Testament that teaches the use of the mechanical instrument "in Christian worship." In this admission that "the

New Testament is silent" on instrumental music in Christian worship he surrenders his proposition.

I have frequently urged him to tell whether singing is commanded, and he finally says: "I have not said in this discussion that instrumental music is commanded, nor have I said that singing is commanded as an ordinance in the sense in which, for instance, baptism is." What a clumsy evasion! Suppose he should be asked, Is forgiveness commanded?" and he should reply, "Not as an ordinance, like baptism." Suppose he should be asked, Is contributing of our means commanded?" and he should reply, "Not like baptism." Any one could see that he would be evading. I did not ask him if singing was commanded as an ordinance, like baptism; I asked him, 'Is singing commanded?" He was afraid to answer, because he knew that the very words which commanded singing would command the use of the mechanical instrument, if the New Testament use' of *"psallo"* included the mechanical instrument.

He now says: "It is the character of the singing which is enjoined upon Christians." Now, what have we? Singing is not enjoined, but "the character of singing" is enjoined upon Christians. How can "the character of singing" be "enjoined," and not singing itself be "enjoined?" No one can "enjoin the character of singing"' upon any one without "enjoining" singing itself.

Brother Clubb says that the mechanical instrument is used for two things—namely, (a) to improve the singing;

(b) to enrich the worship. These two uses include the full scope of the mechanical instrument. He has given no proof that the mechanical instrument improves the singing. In fact, the very opposite is the truth in the matter. Dr. H. Christopher says: "When sacred music becomes so highly artistic as to suit instruments and choirs, it degenerates into a mere musical entertainment; and such is really its character in churches where instruments and choirs exist. It resembles more the orchestral music of theaters, which is designed to entertain the audience while the curtain is down, than spiritual worship, welling up from the soul in

gratitude and praise to the great Fountain of Life and blessing; and the congregation has no more to do with the singing of choirs than the audience of the theater has with the music of the orchestra." ("Lard's Quarterly," Volume IV, page 364.) No,- the mechanical instrument does not improve the singing; the best singing is usually found where no instrument is used in the worship.

His second use of the mechanical instrument is to "enrich the worship." Really, does it enrich the worship? How does Brother Clubb know? What Scriptural authority has he for this statement? Truly, God wants us to give him our best; he wants us to give him the fullest and richest worship possible. Is it not strange that "the New Testament is silent" on that which so enriches the worship? I am sure that the reader is not willing to take Brother Clubb's bare assertions on this point. Paul says: "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work." (2 Tim. 3:16, 17.) Since the Scriptures give complete instruction to the man of God "unto every good work," and since "the New Testament is silent" on the mechanical instrument, we must conclude that the mechanical instrument is not a good work and, therefore, does not enrich Christian worship.

WORSHIP IN HEAVEN

We now come to Brother Clubb's fourth and last argument. He thinks "this is the strongest of all." He quotes Rev. 14:2: "And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder: and the voice which I heard was as the voice of harpers harping with their harps." Let the reader note closely this Scripture. It does not say that there were harps in heaven or that John heard harps in heaven. It says that John heard "the voice," which was "as the voice of harpers harping with their harps;" "the voice" which John heard was "as

the voice of harpers," and this "voice" was "singing as it were a new song." (See verse 3.) "The voice" was not playing on a harp, but "singing a new song." So Brother Clubb's strongest argument is taken from him. However, like his apostolic-example argument, it- proves too much; for if it proves that instrumental music should be used in Christian worship, it proves also that the burning of incense should be used in Christian worship, for we read: "Having each one a harp, and golden bowls full of incense, which are the prayers of the saints." (Rev. 5:8.) If instruments in heaven proves that the mechanical instrument should be used in Christian worship, it proves that the burning of incense should be used in Christian worship.

Now let us review briefly Brother Clubb's four main arguments. They are as follows: (1) Based on New Testament meaning of "psallo ;" (2) apostolic example; (3) Christian expediency; (4) worship in heaven. A close analysis shows that these four arguments do not support his proposition; they are not parallel with each other; they are not cumulative. They are contradictory the one to the other and nullify each other.

His argument on the New Testament use of *"psallo"* was met with an array of scholars which testify that the New Testament use of the word *"psallo"* does not include the mechanical instrument; in defining the New Testament use of "psallo," the mechanical instrument is excluded; they say it means "to sing, to praise God in song." Every standard translation of the New Testament translates *"psallo"* by "sing." Brother Clubb was driven by the most remorseless logic and by the highest consideration for honesty and consistency into this dilemma—namely, he must use the mechanical instrument or he must renounce his contention as to the New Testament use of "psallo." He has never, and he can never, escape the force of this dilemma. It wrecks his proposition.

His argument on apostolic example proved too much; it proved that the burning of incense could be used in Christian worship, if the mechanical instrument is used. It

forced him to the inevitable conclusion that the early Christians, led by the apostles, had full fellowship in the worship with infidel Jews, the murderers of Christ.

His third argument, based on Christian expediency, nullified his argument based on *"psallo"* and apostolic example. He labored with seven chapters to prove that the New Testament spoke through *"psallo"* and included the mechanical instrument. In his discussion on Christian expediency he says that "the New Testament is silent" on instrumental music; that the New Testament has nothing whatever to say about the mechanical instrument being "in Christian worship." In making this argument he confesses that he has no Scripture for the use of the mechanical instrument in worship. He surrenders his proposition, virtually saying that there is no Scripture which teaches that the mechanical instrument is "in Christian worship."

In his fourth argument, which is "worship in heaven," he misinterprets Rev. 14:2. He claims that whatever is found in heaven ought to be in the church. Incense is mentioned in Revelation along with harps; and if because harps are mentioned in heaven they ought to be in Christian worship, then, since incense is mentioned as being in heaven, the same logic will place the burning of incense in Christian worship.

In closing this discussion, I wish to thank Brother Clubb for giving me the opportunity of examining the best arguments that can be presented on the affirmative side of this proposition I have kept the issue definitely before the reader. Brother Clubb has complained about this, and says that the negative side "might have been stated in a smoother, more gracious manner." I knew it was not pleasant to him to point out his misquotations and attempts to evade, but felt that it was my duty to do so. I have enjoyed the discussion, and must say that my faith is stronger and my determination firmer to stand upon the New Testament Scriptures, believing them. to be complete and to furnish the man of God completely unto every good work. I thank the Christian-Evangelist for publishing the discussion and the patient reader for following the discussion throughout.

GENERAL INDEX