

*Debate*  
*Notes*  
*On*  
*Instrumental*  
*Music*  
*In Worship*

By  
James E. Cooper

*Debate*  
*Notes*  
*On*  
*Instrumental*  
*Music*  
*In Worship*

By

**James E. Cooper**

### Note:

These notes were originally developed over four decades ago for a debate on the use of mechanical instruments of music in worship at Campbellsville, KY. Disputants were Raymond S. Bennett, of Jamestown, KY, and James E. Cooper, of Campbellsville. The original intent was to have two nights in Campbellsville and two nights at Jamestown, KY. However, the discussion was not continued for the two nights at Jamestown.

These notes contain my First Affirmative Speech, and an outline of anticipated possible negative arguments by my opponent. They were gathered from various sources, most of which have long been forgotten.

The student should be aware that merely *asserting* that a passage authorizes a practice does not prove that it does. One must always consider what the passage says in the context in which it is found. For instance, "music and dancing" (cf. pg. 33) in celebrating a "homecoming" is not the same as "music and dancing" in the worship of the church.

One should also be aware that there is a rule in logic that says, "what proves too much proves nothing." Devotees of instrumental music in worship often make arguments to defend the use of mechanical instruments that could be consistently used for practices in which they would not think of engaging. They won't apply the principle they argue!

While I was preaching in Campbellsville, KY, Fanning Yater Tant came to town to preach in a Gospel Meeting. In one of his sermons he made this statement: "There is one argument in favor of mechanical instruments of music that you cannot answer by the Bible." While we were trying to think of what it might be, he continued: "That argument goes like this—'We like it, we want it, and we're going to keep it!'" This attitude illustrates the basic difference between those who do, and those who do not use mechanical instruments in the worship. Those who "like it, want it, and are determined to keep it" will do so regardless of whether they have authority in the scriptures or not. Those who respect God's silence as well as his revelation will not presume to act without His authority. We are limited by what Divine authority has revealed.

—James E. Cooper.

May, 2001.

# Table of Contents

First Affirmative Speech .....	1
Index to Negative Arguments .....	10
I. The "Aid" Argument .....	10
II. The General Old Testament Argument .....	12
III. The General New Testament Argument .....	14
IV. Argument that Instrumental Music is as Scriptural as Congregational Singing .....	15
V. The "Natural Talent" Argument .....	16
VI. Instrumental Music in Heaven Argument .....	16
VII. Argument on "the Church of the Firstborn" .....	17
VIII. Argument Based on David .....	18
IX. Argument Based on "the Law, the Prophets and Psalms" .....	18
X. Argument Based on Psalm 87:5-7 .....	19
XI. Argument Based on the Meaning of "Psallo" .....	21
XII. Argument Based on James 5:13; Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16 .....	22
XIII. Argument Based on 2 Tim. 3:16-17 .....	22
XIV. Argument Based on 2 Chronicles 33:8 .....	25
XV. Argument Based on 1 Kings 10:12 .....	26
XVI. Argument Based on Practice .....	27
XVII. Argument Based on John 4:20-24 .....	27
XVIII. Argument Based on Example of the Jerusalem Church .....	29
XIX. Argument Based on 1 Cor. 14:7-8 .....	30
XX. Argument Based on Matthew 9:23 .....	31
XXI. Argument Based on Luke 15:25 .....	32



## Proposition

**Affirmed:** *"It is contrary to Scripture to use mechanical instruments of music in the worship of God, and therefore sinful."*

Gentlemen Moderators, my opponent, ladies and gentlemen:

It is a privilege to stand before you tonight in defense of the New Testament Church, and the authority of my Lord. We are happy to be able to discuss before you the teaching of the Scriptures. Before I go any further in my part of this discussion, I want to assure you that it is my intention that this discussion shall be conducted on a high and noble plain. It is my desire, and I have the assurance of my opponent that it is his desire, for our discussion to be conducted in such a way that it will be a credit toward honorable and fair debate. Some people have soured on debating because some debates in the past have not been conducted "decently and in order." We are not here to engage in personalities, but to engage in an investigation of the teaching of the Scriptures. I trust that you have come to hear what the Bible has to say about the subject under discussion, and we intend for the discussion to be just that.

Now to the **definition of terms** used in my proposition. It has been said that a proposition clearly defined is half argued. We shall now define the proposition, we trust, in such a way that it cannot be misunderstood.

By "It is," I mean to use the present tense, "in the present dispensation, under Christ." My proposition does not require that I deny that such was never used in the Old, or Mosaic, dispensation. It does not require that I maintain that the use of such instruments were never in harmony with Scripture. There is a great difference between "It is," and "it was." My opponent may go to the Old Testament to argue his case, but I want to emphasize that the Old Testament **was**, but the New Testament **is**. It is like the old farmer once said to the horse trader who was trying to sell him a horse on glowing statements about the history of the horse. The farmer said to the trader, "Tell me what this horse **is**; I don't want a **wuzzer**, I want an **izzer**!" I want now to challenge my opponent to come over to this side of the cross of Christ and find scriptural authority for his position. We do not want a relic of Judaism; we do not want something that belongs to an abrogated age; we want an "is," not a "was" on this proposition.

By "Scripture," I mean the Bible, the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament, and the twenty-seven books of the New. We have authority for our religion in the New Testament, but we can turn back to the Old for examples of God's attitude toward obedience and disobedience. That

which is contained in the Old Testament is written for our learning (Rom.15:4; 1 Cor.10:6, 11).

By "contrary to," I mean "opposite to, not in harmony with." By this term, I mean that such instruments as included in my proposition have no authority in the Doctrine of Christ. When they are used in worship today, they are used without the authority of Christ.

By "mechanical instruments of music," I mean instruments made by men, whether stringed instruments, wind instruments, or percussion instruments.

By "to use," I mean "to employ them to the accompaniment of the singing, or to employ them when there is no singing.

By "in the worship of God," I mean when Christians assemble for paying their reverence to God. Worship is "an act of reverence paid." In a footnote on Mark 5:6, the *American Standard Version* states, "The Greek word [*proskuneō*, jec] denotes **an act of reverence** [emphasis mine, jec], whether paid to a creature (see Matt. 4:9; 18:26) or to the creator (see Matt. 4:10)." The word is stated in my proposition as to mean "an act of reverence paid to the creator."

My opponent may deny that the instrument is "in the worship," that worship is altogether in the heart, and that the instrument is used merely as an aid or help. But in taking this position, he will be departing from our Lord's use of the term, "worship." In Mark 7:3 we find the Lord referring to the ceremonial washing of hands, cups, pots, brazen vessels, and of tables. Continuing on the same subject in the seventh verse, He says, "Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." All such things done as religious acts are included in "worship" as Jesus used the term, and similar regulations are included in "will-worship" as used by Paul in Col. 2:20-23. So must instrumental music be, when used in company with singing in the worship of God. So it was regarded, indeed, when, under the Jewish economy, musical instruments were thus employed; for the Psalmist exclaims:

"Praise Him with the sound of a trumpet:  
Praise Him with the psaltery and harp.  
Praise Him with timbrel and dance:  
Praise Him with stringed instruments and organs."

— Psal. 150:3-4.

To deny, then, that the present use of instrumental music in the church is a part of the worship, is a subterfuge and an afterthought ingeniously gotten up to obscure the fact that it comes under the condemnation pronounced against **vain worship** and **will-worship**.



By "therefore sinful," I mean that when the instrument is used without scriptural authority, for that reason it is sinful. By "sinful," I mean "transgression of the law" or "lawlessness" (1 John 3:4), or "unrighteousness" (1 John 5:17). Webster says that "sin is to transgress, neglect or disregard." A man may sin by disregarding God's law: "to 'disregard a Divine law, depart voluntarily from the path of duty prescribed by God to man; to violate the law by actual transgression, or by neglect.'"

The apostle John provides as an inspired definition of sin — "**Sin is Lawlessness**" (1 John 3:4). "Lawlessness" is a translation of the Greek word, *anomia*, which is defined by Thayer as: "1. Prop. The condition of one without law—either because ignorant of it, or because violating it. 2. Contempt and violation of law, iniquity, wickedness." It is the same word that appears in Matt. 13:41, "The Son of man shall send forth His angels, and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that cause stumbling, and them that do **iniquity**, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire." It also appears in Matt. 7:23, "And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work **iniquity**." Those who work iniquity are those who work **without divine authority**. The context of Matt. 7:23 shows men arguing with the Lord on the day of judgment. They are trying to build their case on the ground that they have prophesied in the name of Christ, worked miracles in the name of Christ, and done many mighty works in His name. However, they are called workers of "iniquity," evidently because the works which they had done had been done without His authority. Hence, when we work without divine authority we become "workers of iniquity," and **iniquity is sin**.

We may sin by adding to the word of God. We may sin by taking from it. We may sin by substituting. Deut. 12:32 says, "whatever I command you, be careful to observe it; You shall not add to it, nor take away from it." Prov. 28:9 says, "He that turns away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer is an abomination." 2 John 9 says, "Whoever transgresses and does not abide in the doctrine of Christ, does not have God; he who abides in the doctrine of Christ has both the Father and the Son."

Now, with our proposition clearly defined, I want to call your attention to **some things not demanded by my proposition**. It does not demand that I condemn men for making instruments of music. It does not demand that I condemn their use by Christians in all places and at all times. My proposition is limited to "the worship of God." It does not demand that I condemn the use of instruments by Christians in home or in school, for purposes of social entertainment. It does not demand that I even prove that congregational singing is scriptural. It does not demand that I defend my belief and practice in things connected with, and pertaining to, either religious teaching or worship. The use made of charts, blackboards, or the use made of a tuning fork and song book is



blackboards, or the use made of a tuning fork and song book is not on trial in this discussion. No doubt but what my opponent will refer to these things in his first negative speech. But, friends, let me re-emphasize, the point. My practice is not in question in this debate. Everything practiced by me and my brethren in the worship of God can, and is, endorsed by my opponent as scriptural.

Now, friends, reference to charts, blackboards, tuning-forks and song books is but begging the question. You have heard that "misery loves company," haven't you? To say that things that I practice are no more scriptural than things he practices doesn't prove the case at all. We are obligated by our propositions to try this one case, and this case concerns the use of mechanical instruments of music in the worship of God. No court attempts to try but one case at a time, and we should stick to our propositions.

Now, **what does my proposition demand of me?** It demands but two things. First, it requires that I show that the instrument of music, when used in the worship of God, is contrary to the Scripture. Secondly, it requires that I show that when it is used contrary to the Scripture, it is sinful, and to continue in such a practice will cause one to be lost.

Our discussion of the term, "sinful," in the definition of our proposition should be sufficient to show that when anything is used contrary to the Scripture, it is sinful. To sin is to do iniquity. To do iniquity is to work without divine authority. The essential thing involved in sin is that the law of God has not been respected and obeyed. It is not limited to the doing of things that God has specifically condemned. To fail to do what God has authorized is to sin just as much as to do what God has forbidden. If I can show that the use of mechanical instruments of music in worship is without divine authority, I will have proved my case.

**My first argument** is that the practice such as defended by my opponent, belongs to a **class of things expressly condemned** in the New Testament. Our Savior said, in reference to certain additions which the Pharisees had made to the ritual of the law, "In vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrine the precepts of men" (Matt. 15:9). In these words Jesus propounds the doctrine that *all worship is vain which originates in human authority*. Putting it negatively, no worship is acceptable to God which he himself has not authorized.

Paul echoes this same teaching when he condemns as the observance "after the precepts and doctrines of men" (Col. 2:20-23). The word translated "will-worship" means worship self-imposed, as distinguished from worship imposed by God, and the practices referred to in the context are condemned on this ground, thus showing that all self-imposed worship is wrong in the sight of God.

I am almost certain that my opponent will admit that there is not the slightest indication in the New Testament of divine authority for the use of mechanical instruments of music in the worship of God today. Hence, he who employs it, engages in "will-worship" according to Paul, and he offers "vain worship" according to Jesus.

However, I want my opponent to answer this question. **Is your authority for instrumental music in the worship from heaven or from men?** Please tell us which it is. Is it by human authority or by divine authority? If it is by human authority, it is condemned in the statement by Jesus in Matt. 15:9 and by Paul in Col. 2:20-23.

If it is claimed to be by divine authority, please produce the authority from the Word of God. In order for it to be in harmony with the Scripture and authorized by God, you must find it authorized either by express command, approved example, or by necessary inference. These are the only ways that divine authority can be established. In order to illustrate this point, I want to call your attention to this chart, entitled, "How to Establish Scriptural Authority."

### **How To Establish Bible Authority (The Lord's Supper)**

1. **Express Command**— "This do in remembrance of me" (1 Cor. 11:23-24).  
(Observance)
2. **Approved Example**— "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread..."  
(Time of Observance) (Acts 20:7).
3. **Necessary Inference**—"The first day of the week...to break bread" means as regularly as the day comes. Compare—"The Sabbath day to keep it holy."
4. **Expediency**— Any hour upon the first day of the week.

You will notice on the chart that we are taking the Lord's Supper as an example. In observing the Lord's Supper upon the first day of each week, we are doing so by divine authority. We find an express command to observe it in 1 Cor. 11:23-24, where the apostle tells us that the Lord gave the bread and the fruit of the vine and told his disciples: "This do in remembrance of me." For the time of observance, we follow an approved example. When Paul came to Troas, as recorded in acts, chapter twenty, the record tells us in verse seven, "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread..." When did the early church meet for observing the Lord's Supper? The answer is, upon the first day of the week. What they did in this regard is an example for us. The apostle Paul lent his influence to this occasion, so we conclude that it

is an approved apostolic example. Now, as to the frequency of observance, we must get that from necessary inference. They met upon the first day of the week. The apostle had been in Troas for a week, but when the first day of the week came, he and the disciples in Troas met to break bread. People sometimes object, "It doesn't say that they met *every* first day of week. But, let's consider an example in the old Covenant. God commanded the Jews to remember the Sabbath (Ex. 20:8). God did not have to say *every* Sabbath, because the Jews knew that the Sabbath came each seventh day. If "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy" meant *every* Sabbath day as regularly as it came, then "the first day of the week to break bread" means *every* first day of the week, as regularly as it comes. The conclusion is inescapable. It is necessarily implied.

The question might arise, "at what hour on the first day of the week should we assemble to break bread?" This, my friends, is left in the realm of human judgment, or expediency. God did not say when upon the first day of the week to meet to observe the Lord's Supper. Hence, any hour within the first day of the week is authorized by the fact that observing it on the first day of the week is authorized.

Now, to make an application to our proposition of this evening. In order for the use of mechanical instruments of music to be authorized by the Scripture, and therefore of divine authority, it must be authorized in one of these three ways. It must be authorized by either express command, approved example, or necessary inference. I charge that you can find neither for it. Since you cannot, it must be by human authority, and therefore sinful, and condemned by Jesus in Matt. 15:9 and by Paul in Col. 2:20-23. The use of mechanics instruments of music in the worship of God originated in the will of man, and renders worship vain. Certainly, anything that can render worship vain is sinful.

In connection with this point, I want to now ask my opponent this question. If the use of mechanical instruments of music in the worship of God is by Divine authority, why did not the apostolic church use them? Why were they not used during the first 700 years of the history of the church? In the inspired history of the early church, the Bible, no mention is made of any church in the apostolic period using such instruments. Church historians, such as Eusebius, Neander, Mosheim, Jones, Schaff, and Fisher, make no mention of it for hundreds of years after Christ. To-day, however, it is found in many places, and used in worship. It did not come by divine authority, but is an innovation made by men.

The *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia* states: "In the Greek church the organ never came into use. But after the eighth century it became more and more common in the Latin church; not, however, without opposition from the side of the monks...." (II, 1702). *The American Encyclopedia*

says: "Pope Vitalian is related to have first introduced organs into some of the churches of Western Europe, about 670; but the earliest trustworthy account is that of the one sent as a present by the Greek emperor Constantine Copronymus to Pepin, king of the Franks, in 755" (XII, 688). *Fessenden's Encyclopedia* states: "Instrumental music is also of very ancient date, its invention being ascribed to Tubal, the sixth descendant from Cain. That instrumental music was not practiced by the primitive Christians, but was an aid to devotion of later times, is evident from church history" (852).

We could recite other authorities who state that the use of instrumental music was unknown by the early church, but these should be sufficient to make our point. If the instruments had been authorized by God, they would have been used by the apostles and the early Christians. The very fact that they were not used, is indicative that divine authority left them out of the worship.

---

### Generic and Specific Authority

Commanded	Generic Includes all in its class	Specific Excludes all in its class
1. Ark, Gen. 6:14	Wood	Gopher Wood
2. Water of Cleansing, Num. 19:2	Animal	Red Heifer without Spot
3. Baptize, Matt. 28:20	Burial in Water	Pond, River, Baptistry
4. Contribution, 1 Cor. 16:2	Give as Prospered	Lay on Table Pass the Basket
5. Praise, Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16	Make Music	SING

- A. Under **Generic** authority any [specific] means may be used unless stated as limited.  
 B. Under **Specific** authority, no other specific than that mentioned is authorized.

In what passage does the NT authorize instrumental music, either generically or specifically? \_\_\_\_\_

---

I want to go a little further into the matter of establishing divine and scriptural authority. To illustrate the point, and in order that you might have it more indelibly impressed upon your minds, we present this chart, entitled, "Generic and Specific Authority." When a thing is authorized by

express command, approved example, or necessary inference, it may be authorized either in the **generic** or the **specific** sense.

For instance, when God commanded Noah to build the ark, He commanded him to build it of "gopher wood" (Gen. 6:14). This is specific. The generic would have been simply "wood." But God did not say "wood," He said "gopher wood." If God had said "wood," Noah would have been free to choose any kind of wood, but since God specified the kind of wood to be used, Noah was not at liberty to use any other kind of wood.

Again, in Numbers 19:2, we have the instructions about making the "water of cleansing." In that passage, God specified that the Israelites were to take the ashes of a "red heifer without spot." That is specific. The generic would have been, take an "animal." God did not say, "take an animal," but he specified the particular kind of animal to be used, a "red heifer without spot."

Again, In Matt. 28:20, Jesus instructed His disciples to baptize believers. The New Testament teaches that is to be in water, and that the candidate is to be buried in water. God did not specify where the water was to be—whether a running stream, an artificial lake, or a baptistery. He did not specify whether it must be out-or-doors or in-doors. Hence, as far as the place is concerned, the authority is generic, not specific.

Again, God commands His disciples to contribute of their means (1 Cor. 16:2). The only requirement of this giving is that it is to be "as prospered." He did not specify whether we should "lay it on the table," or "pass the basket." The authority is generic, not specific; hence, it makes no difference.

Again, God commands us to praise Him in song (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16). The generic would have been "make music," and if God had so stated, any kind of music would have been authorized. However, God specified the kind of music He wanted used in worship, and that kind of music is singing, vocal music.

Now, notice the two observations at the bottom of the chart. First, "Under **Generic** authority any means [specific] may be used unless specifically limited." Second, "Under **Specific** authority no other specific than that mentioned is authorized." In the case of baptizing in water, the authority is generic, and any place of baptizing is authorized in the command to baptize, so long as it meets the requirements of a burial of a believer in water. In the case of the contribution, any means of taking up the collection is authorized in the command to give. But, with regard to gopher wood, or the ashes of a red heifer without spot, or with regard to



singing, God has specified what He wanted, and no other specific is authorized by the command.

At the bottom of the chart is a question for my opponent. **In what passage does the New Testament authorize instrumental music?** You may attempt to give either generic or specific authority. Where did God include it by saying "make music," or where did God specify instruments of music in the worship of God under Christ today? Please tell us.

I believe that my proposition is sustained by the argument we have presented. Now, let us summarize. We have shown that anything that originates in human authority in worship is iniquity and sin. We have shown that there is no New Testament authority for the use of mechanical instruments of music, since there is no express command for it, no approved example where the apostolic church used, or a necessary inference that they used it. Since it did not come by divine authority, it must have come from human authority. History corroborates this argument in stating that the mechanical instrument was not used during the apostolic ere, nor for several centuries thereafter. *Hence, we must conclude that "it is contrary to Scripture to use mechanical instruments of music in the worship of God, and therefore sinful."*

Before I yield the platform to my opponent, and that my opponent will not forget to answer the questions which have been asked of him, I want to present them to him in written form. They are based on this argument, and designed to focus our attention to the very heart of this question. Please answer them.

1. Is your authority for instrumental music in the worship from heaven, or from men. Is it by divine authority or human authority?
2. If it is by human authority, why do you continue to work "iniquity"?
3. If it is claimed to be of divine authority, where is the passage that authorizes it? You may give either express command, approved example or necessary inference to authorize it either generically or specifically.
4. If it is of divine authority, why were mechanical instruments not used in the worship during the apostolic age, nor for several centuries thereafter?

When you have undertaken to answer these questions, you will have gotten to the very heart of our differences.

## Negative Notes on Instrumental Music Arguments

### I. The "Aid" Argument:

**Argument:** The instrument aids the worshipper.

1. The fact that the tuning fork and the pitch pipe aid the worshipper is evident that the instrument aids, too; as the tuning fork aids to get the pitch, the instrument aids in sustaining the pitch.
2. The fact that the anti-instrument people often use the instrument as an aid in their homes and for practice shows it aids.
3. The fact that songbooks aid proves that the instrument aids, for the instrument transforms the notes in the songbook to sound, so the ear can detect what the eye cannot.
4. The fact that most congregations use the instrument only as an aid, only while they are singing, certainly is testimony enough. If it did not aid, why else would they use it? for the beautiful tones?
5. I can know that the instrument aids me identically the way I can know that glasses aid me.

### Answer:

1. Even if it could be maintained, as fact that the use of the instrument is no more than a help or an aid to the worship, it would still leave the practice without divine authority; for while the authority to employ all helps that are necessary to its effective performance, it can do no more.
  - a. On this principle, if the use of an instrument were necessary to effective worship in song, this fact would give the needed authorization. But it is certainly not necessary to worship as defined as "the homage of the heart." And, that it is not necessary to the singing is obvious from the fact that most effective singing has been done in churches in all ages and all countries without it; and from the other fact, that any one who can sing with an instrument can sing without it.
  - b. In reality, the use of an instrument does not help the singing, for the singing is the same it would be if the same vocal sounds were made without the mechanical instrument.
  - c. It only helps the music, and it does this by adding to vocal music a music of another kind. It does not help the voice. Is it possible for the extraneous instrument—organ or piano—to aid the vocal cords to form tones?
  - d. Furthermore, if it be granted that men are at liberty to adopt any unnecessary help to the worship which they think desirable, then



it follows that the Romanist is justified in using candles, images, incense and crucifixes as helps in his worship, and should the majority of disciples in any congregation desire to introduce all these practices, the men who have admitted the organ on this ground must consent to it, or abandon their present position.

2. Tuning forks and pitch pipes are not instruments of music, for **music** is "a succession of tones." A tuning fork or pitch pipe only *helps the song leader to get the pitch*; they are not instruments upon which music can be played.
  - a. "Music is the science of sound; or a rhythmical succession or combination of pleasing sounds" (*S.D.N. Theory of Music*, Dean, Acuff, Evridge, p. 5).
  - b. "1. Melody or harmony; any succession of tones so modulated as to please the ear, or any combination of simultaneous tones in harmony. 2. The science or art of arranging tones in such relations of rhythm, melody, harmony, and tone color as to produce effects pleasing to the ear; that science or art which deals with sounds as produced by the human voice or by musical instruments" (*Webster's New 20<sup>th</sup> Century Dictionary*).
    - 1) Note that music is in two classes, vocal and instrumental.
    - 2) Instrumental music does not aid the voice. It does not aid the vocal cords to form tones. You may have better music by drowning out the discords, but not better singing.
    - 3) The only aid given by the instrument is to please the fleshly sense of hearing.
    - 4) Instrumental music does not aid us to teach and admonish, nor to sing with the spirit and understanding, nor to make melody in the heart to the Lord.
3. If we put jelly on bread at home, to aid the fleshly sense of taste, does that mean it is right to put it on the Lord's Table?
  - a. Something morally right may be out of place in the worship (1 Cor. 11:22).
  - b. Anyone who cannot see the distinction does not know the difference between a jelly biscuit and the Lord's Supper, or between a concert and the worship of the church.
4. God explicitly commands singing. Opponent uses the song book for both singing and playing.
5. What about the time instrumental music is played during the Lord's Supper and the Contribution?

6. We can get the same sort of testimonials from the Catholics for their use of images (cf. Gibbons, *Faith of Our Fathers*, 146, 165, 169).
  - a. Glasses aid you to see; instrumental music does not aid you in forming musical tones with the voice.
  - b. Glasses cannot do anything apart from seeing; instrumental music can be performed without singing.

## II. The General Old Testament Argument:

### Argument:

Instrumental music is mentioned repeatedly in connection with the worship in the Old Testament, and it was never abolished by command of God in the New Testament.

1. It accompanied the first song (Ex. 15:20). Laban rebuked Jacob for stealing away, claimed he would have sent him away with timbrel and harp (Gen. 31:27).
2. It was used at the anointing of the first king (1 Sam. 10).
3. It drove the devil out of Saul (1 Sam. 17).
4. It was used at the dedication of the temple (1 Kings 3).
5. It was used when the ark was brought back to the camp of Israel from the Philistines (2 Sam. 10).
6. It was used when Asa put away the idols (2 Chron. 5:11).
7. It was used when Ezra laid the foundation of the temple (Ezra 3).
8. It was used when Zerubbabel and Nehemiah dedicated the walls of the city of Jerusalem (Neh. 12:43).
9. It accompanied the giving of the Law (Ex. 19:19).
10. It was used to accompany worship during the time of the Law (1 Chron. 16:4-6).
11. Some affirmative observations:
  - a. Where is any indication that instrumental music is not pleasing to God?
  - b. In what time or in what place did God change his mind about instrumental music?
  - c. Why did Paul never instruct the Gentiles, who were as familiar with the praise of their gods with instruments as were the Jews of Jehovah, that instrumental music was wrong?

### Answer:

1. To show a thing was practiced under the law does not prove it is acceptable today.

- a. Polygamy was practiced before and during the Law by David and others (Gen. 25:1; 1 Sam. 3:2-5; 5:13).
  - b. Divorce and concubinage were also practiced before and during the Law (Deut. 24:1; 2 Sam. 5:13).
  - c. Sacrifice, incense, and circumcision were practiced before and during the law (Gen. 4:6; 8:20-21; 17:10; Psa. 66:13-15).
2. If instrumental music was right in the Old Testament, it was right because it was **mentioned**; why argue that it is right in the New Testament when it is **not mentioned**?
- a. There is a fundamental difference between the materialistic nature of the kingdom in the Old Testament, and the spiritual nature of the kingdom in the New Testament.
  - b. Can you name a single spiritual advantage in the use of the instrument in the worship of God today?
3. Does anything permitted under the law have to be expressly forbidden in the New Testament before it is sinful?
- a. Polygamy is not expressly forbidden in the New Testament. It is forbidden only in the fact that, the New Testament does teach one husband for one wife. God' specified the family arrangement (cf. Matt. 19:9).
  - b. Concubinage is not expressly forbidden in the New Testament, and is forbidden only by God's express teachings on marriage.
  - c. Dancing was permitted in the Old Testament, at the same time of instrumental music. Since it is not expressly forbidden in the New Testament, may one dance in Christian worship (Ex. 15:20)?
4. Answers to opponent's questions:
- a. The instrument is **left out** of the doctrine of Christ (2 John 9). Where is the indication that burning incense is sinful?
  - b. The New Covenant is not according to the Old (Heb. 8:8). When did God change his mind about dancing?
  - c. Paul did instruct the Gentiles, and specified singing (cf. Eph. 5:19; Col. 3: 16). Why did Paul never instruct the Gentiles that holy water, candles, incense, and vestments were wrong when he knew they practiced these in pagan worship?  
He did not do so because his instructions concerning the spiritual nature of God's kingdom excludes such material emphasis.
5. Does a thing have to be specifically condemned in the New Testament before it is sinful? If God once accepted or authorized a thing, must it be specifically condemned before it becomes sinful?

- a. What about Moses and his striking the rock in Num. 20? On a previous occasion God had authorized his striking the rock (Exodus 17). This time he merely said "speak" to it.

### III. The General New Testament Argument.

#### Argument:

The fact that instrumental music is mentioned 44 times in the New Testament, and not once condemned or once spoken against proves that the inspired writers had an opportunity to place inspiration against it, but failed to do so.

1. Passages that mention instrumental music (Matt. 9:33; 24:31; Luke 15:25; 1 Cor. 14:27-8; 1 Cor. 15:52; 1 Thess. 4:16; Rev. 1:10; 4:1; 5:8; 8:1-2; 8:6-8; 8:10; 8:12-13; 9:1; 9:13-14; 11:15; 15:1-2; 18:22).
2. Other scriptures which in all probability teach the use of the instrument (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; Rom. 15:9; 1 Cor. 14:15; James 5:13).
3. Anything mentioned in the New Testament is mentioned for one of three purposes.
  - a. To uphold it.
  - b. To condemn it.
  - a. To be neutral about it.

#### Answer:

The fact that they are mentioned, also proves that the inspired writers had an opportunity to place inspiration **for** the use of the instrument in the worship, but they failed to do so [or, **were not authorized** to do so].

1. The number of times it is mentioned apart from New Testament worship doesn't prove anything. The Sabbath is mentioned 58 times in the New Testament. When did God say, "Thou shalt not observe the Sabbath Day"?
2. The instrument is **not once mentioned** in connection with the worship of the apostolic church.
3. On "Psallo" in the passages which opponent says in all probability teach the use of the instrument, opponent has forsaken his "aid" argument. If the word includes the instrument, you can't please God without it, and everyone would have to play upon some kind of mechanical instrument in order to "psallo," if the instrument is included in the word.

#### IV. Argument that Instrumental Music Is As Scriptural As Congregational Singing.

##### Argument:

There is absolutely no mention made of congregational singing in the New Testament.

1. 1 Cor. 14:26 refers to solo singing, not congregational singing.
2. Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16 refer to what the individual does. They do not relate to the worship services of the church.
3. You deny the very passage that mentions congregational singing (Rev. 14:2).
4. You discard the solo, the harp, the psalms, but you introduce congregational singing.

##### Answer:

1. 1 Cor. 14:26 is not introduced as authority for congregational singing, but not necessarily an authority for solo singing.
  - a. Opponent **assumes** it refers to **singing** a formal solo.
  - b. He **may** have been **teaching** them a song by inspiration.
2. What does "speaking to one another" mean unless they are together? (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16).
  - a. "Throughout the whole passage there is a contrast implied between the heathen and Christian practices, e.g., **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 lyre, but the melody of the heart; while you sing them not to the praises of Bacchus or Venus, but of the Lord Jesus Christ" (Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Letters of St. Paul*, II, 408).
  - b. Congregations]. singing is **at least one way** of "speaking to one another."
  - c. If you deny that there is New Testament authority for congregational singing, why do you practice it. If the passages introduced do not authorize it, where do you go for authority? You practice singing as well as we.
3. Opponent assumes that Eph. 5:22 has to be done at the same time and place as Eph. 5:19.
  - a. The sex act is not the only way wives are to submit to their husbands.
  - b. They are to be "in subjection" at all times (1 Tim. 2:13).



### V. The “Natural Talent” Argument.

**Argument:** Instrumental music is a God-given talent.

1. Music like language is a gift of God, not an invention, but a discovery.
2. Just as a baby is born with every physical organ necessary to talk or to speak a language, so are they also born with the workmanship of musical instruments within them (cf. Ezek. 28:11–15).

**Answer:**

1. If that natural talent requires expression, then everyone that can play an instrument **must** play.
2. Natural talent compounds incense, and burning it appeals to the natural sense of smell; why not adopt the Roman Catholic practice of burning incense in worship?
3. Natural talent paints pictures, and looking at them appeals to the natural sense of sight; why not also add the Roman Catholic practice of using pictures as “aids” to worship?
4. We have auditory, olfactory and ocular senses—all natural talents—and one would be as right as the other on the natural talent argument.

### VI. The “Instrumental Music in Heaven” Argument

**Argument:** Instrumental music is in heaven, so why not in the church?

1. In the prayer Jesus taught his disciples, “thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven” Matt. 6:10).
2. In Rev. 5:8-14, we see the heavenly host break forth into singing, and they are singing the **new song** — the song of the Lamb
3. And on earth, on Mt. Zion, at Jerusalem, as recorded in Rev. 14:2, we see the firstfruits of the redeemed — that is “the first Christian” — joining in that new song, like the sound of waters [and waters means peoples, Rev. 16:15], and the sound was as the voice of harpers harping with their harps.

**Answer:**

1. The 144,000 were singing — nothing said about singing and playing.
2. Notice the comparisons in the passage.
  - a. The voice was “**as** the voice of many waters.” Literal water?
  - b. The voice was “**as** the voice of great thunder.” Literal thunder?
  - c. The voice was “**as** of harpers harping on their harps.” Literal harps?

3. Rev. 14:2 suggests three things—rhythm, volume and melody. There is no proof at all for instrumental music.
4. Is opponent willing to say that everything mentioned as “seen in heaven” should be in the church? The book of Revelation mentions “golden bowls of incense.” Opponent takes the harps and leaves off the incense!
5. Is “heaven” the church? Then “heaven” is figurative, and you have literal harps in a figurative heaven.
6. If “heaven” in Revelation is the church, what about Rev. 4:1, where John is told to “come up hither” sixty-three years after he got into the church!
7. If “heaven” in Revelation is the church, why the reference to “heaven and earth” in Rev. 15:13? Was the Devil in the church? And, who are the “beasts” in heaven, if it was the church? They were around the throne; what throne?
8. The whole thing is a comparison. Being a comparison, it is not literal, so there is not now, and never will be, a literal, mechanical instrument of music in the spiritual realm. If not literal, they have no argument.

## VII. Argument on “The Church of the Firstborn” (Heb. 12:22-23)

### Argument:

There are Christians in the church singing and playing harps and worshipping all at the same time.”

1. The “Church of the firstborn.”
  - a. “Firstborn” in the Greek is **plural**, and hence doesn’t refer to Christ.
  - b. Old Testament saints endured persecution that “they might obtain a better resurrection” Heb. 11:35).
  - c. They were in the resurrection of Jesus from the grave (Matt. 27:52-53; Eph. 4:8-10).
  - d. “Ye are come to Mt. Zion...” These people comprise and make up the “church of the firstborn.” They are the “heavenly Jerusalem, and just men made perfect” (cf. Heb. 2:14; Eph. 4:8; Matt. 27:52-53; Job 19; Jude 14).
2. They were Christians (Eph. 3:14-15; cf. Isa. 62:2; Acts 11:26; 1 Pet. 4:16; Rev. 22:4).
3. John mentioned these very people five times in the book of Revelation (5:8-14; 7:2-8; 15:2-8; 14:1-2; 21:9).
  - a. They were “redeemed from the earth.”
  - b. They were “redeemed from among men.”



4. To deny that these people had harps is to deny the bodily resurrection. If the bodily resurrection is literal, harps are literal.

**Answer:**

1. Opponent argues that the resurrection is past already (cf. 2 Tim. 2:18).
2. On Eph. 4:8-10, the Bible says "He" and opponent says "they." And, the Bible says that He "led captivity," not the captives.
3. "They that are Christ's at His coming" (1 Cor. 15:20-25).
4. Are all these things mentioned in the references in the Revelation literal? Literal horses—white, red, black and pale? Literal golden bowl of incense, etc.??
5. They couldn't be literal bodies, for 1 Cor. 15:50 says so.
6. Heb. 12:23 refers to the "spirits" of just men made perfect.
7. Furthermore, Rev. 14:1-2 does not say they had "harps," but says that the "voice was as harpers harping on their harps."

## **VII. Argument Based on David.**

**Argument:** David used mechanical instruments, why can't we?

1. David did what was right in the eyes of the Lord (1 Kings 15:5).
2. David was a man after God's own heart (1 Sam. 13:14; Acts 13:22).

**Answer:** Opponent will not take David as an example on all things.

1. Opponent's argument, reduced to a syllogism is:
  - a. Anything David did is all right now.
  - b. David used mechanical Instruments.
  - a. Instrumental music is all right now.
2. Try his argument on other, things David practiced. All you have to do is change the minor premise, and the conclusion.
  - a. By this same argument Mormons can justify **polygamy**.
  - b. By this same argument Adventists can justify their **Sabbath**.
  - a. By the same argument Methodists can justify **infant baptism**.
3. Then, too, David once staged a shirt tail dance, and his wife quit him for it (cf. 2 Sam. 6:20-23).

## **IX. Argument Based on "the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms" (Luke 24:44).**

**Argument:** Instrumental music is found in the Psalms.

1. Several Psalms refer to it.

2. Jests recognized a difference between the law, the prophets, and the psalms.
3. Psalms have not been abolished; that book is the "universal hymn-book."

**Answer:**

1. Reduce opponent's argument to a syllogism.
  - a. Show that the Psalms also refer to burnt offerings, sacrifices, and incense.
  - b. Opponent doesn't want all that he finds in the Psalms.
2. The Psalms, as part of the law, were abolished.
  - a. John 10:34 quotes Psa. 82:6 and ascribes it to the "law." The quotation is not from Ex. 22:28.
  - b. John 15:25 quotes Psa. 35:19, and Jesus said it was in "the law." The quotation is not from Num. 14:11.
  - c. In Romans 3:10-18, Paul quotes Psa. 14:1-3; 5:9; 140:3; 36:1 and Isaiah 59:7-8, and in verse 19 he included all his quotations in "the law."
3. Any argument for instrumental music from the Psalms must be verified in the New Testament. Paul quoted the **singing** Psalms but never did he quote the **playing** Psalms.
  - a. We know that Psalm 18 and Psalm 22 both refer to the gospel dispensation, because the apostle Paul quoted them both and so applied them both.
  - b. No Instrumental music Psalm is quoted in the New Testament. How can opponent prove that such Psalms apply to us?
  - c. If the mechanical music Psalms were prophecies of instrumental music in the church, the apostles of the New Testament would have known it, for it would have been revealed to them. The apostle Paul says as much in his statement to the Ephesians on the purpose and completeness of the revelation made to the apostles and prophets in the New Testament (cf. Eph. 3:3-5).

**X. Argument Based on Psalm 87:5-7**

**Argument:** This prophecy is of the church.

1. "Zion" Is used in reference to the church (1 Pet. 2:3-6).
2. "This and that man was born in her" (vs. 5; compare John 3:5). Then, too, the church is feminine, the "bride of Christ" (Rev. 19:17).
3. "And the highest himself shall establish her" (vs. 5; cf. Matt. 16:18; 1 Cor. 3:11).

4. "The Lord shall count when he writes up the people, that this man was born there" (vs. 6; cf. Acts 2:47).
5. "As well, the singers as the players on instruments shall be there: all my springs are in you" (vs. 6).
  - a. Who would say that God. changed his mind after this prophecy was written, and decided in the final plan to have singers and not have the players?
  - b. Was the singing part fulfilled, and the playing part unfulfilled?
6. Prophecy has a direct bearing upon the teaching of the New Testament (cf. Eph. 2:20).

### **Answer:**

It is assumption to say that the "Zion" of Psalm 87:5-7 is the church.

1. 1 Peter 2:3-6 does not prove "Zion" of Psalm 87:5-7 is the church, but does prove that Isaiah 28:16 refers to the New Testament dispensation.
  - a. Opponent needs the New Testament passage that quotes Ps. 87:5-7 and applies it to the church.
  - b. Opponent will not cite one because he cannot find one.
    - 1) Mormons make the same blunder when they quote Isaiah 4:1-11 to show in "Zion" seven women will hold one man.
    - 2) Methodists try to use Ezek. 36:25-26 to prove sprinkling for baptism.
    - 3) Adventists try to use Isaiah 66:22-23 to prove that the Sabbath would be observed in the gospel dispensation.
2. There is no parallel between Psalm 87:5-7 and John 3:5.
  - a. Men were born "in" literal Zion, but they are "born again" **in order to enter** spiritual Zion.
  - b. The church being feminine proves nothing, for Jerusalem is described as "her" in Lam. 1:1-ff.
  - a. The use of the future is also mentioned with reference to Jerusalem. Isaiah 62:7.
3. Opponent bases his argument on a passage when the correct translation is in question.
  - a. ASV translates it: "They that sing as well as they that dance shall say, all my fountains are in you."
  - b. RSV translates it: "Singers and **dancers** alike say, all my springs are in you."

Is this a prophecy of **dancing** in the church?

## XI. Argument Based on the meaning of "Psallo."

### Argument:

The mechanical Instrument is included in the meaning of "Psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs" of Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16.

1. Opponent will cite Lexicons defining the words as follows
  - a. **Psallo** "to sing with an instrument."
  - b. **Humnos** "to sing hymns of praise."
  - c. **Odos** "any kind of song, either with or without an instrument."

### Answer:

Opponent gives the classical meaning of the words, but not according to New Testament usage.

1. **Psallo** — "to pluck off; pull out (the hair); to cause to vibrate by touching; to twang; to touch or strike the chord, to twang the strings of a musical instrument, to play on a stringed instrument, to play the harp, to sing to the music of the harp: *In the New Testament, to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praises of God in song*" (James 5:13; Eph. 5:19; Rom. 15:9; 1 Cor. 14:15).
  - a. Notice that opponent only quotes the classical definitions, for to quote the New Testament definition would ruin his case — as a dishonest lawyer who only cites what is favorable to his cause.
  - b. The fundamental meaning of the word is "to pluck," regardless of what is plucked. When little Johnny sits upon grandpa's lap and plucks his beard, he is **psallo-ing**.
  - a. What is "**psallo-ed**" depends upon the context, and the context shows that it is the **h-e-a-r-t**, not the strings of a harp.
2. **Humnos** — "In Greek writing, from Homer down, a song in praise of gods, heroes, conquerors, but in the Scriptures of God, a sacred song, hymn (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16)."
3. **Odos** — "A song, lay, ode; in the Scriptures a song in praise of God or Christ (Rev. 5:9; 14:3; Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16)."
4. McGarvey says, "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 the father of the thought, correct exegesis is like water on a duck's back" (*Essays on Biblical Criticism*).

**XII. Argument Based on James 5:13; Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16****Argument:**

To sing "psalms" as mentioned in these passages enjoins the singing of the Psalms of the Old Testament, and they authorize instrumental music.

1. It either places the Psalms in the New Testament, or it makes a man sing one thing and practice another.
2. Paul got them from Christ, not Moses or David (cf. Gal. 1:11-12).
3. The Psalms are in the law of Christ, since the New Testament says, "sing psalms" (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16).

**Answer:**

Opponent **assumes** that the "psalms" mentioned in these passages refer to the Psalms of the Old Testament.

1. Jesus said the Psalms of the Old Testament were a part of the law; opponent denies what the Lord affirmed.
2. When we are told to sing "psalms, hymns and spiritual songs" — we are advised as to what kind of songs to sing.
3. This argument nullifies his "aid" argument, as Psalm 150 says "praise God with" the instruments. Playing instruments are **acts**; they are not **aids**.
4. There are many Old Testament Psalms that opponent will not sing; he takes what he wants from the Psalms, and leaves out the rest.
  - a. Vengeance against Babylon (Psa. 137:9).
  - b. Offer the sacrifices (Psa. 4:5; 96:8; 116:17).
  - c. New moon, or feast day (Psa. 81:3-4).
  - d. Two-edged sword to execute vengeance (Psa. 149:6-7).

**XIII. Argument Based on 2 Tim. 3:16-17****Argument:**

"All commandments, promises and warnings that God has not repealed constitute the will of God for man today."

1. "All Scripture" includes the Old Testament, and it is profitable.
2. It includes all commandments, promises and warning that God has not repealed.
  - a. God has revealed all things that are sinful (Rom. 3:20; 4:15; 5:13; 7:7; 1 John 3:4; Rom. 1:18).
    - 1) God has specified by commandment, by statement, by example or by principle everything that is a sin.

- 2) When God reveals a thing, it could never become sinful unless he repeals it.
- b. God has specifically repealed the Old Testament covenant, but it was in force until he repealed it.
- c. Jesus never repealed that which was original; he repealed the temporary (cf. Matt .19:8).
- d. Ways to determine what has been repealed
  - 1) The Covenant given at Sinai was repealed (Dent .5:1-5; Jer. 31:31-32; Heb. 8:8-13).
  - 2) Prophecies are repealed in their fulfillment.
  - 3) All other things that are repealed, are specified to be so.
- e. God has specifically forbidden us to diminish from his word (Deut. 4:2; 12:32). It is up to God to repeal that which he has repealed, if he no longer wants it in force.
3. Instrumental music was given by God (2 Chron. 29:25; cf. Psa. 119:172).
  - a. It was instituted 450 years after Moses gave "the whole law" (2 Chron. 33:8).
  - b. You can't add to a covenant (Gal. 3:15-ff.).
  - c. Since instrumental music wasn't added to the covenant, it could not have been repealed with it.
4. Since God has not repealed instrumental music specifically, it is still a command of God for us today.

**Answer:**

1. Yes, all Scripture is profitable, but not as authority for acts of worship. The Old Testament is profitable for:
  - a. Study of types and shadows (Neh. 8:5).
  - b. Study of fulfilled prophecy (2 Pet. 1:19).
  - c. Study of examples (1 Cor. 10:1-11; Rom. 15:4).
2. When opponent argues that God commands the use of Instrumental music, he is surrendering his aid argument.
  - a. Opponent takes it out of the realm of incidentals, and makes it an essential.
  - b. Can one go to heaven without righteousness?
3. God does not have to specify everything that is repealed, or sinful.
  - a. Where had God specified that it would have been sinful for Moses to strike the rock (Num. 20:7-12)? Striking the rock had been previously authorized (Ex. 17:5-6).

- b. Where had God specified against the brazen serpent? (2 Kings. 18:4)? The serpent had been previously authorized (Num. 21:9).
  - c. Where does the Bible specify that we cannot burn incense in worship?
  - d. Where does the Bible specify that we cannot observe the Sabbath?
- 4. Included also among sinful things those which are **without authority** [*anomia*, cf. Matt. 7:23; 2 John 9).
- 5. We are not diminishing from the will of God when we sing; opponent is adding to it when he uses instrumental music.
- 6. The principle of this argument is what made the digressives; they think God has to specify before a thing is sinful.
- 7. God's rule is the reverse of opponent's rule.
  - a. When God wanted a thing included, he **mentioned** it.
  - b. We have no authority for saying that things not mentioned are a part of the will of Christ. The only way we can know what pleases God is for him to tell us, and the only way he tells us is what is revealed in his Word.
- 8. Instrumental music was authorized by God through his prophets as a part of Jewish worship. It belongs to the Law of Moses and the Law of Moses was nailed to the cross (Eph. 2; Col. 2).
- 9. We must come to the New Testament to find the will of Christ concerning his worship (Heb. 9:15-17).
  - a. Opponent doesn't come to Christ; he stays in the Old Testament (cf. Gal. 3:15).
  - b. The Old Testament was superseded by the New (Heb. 8).
    - 1) Law was constitution (Luke 24:44).
    - 2) Prophets prophesied and taught according to constitution.
    - 3) Psalms were songs of national Israel.
- 10. Opponent's statement on types nullifies his argument.
  - a. David the King vs. Christ the King.
  - b. Moses the Lawgiver vs. Christ the Lawgiver.
  - c. Melchizedek the High Priest vs. Christ the High Priest.
    - 1) "All types are repealed In their fulfillment." Opponent.
    - 2) Therefore: the authority of David, Moses, and Melchizedek is repealed (cf. Acts 3:22-23; Col. 2:12).
    - 3) The whole debate revolves around the authority of Christ.



11. Is that which has been repealed good for anything?
  - a. Is the law given at Mt. Sinai good for instruction in righteousness and profitable for doctrines?
  - b. Opponent's argument says it is not, for he makes it an exception to the "all scripture" mentioned in 2 Tim. 3:16-17.

**Chart:**

**Why Did God Repeat Himself in Different Ages?**

<i><b>Patriarchal Age</b></i>	<i><b>Jewish Age</b></i>	<i><b>Christian Age</b></i>
Animal Sacrifice Gen. 4:4; 8:20	Animal Sacrifice Lev. 1:5; 8:21	Not Mentioned
Altar Gen. 22:9; 26:25	Altar Ex. 27:1; Deut. 12:27	Not Mentioned
Circumcision Gen. 17:23; 21:4	Circumcision Ex. 12:44; Deut. 10:16	Not Mentioned
Tithing Gen. 14:20	Tithing Num. 18:21	Not Mentioned
Infant Membership Gen. 17:10-23	Infant Membership Ex. 13:2; Deut. 33:10	Not Mentioned
Priests— Gen. 14:18	Priests— Ex. 19:6	All Priests— 1 Peter 2:5
Pray—Gen. 20:7	Pray—Num. 21:7	Pray—Acts 2:42
	Sing—Ex. 32:18	Sing—Eph. 5:19
	Instrumental Music 2 Chron. 29:25	Not Mentioned
	Teach Lev. 10:11; Deut. 17:11	Teach Matt. 28:19-20
	Give—1 Chron. 16:28	Give—1 Cor. 16.2
		Lord's Supper 1 Cor. 11:23-24

**XIV. Argument Based on 2 Chronicles 33:8.**

**Argument:**

The instrument was not included in the law that was taken away.

1. All 12 passages in the New Testament that show that the Law was taken away specify that it is the law that Moses gave.

2. Sixteen passages specify that the law was given by Moses.
3. One specifies that Moses gave "the whole law" (2 Chron. 33:8).
4. Instrumental music was not a part of the Law which Moses gave, therefore it was not part of that which was done away.

**Answer:** 2 Chron. 33:8 simply says do all that Moses told you to do.

1. Paul refers to Genesis 3:16, saying, "as the law also says" (1 Cor. 14:34).
2. Luke refers to Exodus 12:2-8, saying, "according to the law of Moses" (Luke 2:22).
3. Matthew records a reference to Leviticus 19:18, as "in the law" (Matt. 22:36, 39).
4. Matthew records a reference to Deuteronomy 6:5, as "in the law" (Matt. 22:36-37).
  - a. If what Moses wrote is repealed, why not cut them out of the Bible? Are they of any profit for us today?
  - b. If you can keep the first five books and use them, why can't you take the Psalms as repealed, and still use them (cf. Rom. 15:4)?
5. Notice 1 Chronicles 33:8 in the New King James Version:
 

"and I will not again remove the foot of Israel from the land which I have appointed for your fathers—*only if they are careful to do all that I have commanded them*, according to the whole law and the statutes and the ordinances by the hand of Moses."

## **XV. Argument Based on 1 Kings 10:12.**

**Argument:**

1. Instruments 'were made "for singers."
2. There is a difference between singers and players. 2 Chron. 29:28.
3. They used instruments to (a) praise the Lord, (b) to aid them.

**Answer:**

1. The passage does not say they were made "to aid singers."
2. The purpose of instruments was for signals (Num. 10:1; 1 Cor. 14).
3. Played over burnt offerings (Num. 10:10).
4. All worshipped, including the players (2 Chron. 29:28)
  - a. Some offered burnt offerings.
  - b. Some were singing.
  - c. Some were playing trumpets.
  - d. Some were playing the instruments David made.

5. David said, "On the harp I will praise you" (Psa. 43:4), but opponent says "with the harp."

## **XVI. Argument Based on Practice.**

### **Argument:**

Instrumental music is as scriptural as seats, lights, song books, and meetinghouses.

### **Answer:**

1. Seats are authorized (James 2:1).
2. Lights are authorized (Acts 20:8).
3. Books are mentioned (2 Tim. 4:13).
4. Meetinghouses are expedient places of assembly (Heb. 10:25).
  - a. In what way does the meetinghouse accompany the worship?
  - b. The place of worship is not an element of worship (John 4:20-24).

## **XVII. Argument Based on John 4:20-24.**

### **Argument:**

Worship is exclusively **in the heart**, hence the instrument cannot be "in" the worship.

1. "In spirit" refers to the inner man (John. 4:24; Phil. 3:3; cf. 2 Cor. 5).
2. "In spirit" is the **place** where worship is; it does not refer to manner.
  - a. "fervent in spirit" (Rom. 12:11).
  - b. "serve God with my spirit." (Rom. 1:9)..
  - c. "both in body and in spirit" (1 Cor. 7:34).
  - d. "my spirit prays" (1 Cor. 14:14).
  - e. "spirits of the prophets" (1 Cor. 14:32).
  - f. "no rest in my spirit" (2 Cor .2 15).
3. God is not worshipped with the outward man; so giving is not worship (Acts 17:25).
4. Bible distinguishes between worship and acts.
  - a. Bible distinguishes between worshipper and one doing the will of God (Acts 10:35; John 9:31).
  - b. Bible distinguishes between worship and giving (Matt. 2:11).
  - c. Bible distinguishes between worship and singing (2 Chron. 29:28, 30).

- d. Bible distinguishes between worship and praise (2 Chron. 7:3; Acts 16).
6. Out of 58 times the word "worship" occurs in the New Testament, only 36 refer, in any way, to true worship. Only 4 of the 36 say anything about worship. All 4 are from **proskuneo**, and show worship is **in the spirit**, not the outward man (John 4:20; Phil. 3:3; Acts 17:25; John 9:31).
7. Worship is not once connected with the Christian assembly in the New Testament.

**Answer:**

1. Opponent bases his argument on a false definition of "worship."
  - a. He wants the instrument out of worship, and tries to **define** it out. He needs to **take** it out, not **talk** it out.
  - b. Thayer says "phrases relating to the **manner** of 'worship are these (John 4:24; Phil. 3:3) [Lexicon, p. 72]."
  - c. Footnote on Matt .2:8 and Mark 5:6 says, "The Greek word [**proskuneo**, emp. jec] denotes an *act of reverence*, whether paid to a creature (cf. 4:9; 18:26), or to the Creator (4:10)."
  - d. Worship includes **acts**, opponent ridicules it (Luke 4:7).
    - 1) Worship is not a sentimental attitude.
    - 2) Worship includes the acts (rites) God commanded.
    - 3) Worship is not a condition, but a production of the heart.
2. Opponent has the outer man acting, but the inner man worshipping.
  - a. He splits man up like the Baptists, when they speak on the subject of apostasy.
  - b. Opponent cuts off all but the heart; he cuts off the word of God that regulates worship.
3. **All worshipped**, including singers, players, and burnt offerings (2 Chron. 29:28).
  - a. Why take the instrument and leave out the burnt offerings?
  - b. There isn't any rule on earth that can tie up with the Jew and say, "I use a mechanical instrument for the same purpose that the Jew used it" and not use it as an act of worship (2 Chron. 5:13; 15:11-15; 29:25-28).
  - c. You can't put it in, leave it in, and **talk** it out. You ought to **take** it out !
  - d. Opponent's position that the instrument is not in the worship is a child of circumstances. His position was not born of truth; it is an invention to meet an emergency.

- e. Furthermore, when he tries to **talk** the instrument out of the worship, he is using worship in a different sense than that used by our Lord. (Matt. 15:9).
- 4. Opponent takes singing out of the worship; but the Bible puts it in.
  - a. Paul said sing “unto God” (cf. Acts 16~25; Eph. 5:19).
  - b. Opponent wants the piano so badly that he’ll destroy the worship of the living God to get it in.
  - c. Your Brother Donald G. Hunt has provided it on his chart, “What the Bible says about the church,” publishes by the “Voice of Evangelism,” They preach singing as a part of the worship, but they don’t debate like they preach!
- 5. Questions for my opponent:
  - a. Do you argue that it is sinful to worship God **with** the instrument?
  - b. Or, do you argue that the instrument is only an **aid**?

#### **XVIII. Argument Based on the Example of the Jerusalem Church.**

**Argument:** Instrumental music was used in the apostolic church.

- 1. The 3000 converted on Pentecost went into the temple and took it over for their worship.
- 2. The temple thereafter had no place in Jewish worship for the incense was now the prayers of the saints.
- 3. The great temple orchestration was doubtless intact, and It would be natural to suppose that they utilized these instruments in their praising and rejoicing, just as they utilized the temple itself.

**Answer:** This argument is based on misunderstanding and supposition.

- 1. Did the nation of Israel, those who rejected Christ, cease their worship in Jerusalem after Pentecost?
  - a. Was the “hour of prayer” in Acts 3:1 a Christian or a Jewish practice?
  - b. What feast was that in Jerusalem [mentioned in Acts 18:21]? Was it Jewish, or distinctly Christian?
  - c. The Eunuch [while not a Christian] had been to Jerusalem to worship — and this long after Pentecost (Acts 8:27).
- 2. Why did God destroy the temple in AD 70, if it had become a house of worship for Christian, and was no longer used for Jewish worship? Would not this have been punishment for the Christians instead of the Jews?

3. Josephus, a Jewish historian who witnessed the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70, makes no reference to the Jews having ceased to use the temple for their worship; rather he relates the history as though the temple was used by the Jews right on until the time it was destroyed.
  - a. Relating events that happened after AD 45, he says, "But I shall first explain the occasion whence it was derived. When that feast which is called Passover was at hand, at which time our custom is to use unleavened bread, and a great multitude was gathered together from all parts to that feast, Cumanus was afraid lest some attempt of innovation should be made by them; so he ordered that one regiment of the army should take their arms, and stand in the temple cloisters, to repress any attempts of Innovation" (*Antiquities*, Book 20, Chapter 5).
  - b. "Accordingly, the number of high priests, from the days of Herod until the day when Titus took the temple and the city, and burnt them, were in all twenty-eight" (*Antiquities*, Book 20, Chapter 10).
4. The only "proof" possible is from Acts 2:46, and opponent assumes that this must mean the temple proper.
5. Even if they used the temple proper, it is mere **assumption** to say they used mechanical instruments. This he admits.
6. Whenever early Christian worship was performed, there is just as much proof that Incense and animal sacrifices were continued as there is that instrumental music was continued. That proof is **nil**!

### **XIX. Argument Based on 1 Corinthians 14:7-8.**

**Argument:** Paul speaks of edifying by the harp and trumpet.

1. Paul draws a parallel of the trumpet in war and shows that even things without life can give a message and can edify in the church.
2. The early church used pipe and harp and psaltery, while the Catholic church did not.
3. In 1 Cor. 14, Paul speaks of edifying by harp and pipe as casually as he speaks of edifying by tongues, by interpretations and teaching.
4. Paul here admonished them to do all that they do in the assembly for the edifying of the church.

**Answer:** This argument is a misapplication of Paul's illustration.

1. In the part of the chapter under study, instead of exhorting them to do several things unto edifying, Paul is showing the need of one certain thing [prophesying] instead of another [speaking in tongues] (cf. 1 Cor. 14:4-5).
2. This one point — that prophecy is preferable to speaking in tongues — is the sole theme of the first 25 verses.
3. Verse 26 begins an obvious break in thought. Here Paul tells them to avoid confusion by giving every man his turn.
4. Notice what they did when they came together — “Every one of you has a psalm, has a doctrine, has a tongue, has a revelation, has an interpretation.” Nothing said about any of them having a pipe or a harp !
5. Paul’s mention of pipes and harps are in **illustration** to emphasize the one point in the first 25 verses.
  - a. Paul does not say that pipes and harps need to be understood or else they will not **edify inn the church**.
  - b. This is simply a truth or principle about pipes and harps **wherever, whenever, and for whatever purpose**.
6. Paul’s application is solely to the point that they should “utter with the tongue words easy to be understood” (cf. vs. 9).
7. If opponent’s application of Paul’s illustration is correct, then the fact that he mentioned in this same connection the soldier preparing for battle, that would put “physical war” in the church.
8. And when Paul uses the Olympic games as an illustration in 1 Cor. 9:24, that would put the prize-ring and the race-track in the church.
9. And in 1 Cor. 9:9, when he says not to muzzle the ox, that would put oxen into the church.

## **XX. Argument Based on Matthew 9:23.**

**Argument:** Flute players are mentioned.

1. The minstrels were playing the flutes at the ruler’s house where the maid lay dead.
2. Here is an example of instrumental music at a funeral service.

**Answer:**

1. This is not an act of Christian worship.
2. Jesus told them to “make room.” He put them aside!



**XXI. Argument Based on Luke 15:25.****Argument:**

1. This is the story of the return of the prodigal son.
2. Upon the return of the son, there was joy, and "music and dancing."

**Answer:** This does not refer to the worship of the church.

1. If it is an example for instrumental music in the church, why not **dancing**? Does opponent practice dancing in worship?
2. If this is a church scene, who was the elder brother? the fatted calf? and what does the servants represent?
3. We are told that the banquet represents the Lord's Supper, in which case the "fatted calf" represents Christ — but Christ was never called a **calf**.
4. Opponent makes all figurative, except the "**music**."

