

St. November I. M. ad?

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC

IN

THE WORSHIP.

A DISCUSSION BETWEEN—

H. L. CALHOUN

AND

M. C. KURFEES

WITH AN APPENDIX

INTRODUCTION BY DAVID LIPSCOMB—
Editor of the Gospel Advocate

NASHVILLE, TENN.:
Gospel Advocate Publishing Company
1901

INTRODUCTION

Worship is the homage paid to a superior. Webster defines "worship": (1) To respect, to honor, to treat with civil reverence; (2) to pay divine honors to, to reverence with supreme respect and veneration, to adore, to venerate; (3) to honor with extravagant love and supreme devotion, as a lover." The word as used in the second sense refers to the worship of God or some supposed god. There are two kinds of worship, determined by the being worshiped- the worship of the true God or of some idol worshiped as god. Then the worship of the true God is divided into true worship and vain worship. The true worship is that which is offered according to the will and direction of God. All worship not according to the will of God is vain worship.

The law of worship is, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve"- undivided fidelity to Him as the only true and living God; and this shall be done as He directs. To worship Him in any other way than as He directs is to serve another than God. In reference to eating without washing the hands, Jesus says: "In vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men." (Matt. 15:9, R. V.) This teaches that any service into which the commandments of men enter is vain worship. Other conclusions from the same lesson are, Those who commingle the precepts men with the worship of God are "blind leaders of the blind", both of which must fall into the ditch; and: "Every plant, which my Heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up". Every practice not commanded by God shall be rooted out before God can accept the service.

"Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." (Matt. 7:21) The context shows the meaning of this is: Not every one that worships me as Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom; but those only who do the will of God. Many are so sincere and

honest in their worship that only the sentence at the last day, "Depart", will undeceive them.

When Aaron made the golden calf, he proclaimed "and said, Tomorrow is a feast to the Lord. And they rose up early on the morrow, and offered burnt offerings, and brought peace offerings." (Ex. 32:5,6.) He intended with the golden calf to aid their sense of worship to God, but God said: "They made them a molten calf, and have worshiped it." (Verse 8.) God in this condemns as idolatry what they intended as a help to worship God. Down to the days of Jesus the Samaritans claimed to worship God in worshiping the calves set up by Jeroboam. The woman at the well of Samaria said: "Our fathers worshiped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship. Jesus said unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father. Ye worship that which ye know not: we worship that which we know: for salvation is from the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for such doth the Father seek to be his worshipers. God is a spirit: and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth." They intended to worship God, but Jesus tells them: "Ye worship that which ye know not." While intending to worship God, they were guilty of idolatry. He tells the woman: The time is now (under the reign of Christ) when worship will no longer be confined to Jerusalem or to this mountain in Samaria, but the true worshipers shall worship him in spirit and Truth. The heart, or spirit, must be in the worship, and it must be according to the truth of God. Only such worship as this will God accept.

"Covetousness is idolatry." Idolatry is the worship of an idol, or false God. To make and seek money as the chief good is to worship money. Whatever man sets his heart on as the chief good he makes his god and worships it.

The service that he renders in seeking this good is worship he renders to the idol. This worship of money is frequently unconsciously rendered, and does not necessarily involve purpose of worship. All true service to God must come from the heart. Then all service to God must partake more or less of worship. Jesus said to those on his right hand: "I was hungry, and ye fed me," etc. (Matt. 25: 34-36.) They asked when they did these things to Jesus. He told them in doing it to the least of his brethren they did it to him. They were worshipping when not intending it as worship.

A person may worship money, power, pleasure, lust, a husband, a wife, a child. He may worship music itself. When music is placed in the divine service not as worship to God, but to charm and draw and attract admiration to itself, it would seem to be worship of music. A definition of "worship" that does not embrace its scriptural uses is a very misleading and hurtful definition.

It is a sad mistake and perversion of the song service to think the worship is in the melody or rhythm or music of the song. The singing is to praise God and to teach and admonish one another in the songs. The praise to God, the teaching and admonishing in the thoughts, constitute the worship. The music is only an effective means of impressing the sentiments sung on the hearts and to bring the thoughts and purposes of the hearts into harmony with the sentiments sung. Without the sentiment there is no worship. I do not believe it possible to accompany the song service with an instrumental performance without God regarding it as a part of the worship--or, worse, an object of worship. But suppose it were possible to connect it with the song service while it constitutes no part of the worship; would it be acceptable to God? It is a human and secular service continuing through the service to God and attracting fully as much attention as a performance as the divine part of the service does to itself. It is a service partly divine, partly human. The instrumental service diverts attention from the sentiment of praise to God, drowns the speaking in

psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, and hinders the teaching and admonishing, the essential part of the song service, and invariably tends to supersede and displace the song service with a musical and artistic performance that cultivates the sensuous and artistic parts of our nature. This commingling the human and divine is especially offensive to God.

Does any one believe that it would be acceptable to God to add a beefsteak to the Lord's Supper--not as a part of the worship, but as a human accompaniment to make it more attractive and secure a better attendance to observe the Supper? Were the Lord's Supper to be partaken of in the midst of a feast of good things to please the palate or to satisfy the hunger, would it be acceptable to God? Read 1 Cor. 11:20, 21. It would divert the minds from the worship to the things that please the flesh. But if the Supper would not be acceptable when so observed how can the song service be acceptable commingled with the instrumental entertainment? This course would commingle the human and the divine, the common and the holy, the clean and the unclean. "And the Lord spake unto Aaron, saying, Drink no wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tent of meeting, that ye die not: it shall be a statute forever throughout your generations: and that ye may put difference between the holy and the common, and between the unclean and the clean; and that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses." (Lev. 10:8-10, R.V. ; see also Lev. 20:25; Ezek. 22:26; 44:23.) In the New Testament the distinction is kept up as counting the blood of Christ sacred or common. What is commanded is sealed with the blood of Christ. To bring only what God commands into the worship is to hold the blood sacred and to seek blessings through it; to connect with his appointments things not commanded, so not sealed with his blood, is to trample under foot the authority of Christ Jesus, to count the blood of the covenant unholy, and do despite to the teachings of the Holy Spirit. (Heb. 10: 28, 29.)

There is a safe way in which every child of God may walk. It is a crime against God, against the blood of Christ, against our own souls, and against our own souls, and against the souls of our fellow-men to walk in any other way. Those who believe a service wrong, yet walk in it, or so affiliate with it as to encourage its

use or to make the impression that it is a light matter, do more to build up error and are greater sinners than those who believe it right. They sin against light and knowledge, against God and their own consciences. May the Lord help us to see the right way and give us faith and courage to walk in it.

DAVID LIPSCOMB.

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC

IN THE WORSHIP

Editors Gospel Advocate:

When I received your request last winter to place in your hands for publication the discussion between Brother H. L. Calhoun and myself on the use of Instrumental Music In The Worship, I declined, for the time being, thinking that brother Calhoun might have something further to say in reply; but my last article has been in his hands now for more than a year, with no reply whatsoever from his pen, and I suppose it is useless at this date to expect anything further from him. He has read his production on "The Law of Worship" on different occasions to persons in private and has recently delivered it in public before the Tennessee State Convention of the Christian Church. I think I have met and answered his argument at every point, and it is but just that the public should see both sides of the question; hence, I now place the discussion in your hands, with the statement that, so far as I am concerned, you not only have full liberty to publish it, but also the concurrence of my own Judgment, with yours, that it should be published.

M. C. KURFEES

Louisville, Ky.

AN IMPORTANT QUESTION. Is the use of an instrument in connection with the singing in the church an act of worship? Before the question can be intelligently answered it is necessary to know what are the essential conditions of any act of worship. I lay down the following as the two essential conditions of an act of worship:

1. The act must be directed to some object regarded by the actor as a proper object of worship.
2. The act must be done with the intention on the part of the actor of doing homage to the object worshiped.

Any act which fulfills these two conditions is an act of worship, and any act which does not fulfill both these conditions is not worship. When an instrument is used in connection with the singing in the church and such use is directed to some object regarded as a proper object of worship by those using the instrument, and when it is used with the intention on the part of those using it of doing homage to that object, then this use of an instrument is worship, for it fulfills the two essential conditions of an act of worship. Examples of the use of an instrument in connection with the singing as an act

of worship are the Jews in the temple service and some sectarian bodies to-day. Both the Jews and the sectarians use the instrument with reference to God as the object and with the intention of doing homage to him by its use. Therefore, their use of the instrument is unquestionably worship, since it fulfills the essential conditions of an act of worship.

But a large proportion of those who choose to call themselves "Disciples of Christ" to-day use an instrument in connection with the singing in the church, and they tell us that their use of it is not an act of worship. Are they correct or incorrect in this statement? Their act must be tried by the essential conditions of an act of worship. If it fulfills them, it is an act of worship; if it does not fulfill them, it is not an act of worship. The only person who knows the object toward which an act is directed and the intention of the act is the person performing the act, and he does know both. "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? (1 Cor. 2:11.)

Now, if we ask this large proportion of Disciples, "Do you use the instrument with reference to any object regarded by you as a proper object of worship?" they answer, emphatically: "No." Again: "Do you use the instrument with the intention of doing homage to any object?" Again they answer, emphatically: "No." Now, if these people tell the truth, their use of an instrument cannot possibly be worship, for it does not fulfill the condition of an act of worship.

Any argument which says because the use of an instrument by the Jews and by certain sectarian bodies is worship, therefore its use by this large proportion of Disciples must be worship, is clearly invalid, because the cases are not similar. They differ in the only two points that have anything to do with the question of worship--viz., the object and the intention.

But some one may be ready to ask: "What does this large proportion of

Disciples use an instrument for, if not as worship?" To this question those Disciples would answer: We use it as a mere matter of convenience to ourselves. Just as a notebook, when properly used, is a convenience to the eye--giving the correct time, keeping the correct time, indicating the correct pitch, and leading each part of the music--so the organ, when properly used, gives to the ear the correct time, keeps the correct time, indicates the correct pitch, and leads each part of the music. Hence, the organ is a convenience for the ear, just as the note book is a convenience for the eye. They would respectfully suggest that those who say the notebook and organ or not properly classed together as conveniences would show the difference instead of saying that "those who class them together are guilty of the climax of logical stupidity." An ounce of sound reasoning is worth more than a ton of abuse in convincing intelligent people on any subject.

Can the use of an instrument in connection with the singing in the church be an act of acceptable worship? To answer the question intelligently we must know the essential conditions of an act of acceptable worship. Jesus, in John 4:24, states these for us, and they are three in number:

1. God must be the object to which the act is directed.
2. "In spirit", which means from the heart or sincerely or with the intention of doing homage, must be the spirit of the act.
3. "In truth", which means according to the truth, or as God directs in the New Testament, must be the manner of the act.

Any act which fulfills these three conditions is acceptable worship, and any act which does not fulfill all three of these conditions is not acceptable worship.

It will be admitted that the New Testament no where mentions the use of an instrument in connection with the singing in the church. This fact settles,

beyond all dispute, that the use of an instrument in connection with the singing in the church cannot be an act of acceptable worship, for it fails to fulfill one of the essential conditions of an act of acceptable worship, and the condition which it fails to fulfill is the only condition which differentiates an act of acceptable from an act of worship which is not acceptable.

The use of instruments by the Jews was acceptable worship, for they lived under the Old Testament, which directed them to use instruments; but people today, living under the New Testament, have no direction given for their use as worship. Hence, the only possible ground upon which any one can seek to justify the use of an instrument in connection with the singing in the church is that of convenience, and not worship. H. L. CALHOUN.

REPLY TO "AN IMPORTANT QUESTION".

Brother Calhoun: Your article on the use of instrumental music in the worship of God under Christ came duly to hand, and has been carefully examined. In response to your request that I submit a criticism of the arguments therein presented, I proceed to offer such reflections as the logical character of your production seems to demand; and I the more cheerfully do so, because of your accompanying statement that you are unable to see any fallacy in the line of argument which you present. Allowing all due credit for ingeniousness of arrangement, a merit which candor compels me to accord to your communication, I am, nevertheless, surprised that you are unable to see the fallacy that lurks in much that you have written. By the help of the Lord, I shall endeavor to place your production under conditions that will enable you to see wherein it is deceptive as an argument, and, hence, that it utterly breaks down at the very point where you seem to think it is strong and unanswerable.

That we may come at once to the main fortress behind which you seem willing to risk your cause, I begin

with an examination of your canon on worship. The first of what you lay down as "the two essential conditions of an act of worship" is as follows: "The act must be directed to some object regarded by the actor as a proper object of worship." But in this you are mistaken. The fact is, this your first statement in the form of a proposition is simply not true. You gravely put it forth as a statement of fact, whereas the statement itself is a palpable contradiction of fact. I am surprised that numerous events in the Old Testament history plainly contradicting the statement did not occur to you. Turning now to the record in I Kings 13, we find that Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, established idolatrous worship in altars at Bethel and Dan. He worshiped at these altars, bowing down to the gods of his own creation and teaching Israel to follow his presumptuous course. Without entering into the details of the history, not demanded by the present investigation, the fact stands out in plain view to every eye that is open to see it that these gods were not only not "a proper object of worship", but that Jeroboam himself knew they were not. Here is a case of worship, then, in which the act was not only "directed to some object" not "regarded by the actor as a proper object of worship", but which the actor himself positively knew was a very improper object of worship. But, nevertheless, he proceeded headlong and headstrong in his presumptuous determination to worship that object, because it suited his rebellious purpose to do so; and he has many imitators in principle to-day. But this is by no means an isolated case. Precisely the same point could be made with the facts connected with the reigns of Ahab, Baasha, Nadab, Omri, and others; and yet, as a part of your presentation of the organ issue, you send forth a direct contradiction of this fact, and say in a private note accompanying your arguments: "I am frank to tell you that I do not see any way to answer it." If it were clearly and positively in evidence that you are absolutely free from any predilection in favor of the organ side of this controversy, I might not sus-

pect that the inability, so frankly acknowledged by you, to see a fact thus plainly revealed is to be accounted for in the same way in which both you and I account for the inability of very able, pious, and learned men to see that a burial in water is the only baptism taught and practiced by inspired men or that is supported by the united voice of classic usage and scholarship. With a frankness not excelled by your own, they tell us they "do not see any way to answer" the arguments they are able to make in favor of sprinkling and pouring for baptism; but it would be difficult to convince either you or myself that the alleged inability would not be largely removed by a removal of all predilection in favor of sprinkling and pouring. I see no other ground on which to account for your inability to see that your statement is a plain contradiction of Bible facts.

I now come to the second part of your canon on worship, which is as follows: "The act must be done with the intention on the part of the actor of doing homage to the object worshiped." Commenting on the whole, you say: "Any act which fulfills these two conditions is an act of worship, and any act which does not fulfill both these conditions is not worship." But we have already seen that your first "essential condition of an act of worship" is no condition at all, but is a plain contradiction of Bible facts, and hence, that some acts which "do not fulfill both these conditions" are, nevertheless, acts of worship; and we will now see that your reasoning on the second condition is as unsound as your statement of the first is untrue.

After conceding that the use of instrumental music by Jews and sectarians is worship you attempt to come to the rescue of "a large proportion of those who choose to call themselves 'Disciples of Christ,'" and who "tell us that their use of it is not an act of worship," by an application of your canon on worship; and you gravely tell us, referring to your second condition, that "the only person who knows . . . the intention of the act is the person performing the act," which, forsooth, you try to back

up with Scripture by quoting: "Who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man which is in him?" (1 Cor. 2:11.) You then complete this ingenious application of your canon in the form of a catechism, as follows: "If we ask this large proportion of Disciples, 'Do you use the instrument with reference to any object regarded by you as a proper object of worship?' they answer, emphatically: 'No.' Again: 'Do you use the instrument with the intention of doing homage to any object?' Again they answer, emphatically: 'No;'" Thus the case is so arranged that the man who wants instrumental music in the worship, in spite of its rejection therefrom by Christ and inspired apostles, is himself resolved into the entire court---judge, jury, counsel, and witness---and of course it is an easy matter to have a verdict rendered in favor of himself. You not only place in his hands the means of having the case always decided "unanimously" in his own favor, but the logical use which you make of this contrivance effectually debars all others, even God himself, from having a solitary word to say in the case. No other alternative is left to the universe of intelligences but to meekly bow and implicitly acquiesce in the ipse dixit decision of this remarkable monocratic court. If Nadab and Abihu (Lev. 10) had been in possession of this ingenious canon and had made the same logical use of it, notwithstanding they were performing an act in offering strange fire which the Lord himself and his people regarded as worship, they could, nevertheless, have promptly replied that they did not do it "with the intention of doing homage to any object," and this giant blow would have knocked out Moses, Aaron, Eleazar, Ithamar, and all the rest. If you contend that the fact that what they were doing was regarded by the Lord as worship would have precluded setting up such a claim in that case, then I reply that the same is true in the case before us, and with equal clearness it precludes setting up such a claim in this case. Instrumental music, when used in the manner in question, was not only regarded by the Lord as worship, but there is no instance on record in which he regarded it any other way. The idea that it is not

worship was never thought of, so far as the public has been informed, until its advocates discovered their inability to meet the position of those who stand with the Son of God and inspired apostles in their rejection of its use from the worship of God under Christ. It is an ex post facto invention to meet an emergency.

But, since you are disposed to hinge the whole matter on the ex parte deliverance of this self-constituted, self-appointed, monocratic court, which rules out both God and man and leaves the worshiper himself as sole umpire in the case, with unlimited power to practice as he pleases, with the right to a safe retreat under the specious plea that he does not "intend" it as worship, I now propose to examine the logical merits of this method of argumentation and to show that, in the present instance, it is utterly untenable and misleading. This fact will appear from two considerations:

1. It proves too much, and hence, logically, proves nothing. By the very terms of your canon, the flood gates are opened for every abomination under heaven, not in itself morally wrong, which men may see fit to introduce into the service of God. I use the word "abomination" advisedly here; for while, strictly speaking, things not morally wrong are not in themselves abominable, yet many such things would be an abomination in the service of God; and there is no escape from the conclusion that your principle opens the way for the practice of every imaginable whim or fancy of man. Even the Son of God himself could have been silenced by the Jews in the matter of washing hands and other traditions which they had introduced, and which he so solemnly condemned as vain worship. (Matt. 15: 1-9; Mark 7: 1-13.) They could have routed him from the field of debate by informing him that they did not "intend" it as worship. It is true he could have replied: "You go through with this performance in precisely the same way that you do other acts which are worship, and how can it be that they are worship and this is not?" But such a statement of fact

would have been to no purpose, for they could have promptly replied, "We do not 'intend' it as worship, and 'what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?'" and this would have placed an effectual quietus upon all opposition.

Nor is this all; for, by this principle of argumentation, the very same defense can be made of all the flummery of Rome, including the burning of incense, burning candles, or doing anything else men may see fit to do in the service of God. You would be utterly powerless to rule out such things on the plea that they would be of no use in the worship; for, according to the terms of your canon and the use you make of it, neither you nor anybody else can have anything to say in the case, so long as the worshiper himself says they are of use to him and that he does not "intend" them as worship. You make the point that certain "Disciples," whom you are defending, want instrumental music as "a convenience for the ear" while they are worshipping God; but if they may have instrumental music as a "convenience" to the auditory nerves while worshipping God, others may want to burn incense and candles as a "convenience" to the olfactory and visual nerves while worshipping God; and if convenience is a valid reason in the one case, why is it not in the other?

2. Your reasoning involves rebellion against God. Inasmuch as "the use of an instrument in connection with the singing in the Jewish service was worship, which you candidly admit, I now propose to show that its use by certain "Disciples," which you have undertaken to defend, is either worship, and hence is to be condemned because not divinely directed, or, if really not intended as worship, is, nevertheless, a case of rebellion against God. Be it observed, then, that the term "music" is generic, comprehending the only two kinds of music in existence --- namely, vocal and instrumental. It follows, therefore, that if, at any time, God should command the praise of his name by means of music

without specifying the kind, either kind used separately, or both kinds jointly and simultaneously, would come within the purview of the divine command; but if the praise of God should be ordered with specific directions that it be done with one of these kinds of music, then the use of the other kind would not be obedience to the divine command. In such a case the one kind of music is explicitly commanded, the other is implicitly forbidden. Now, it happens that both of these kinds of music were incorporated in the Jewish worship and were allowed to remain in it as long as the system of Judaism itself remained; but when Judaism was abolished and a new order of worship was established, the children of God were not commanded in general terms to make music or praise God, but they were commanded to make one specific kind of music---namely, vocal music---in the praise of God. (Matt. 26:30; Acts 16:25; Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; Heb. 13:15.) Now, the Holy Spirit not only specifically incorporated vocal music in the worship of God under Christ, from which it follows that having the other kind is not obedience to the divine command, but it did so in the face of the existence and usage up to that time of both kinds of music in the worship, thus revealing the fact that it was not only the divine will to have the kind of music specified, but that it was not the divine will to have the other kind, from which it follows that having the other kind, "in connection with the singing in the "worship, even though not "intended" as worship, is, nevertheless, rebellion against God. If it is not rebellion, then we are confronted with the curious and anomalous fact that men may do the very thing which, by all the facts in the case, God has implicitly forbidden, and may do it at the same time and in the same place when and where it is so forbidden, and yet not be engaged in rebellion against God, because, forsooth, of some peculiar "intention" they may have in the performance. But no difference what may be the intention of worshipers, whenever and wherever they have the instrument, even though it may be, as you constantly express it, only "in connection with the singing in the church" without "intending" it as worship, it is, nevertheless, indefensible on this ground; for its use

"in connection with the singing" when men are worshipping God is the very thing which is contrary to the will of God. Although, as we have seen, the two kinds of music were both in use in the worship under the Old Covenant, we have a clear and unmistakable expression of the divine choice of the one kind and the omission of the other kind in the worship under the New Covenant. It is, therefore, ruled out of the worship under the New Covenant on precisely the same principle on which you and others rule out infant membership in the church, which is nowhere explicitly commanded, but by all the facts in the case is everywhere implicitly forbidden. The conclusion is, therefore, unavoidable that its use in connection with vocal music in Christian worship is rebellion against God.

Finally, I beg to suggest that the attitude which you have chosen to assume toward the present issue, and the impression which you seem to be seeking to make, are worthy of your serious consideration. You seem to feel that it is necessary to be constantly explaining that it is not your purpose to advocate the use of the organ. But if it is not wrong to advocate its use, why fear that you will appear as so doing? And if it is wrong, or even possibly wrong, to do so, why assume an attitude toward the question that makes it necessary to keep explaining that you are not advocating it? I certainly do not question your statement that you "have never knowingly advocated the use of an instrument in connection with the singing in the church;" but no difference whether you "wish to be so understood in this article" or not, the article is, nevertheless, a very manifest, though illogical, defense of this very use of the instrument, and it is to be regretted that you have assumed an attitude toward the question which prevents you from seeing so plain a fact. Moreover, even granting, for the sake of argument, that the practice per se is not sinful, why do you think it necessary, my dear brother, to construct arguments in favor of it to see if they can be answered? If the organ should be kept out of the churches,

even by fallacious argument in some instances, would sin lie at their doors? Would it not be better to point out the fallacy without defending the practice? Years ago you modestly refrained from speaking out against this innovation, stating as the reason for your course that you did not deem it wise, using your own vigorous and pointed language, to "butt out your brains arguing against the organ before the people found out whether you had any brains or not." I thought this was an exhibition of commendable modesty; but, with the inevitable impression which such words would make, it seems strange that all subsequent efforts calculated to impress the public concerning your cerebral capacity which you have been willing to risk on this issue have been in the interest of the other side. Doubtless, in the estimation of many, you will make a favorable impression for yourself, even on the wrong side of an issue like this; but, on the principle that :

Thrice is he armed that hath his quarrel just,

I crave for the public an opportunity to witness an exhibition of your powers on the side of truth in the present controversy. Is it vain to hope they may yet see it? I trust not. On the contrary, I trust you may yet resurvey this whole question, weighing well the influence of your life and teaching on an issue whose history is marked by wrecked and ruined churches and by heartbreaking alienations, and on one side alone of which is universal union possible among the followers of Christ. May the Lord rule in and overrule us both for the advancement of his truth.

Most fraternally,
M. C. KURFEES

CRITICISM OF BROTHER KURFEES' "REPLY TO AN IMPORTANT QUESTION."

Preliminary Remarks. The "important question" reads as follows: "Is the use of an instrument in connection with the singing in the church an act of worship?"

Please let the following things be considered as decided, so far as we

are both concerned, for the present, at least:

- (1) That the use of instruments by the Jews in connection with their singing was worship;
- (2) That the use made of instruments by the sectarians to-day is worship;
- (3) That the use of instruments in connection with the singing in the church is not mentioned in the New Testament;
- (4) That worship by means of instruments to-day is not "in truth", and, therefore, not such as God seeks or accepts;
- (5) That even if it were shown clearly that the use of instruments in connection with the singing in the church is not worship, their use might still be wrong for other reasons;
- (6) That the real issue involved in the above question is over the use made of instruments by "a large proportion of those who choose to call themselves 'Disciples of Christ' today who say they do not use it as worship;" and
- (7) That the issue is that Brother Kurfees affirms that the use of instruments by this large proportion of those who choose to call themselves "Disciples of Christ" to-day is worship, while Brother Calhoun does not see the proof that it is worship, and hence, logically, must deny that it is worship until he sees the proof to the contrary.

Again, please let it be understood

- (1) That Brother Calhoun emphatically denies having made any argument which can be fairly construed as favoring the use of an instrument in connection with the singing in the church;
- (2) That Brother Calhoun thinks that any such construction as would

make his arguments favor the use of an instrument in connection with the singing in the church grows out of a "predilection" similar to that which enables the advocate for sprinkling as baptism to see an argument for sprinkling where you and I see no argument for anything of the kind;

(3) That Brother Calhoun thinks he has discovered not a "lurking" fallacy, but a very patent one, in the old argument which has been worn threadbare in our religious papers for the past ten years, saying that the use of an instrument in connection with the singing in the church is always a part of the worship, and, therefore, sinful, since it is, if this be true, an addition to the worship;

(4) That Brother Calhoun, believing that "a candid mind will disdain to take the help of a falsehood, even in support of the truth" (Dr. George Campbell on "Immersion," by John T. Christian, page 230), has simply endeavored to point out the falsehood in this argument, so that the candid minds among his brethren might disdain to use it longer;

(5) That Brother Calhoun tried to point out this fallacy by formulating a definition of "an act of worship" and then showing that the use of an instrument in connection with the singing by "a large proportion of those who choose to call themselves 'Disciples of Christ' to-day" did not fulfill the conditions of an act of worship, and hence is not worship, but that, according to their own statement, its use was simply a matter of convenience to themselves;

(6) That Brother Calhoun made no argument on any other phase of the instrumental music question, such as its being rebellion against God, etc., and that he knows, and so stated in the letter accompanying his article, that there are other things to be considered besides the one mentioned in his article in the settlement of this question;

(7) That Brother Calhoun does not feel that he needs any admonitions and exhortations to be sound in the faith

any more than Brother Kurfees does, and while he appreciates the kind, though mistaken, intent of all such homilies, he respectfully suggests that solid argument be substituted for them in the future, and he believes more good will be done.

CRITICISM.

1. Occupying the logical affirmative of this question, when you denied the correctness of my definition of an act of worship it was your logical duty to give a definition which you considered correct. This course would have brought the main issue fairly and prominently before us. But you, for some reason, chose (notwithstanding two earnest requests to the contrary) to refuse me the benefit of your definition of the most important term in the proposition. Had you given this definition of an act of worship, it would have been a very short work to try the act of using an instrument in connection with the singing in the church by this definition, and if the act fulfilled the conditions as laid down in the definition, it would have been shown to be worship without another argument.

2. After denying the correctness of my definition of an act of worship, you next explained my inability to perceive its incorrectness by an insinuation which was certainly "ingenious," though one which, strangely enough, you did not see might as easily, if applied to you, explain your inability to see the correctness of my statements---viz., a "predilection" like that of the advocate of sprinkling. This predilection to see arguments for the use of instruments where no such arguments really exist you will doubtless disclaim, and I just as emphatically disclaim the predilection attributed to me, and I feel myself fully able to give as strong proof of my innocence in this regard as you can of yours.

3. Your criticism of my first condition of an act of worship, which reads as follows, "The act must be directed to some object regarded by the actor as a proper object of worship,"

appears to me to be directed against the word "proper." Now, you give to this word "proper" an entirely different meaning from what I intended it to express. It seems to me that you use it as synonymous with "worthy," while I meant it to express the idea of "fit" or "appropriate" to worship for any reason satisfactory to the worshiper. I am perfectly willing to drop out the word "proper," and let the condition read thus: "The act must be directed to some object of worship." The shorter form expresses all that I meant in the longer expression. I have frequently written the condition down this way: "The act must be directed to some god." Webster defines "god" as "an object of worship." You may, perhaps, contend that my words really mean what you said they did and that I ought not to have used those words unless I meant to convey that idea. I will not contend that my meaning was expressed in the best way possible, but all I ask is the privilege of saying that when you "shot" at the word "proper" with the idea you have of its meaning, you missed toto caelo my first condition, as I understand it. It seems to me that the plainness of the cases of Jeroboam and those others who followed in his same wicked course ought to have shown you that you had missed entirely the real meaning of the first condition. Concerning the case of Jeroboam, I think you and I will have no trouble in agreeing on the following points:

1. When he made the two calves as idol gods (1 Kings 12:28), he sinned by violating God's command in Ex. 20:4,5.
2. When he changed the place of sacrifice from Jerusalem to Bethel and Dan, he sinned.
3. When he changed the priesthood from the family of Aaron, he sinned again.
4. When he changed the time of the feast, he sinned again.
5. That he certainly did direct his sacrifices to those calves is stated in 1 Kings 12:32.

6. That Jeroboam deemed all this proper for him to do to keep the kingdom from going back to Rehoboam.

7. That "Jeroboam himself knew" that all these things were contrary to God's law.

8. That "nevertheless he proceeded headlong and headstrong in his presumptuous determination to worship that object because it suited his rebellious purpose to do so."

9. That "precisely the same point could be made with the facts connected with the reigns of Ahab, Baasha, Nadab, Omri, and others."

From a consideration of the above points, you will readily see, I think, that my first condition of an act of worship, as I understood it, is in perfect harmony with all the Bible facts cited by you and that your criticisms have all been directed against an idea not intended to be expressed by myself in the proposition and which I do not think is really in it when the words are taken in their exact sense.

I now come to your treatment of the second part of my definition of an act of worship, my reasoning on which you pronounce "unsound." Your first objection under this head appears to have reference to my statement that "the only person who knows the intention of the act is the person performing the act"---which statement you say I try to back up by quoting 1 Cor. 2: 11: "What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?" clearly implying by the form of your statement that I did not succeed in proving my proposition by this scripture. Now I have twice earnestly asked you for an exegesis of this scripture, that I might see wherein you deemed my application of it wrong, but you have twice refused (perhaps you would say "deferred") to give me your exegesis.

I will favor you with an exegesis of it which I believe is correct

and which is entirely in harmony with my application of it, and which, logically, I defy you to show incorrect. So we have here a clear issue which I hope both of us will squarely face.

"What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?" is an erotesis. Changing the figurative into literal language, we have: "No man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him." "No man" does not exclude God or Christ or the Holy Spirit; it does exclude every human being, save the man himself. "The things of a man" are his thoughts, feelings, and intentions. These three things embrace all of a man's mental operations. So in regard to these things he is judge, jury, counsel, witness, monocratic, etc., not by his appointment, but by the creative act of God, who made him that way, and until he in some way makes known his thoughts, feelings, and purposes, no other man can say what they are. It was certainly a remarkable statement on your part that my application of this scripture would exclude God, Christ, or any inspired man. I am sure I said no such thing and I do not believe anything of the kind. So all your talk about Nadab and Abihu does not touch the point under consideration at all. You say the idea that the use of an instrument in connection with the singing in the church is not worship was never heard of until the advocates of instruments discovered their inability to meet those who oppose them. Please allow me to say that I am not specially concerned to know the exact age of this argument, but I am anxious to know whether it is valid or not, and I know I have been hearing it from those who use them for the last ten years.

You next propose to show that my method of argumentation "proves too much, and hence proves nothing." You say it opens the flood gates for every abomination under heaven, even "all the flummery of Rome," "the burning of incense, burning candles," etc. Now, you know that all these things are done as worship and that we all condemn any addition to the appointed worship revealed in the New Testament. You burn some kind of lights in your meeting-

house, and I suppose they are used as matters of convenience; but you do not think it wrong, nor do I, to use them as conveniences. They are not necessities, for you can worship without them; blind people worship without them all the time, and the Christians in early times often met and worshiped without your modern conveniences in the way of lights. Will you kindly inform me just what conveniences are proper and what are not proper to use and how you found out about them? Sometimes I find a bouquet of flowers on the pulpit on Sundays. They are not even conveniences in the ordinary use of that term, but I have never thought it sinful to let them remain there but if they were placed there as an act of worship, I should oppose it. Do you ever have flowers on your pulpit? If so, how do you justify their use? The only difference between your burning of lights and that of the Catholics is that yours is an act of convenience, while theirs is an act of worship; and so of the other things mentioned by you. So all your great volume of wordy assertions about Jewish washing of hands and Roman rites and ceremonies fails to weigh even one grain when placed in the scale of logic, and I am truly surprised that you did not see the glaring fallacy staring you in the face.

Your next objection is the serious charge that my "reasoning involves rebellion against God." The premises from which you draw the conclusion involved in this charge may be briefly stated as follows: The term "music" is generic, comprehending all music under the two divisions--vocal and instrumental. Both these kinds of music were incorporated in the Jewish worship. When Judaism was abolished and Christianity was established, vocal music only was incorporated in the worship.

The logical conclusion following from these premises is that the use of instrumental music in the worship is rebellion against God. Hence, you can see that your conclusion, "Having the other kind (instrumental) in connection with the singing is rebellion

against God," is simply not true, as the merest tyro in logic ought to know. The foregoing remarks appear to me to be sufficient to place your "Reply to 'An Important Question'" "under conditions that will enable you to see wherein it is defective and that it utterly breaks down at the very points where you seem to think it strong and unanswerable."

Finally, "I beg to suggest that the attitude which you have chosen to assume" in the present issue is worthy of your most serious consideration; for when you resolve yourself into the entire court--judge, jury, counsel, and witness--to pronounce the decision of "predilection" as the ground of your opponent's inability to see that his arguments are not sound, it will, of course, be easy to secure a decision in your own favor from this self-constituted, self-appointed, monocratic court; and under such circumstances you need not be surprised that your opponent should refuse to accept this "ex parte" deliverance and appeal to a judge who, is not possessed of more presumption, is at least possessed of more ability to look into men's hearts and read them. Is it too much to hope that in the future you will accord to your opponent that same freedom from prejudice which you claim for yourself? I trust not. May God add his blessing. H. L. CALHOUN.

REVIEW OF BROTHER CALHOUN'S "CRITICISM OF BROTHER KURFEES' 'REPLY TO AN IMPORTANT QUESTION.'"

Brother Calhoun: Yours in reply to my review of your first article on the instrumental music question has been carefully examined, and I am glad to perceive that the line of argumentation submitted in said review remains intact. I shall proceed, therefore, to point out where your reasoning in the present case, as in the former, not only fails to establish your position, but opens wide the flood gates for all manner of unscriptural practices in the worship of God. This will abundantly appear as the investigation proceeds. Some erroneous statements, as well as questions, in your document demand attention; and I shall endeavor, first of all, to properly notice these,

and then to point out the fallacy in your argument. For the sake of order and clearness of thought, I shall arrange my reply in accordance with this twofold classification of matter; and hence we may notice:

I. A CORRECTION OF ERRONEOUS STATEMENTS, WITH ANSWER TO QUESTIONS.

(1) Of course "a candid mind will disdain to take the help of a falsehood, even in support of the truth," but it does not follow, as you assume, that "a candid mind" will rush to the defense of a practice which "truth" nowhere demands. It is this manifest readiness on your part to spring to the defense of instrumental music in a connection in which you yourself admit truth does not demand that it be used that makes the impression that you have a "predilection" in favor of the practice. You need not be surprised, my dear brother, if people continue to have this impression about you as long as you write, talk, and act about instrumental music as you do, and as long as nothing more harmful than keeping churches from using it is done by the arguments you assail. If you would properly practice the principle of the illustrious man you quote, it seems to me you would "disdain" to pursue a course not demanded by the Lord which constantly leads good and thoughtful men to regard you as favoring a practice which leads to strife and division among churches, and which practice you yourself admit God does not require; and I hesitate not to say that any one who can knowingly pursue such a course must have a very decided "predilection" in favor of such practice.

(2) If "Brother Calhoun does not feel that he needs any admonitions and exhortations to be sound in the faith any more than Brother Kurfees" needs them, what then? "Brother Kurfees" frankly admits that he does need such "admonitions and exhortations" and feels grateful to the Lord and to his brethren for them, and he fails to see that the author of this bit of information makes any "solid argument" or

gains anything at all by telling in this case what he "does not feel." The most conspicuous difference between these two brethren at this point is that Brother Calhoun disregards the "admonitions and exhortations" to stay within the word of the Lord and spends some of his time in running outside after instrumental music, while "Brother Kurfees" is trying to put in all his time in a laborious effort to stay within the word. Enough "solid argument" has already been "substituted" to make this distinction clear.

(3) If I have any predilections at all on the instrumental music question, which doubtless I have, I am glad they are all in favor of remaining within the word of God, and never going after what is outside, and I take no offense at all at your insinuations about my prejudices along this line. It is difficult for frail human beings to keep from being prejudiced; and, knowing so well the danger common to all of us in this direction, I am engaged in a constant effort to so study, preach, and practice on this and on all other issues that whatever prejudices I may have will all be in favor of what is in the word of God, and opposed only to that which is outside.

(4) Your emphatic denial of "having made any argument favoring the use of an instrument in connection with the singing" reminds me that you could just as emphatically and with as good reason deny "having made any argument favoring" anything at all. What do you expect your articles to "favor," if not "the use of an instrument in connection with the singing?" I do not charge that you so intend your articles; but I dismiss this point with the single remark that the proper way to meet your emphatic denial is with a mild reference to your articles, for they are a plain contradiction of your denial.

(5) I have not "refused" to define "worship." I wrote you fully in a private letter, and in a way that should have saved you from making this kind of a statement.

(6) Certainly you have the unquestioned

right to explain your language, and I accept your explanation; but I have the right, also, to understand you to mean what you say. You said that before an act could be worship it "must be directed to some object regarded by the actor as a proper object of worship," and you repeated the statement several times; but it is not correct. Your language not only failed to express what you meant, but it expressed what you did not mean; and if I "missed" your "first condition" the breadth of "the whole heavens" when I "shot at the word 'proper,'" it is because you yourself "missed" saying what you meant. Of course "Jeroboam deemed all this proper for him to do to keep the kingdom from going back to Rehoboam," and doubtless the makers of instrumental music "deem all this music 'proper'" for them to have to keep up what they want. I am aware, too, that it "is stated in 1 Kings 12: 32 that "Jeroboam "did direct his sacrifice to these calves;" but how easily he could have escaped the charge of being an idolater, if he had made the same application of your canon on worship that you make by replying to the Lord's prophets that he did not "intend" it as worship! This powerful weapon would have knocked them all out; "for what man knoweth the hings of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?" You dare not deny that he could said this; and, moreover, you dare not deny that precisely the same thing could be said as an excuse for every abomination under heaven, not morally wrong, that men might wish to introduce into the worship of God.

(7) You are entirely mistaken about my being a "monocratic court" sitting in judgment on your case and rendering an "ex parte" verdict. True, it has fallen to my lot, by your own appointment, to sit in judgment on the case, but others besides myself belong to the "court," and they are all, as far as I know, reluctant to render the verdict toughing your attitude toward the instrumental music question which the testimony in the case forces upon them. Only last month the following inquiry and comment were sent from a point where you

had held a meeting: "How does Brother Calhoun stand on the organ and society question? He held a meeting here, and told us who oppose these things that he opposed them, but he never mentioned the subject in the pulpit. I believe he is trying to carry both sides of the question." This was at a place where, according to the letter referred to, instrumental music had been forced upon the church and had caused division. Other letters and facts are before me from brethren who have heard you talk on this subject, and they are all to the same effect. No, my brother, the "court" I am in on the present case is not "monocratic," but decidedly "poly-cra-tic," and its numbers seem to increase wherever you go and talk on the subject. If you are really opposed to the use of the organ "in connection with the singing," how does the opposite impression get out? There was a time when you made no such impression. Even as late as when you took the important step of resigning as teacher at Lexington, Ky., you were careful to inform me that you did so because the tendencies there were too much in favor of these innovations, and that you did not feel right in giving your influence in that direction. This, of course, could make but one impression; and when I suggested that you might help the case of truth by making a public statement of the reasons for your course you repeated the same:

statement, first made to me at the time of your graduation, that you did not wish to "butt out your brains arguing against these things before the people found out whether you had any brains or not." Now, as you still say that you are against these things, when do you expect to begin your opposition to them?

(8) Concerning "a bouqout of flowers on the pulpit," you say you "have never thought it sinful to let them remain there." Neither do I think the organ sinful at the place of worship, if you just "let it remain there" and do not make music on it when worshipping God. As to the use of "lights," I do not burn lights "in the meeting-house" nor anywhere else, as you as-

sume, when worshipping God, as instrumental music is made. If I did, somebody ought to deal with me on burning lights as I am trying to deal with you on making instrumental music. I deny that I burn lights or do anything else not commanded when worshipping God as instrumental music is made.

(9) As to whether "in the future" I will "be willing to accord to" my opponent the "same freedom from prejudice which" I claim for myself, it depends altogether on whether or not my opponent gives evidence that he has the "same freedom from prejudice." It will be no trouble "to accord" it, if there is evidence that it exists. The fact is, if my opponent's prejudices in the present discussion, unfortunately did not seem to be on the wrong side, I would, perhaps, have had nothing to say against them; but according to documentary evidence that he has placed in my hands, as well as other facts, his prejudices are so pronounced in favor of instrumental music that he is not only engaged in a struggle, the purpose of which seems to be to open the way for having it "in connection with the singing," but after preaching through a protracted meeting where a church is divided over the subject, he leaves the impression that "he is trying to carry both sides of the question." If this is not a bias in favor of it, what would it take to constitute such a bias? We may now notice:

II. THE FALLACY IN YOUR ARGUMENT, AND THE TRUE POSITION INVOLVED.

When you state the issue between us in form of the question, "Is the use of an instrument in connection with the singing in the church an act of worship?" you fail to state it correctly. I have raised no issue as to whether an "instrument" simply may be used "in connection with the singing in the church," although you and other advocates of instrumental music seem inclined, for some reason, to state the issue in this indefinite form. The real issue is: Is instrumental music

in connection with the singing in the church a part of the worship? It may be said, in general terms, that it depends on what the singing is for and who makes the instrumental music. If the singing is for the worship of God and the instrumental music is made by the church, then it will be seen, in the light of all the facts in the case, that it is either worship, and vain worship at that, or in any event is a case of rebellion against God. "To the law and to the testimony" I now appeal:

(1) The Lord himself says instrumental music, when used in this identical connection, is worship. Neither does he limit it in this particular character to "the Jews in connection with their singing" nor to "the sectarians to-day," as you try to do, but simply says that such music in such connection is worship. Hear his word: "When the burnt offering began, the song of the Lord began also, and the trumpets, together with the instruments of David king of Israel. And all the congregation worshiped." (2 Chron. 29:27, 28, R.V.) This testimony is clear and specific. After giving the parts performed by all, including the making of instrumental music, the record says: "All the congregation worshiped." Now, "those who choose to call themselves 'Disciples of Christ,'" whose use of instrumental music you have undertaken to defend, use it at the same time, in the same place, and in the same connection. In their case, precisely as in that of the Jews, when "the song of the Lord begins," they begin also "with the instruments of David king of Israel," and the Lord says it is worship. He does not say it was worship because it was among "the Jews" or "some sectarians", as your logic assumes, but he says that such use of instrumental music in such connection is worship. When the Bible says that a certain act in a certain connection is worship, I conclude that whatever is essential to an act of worship is present with all who perform that act in that connection. If not, why not? If you remind me here that the "Disciples" in question "say they do not use it as worship," it is sufficient to reply that they also "say," in another way, that they do use it as worship; and if there

is a lack of harmony between their "sayings" on the subject, I hesitate not to accept the one that agrees with the Lord. This leads me to say that I accept your exegesis of I Cor. 2:11, because in all essential particulars it is correct; but after giving a correct exegesis of the passage, you make a remark the significant bearing of which you seem to overlook. Concerning a man's intentions, you correctly observe that "he is judge, jury, counsel, witness, etc., not by his appointment, but by the creative act of God, who made him that way; and until he in some way makes known his thoughts, feelings, and purposes, no other man can say what they are." Exactly so; and your fallacy here is in overlooking the fact that these "Disciples" do "in some way make known" that the intention necessary to an act of worship is present with them. They do not make it known "by word of mouth" but by other "signs of ideas"--namely, by doing at the same time, in the same place, and in the same connection that which God calls "worship", and of course all the intentions necessary to an act of worship must be present. If you say that what the Lord calls "worship" was confined to the Jews, I deny it, and I make good my denial by simply stating the fact that certain acts were performed at a certain time, in a certain connection, and the Lord calls these acts, as such and in such connection, "worship"; but "those who choose to call themselves 'Disciples'" perform the same acts, at the same time, and in the same connection, and it follows, with the irresistible force of logic, that these acts, when thus performed by them, are worship. If not, why not? If you still question this conclusion, then I call upon you to produce a solitary thing in the making of the instrumental music of II Chron. 29, where the Lord calls it "worship", that is not also present in the making of such music by these "Disciples".

(2) I will now examine your claim that they use instrumental music simply "as a convenience to themselves". You make the charge that your opponents on this issue use such conveniences, and your implied conclusion is that "those

who choose to call themselves 'Disciples of Christ'" do no more when they use instrumental music than we do in principle when we use other things. It is quite easy, of course, for you to call it a "convenience" and to assume the very thing to be proved-- namely, that your opponents use conveniences involving the same principle that is involved in the use of instrumental music "in connection with the singing". Now, I respectfully deny this, and call for the proof. You simply assume, my dear brother, that your opponents on the present issue use conveniences involving this principle; but I deny it.

(3) In response to your request for a definition of "worship", please observe, first of all, that it is not necessary to trouble ourselves about the meaning of the Anglo-Saxon word "worship", only in so far as we make it the exact equivalent of the Greek and Hebrew words of which it is the representative in the English Scriptures. The different Greek words rendered "worship" in the New Testament are "proskuneo," "sebomai," and "latreuo", answering, respectively, to the Hebrew words "shachah," "Yare," and "avadh", which are rendered by the same word in the Old Testament. I prefer to adopt the definition of those who speak with authority rather than to frame one of my own. Hence, without attempting to give, in this connection, the varying shades of meaning involved in these different words, which is not material to the truth we are seeking, it is sufficient to note the fact that by the very highest lexical authority on the roll of biblical Greek and Hebrew scholarship, Joseph Henry Thayer and William Gesenius, they are defined, substantially, to mean, "to revere, to prostrate oneself, make obeisance, or yield allegiance to one;" and, as pertaining to God and man, "to worship, or serve God by observing the rites instituted for the purpose." Thus far we have worship in general and the divinely ordained worship of God in particular defined only in general terms. Turning now to the Word of God, we find this worship, as prescribed under Christ, consists in reading the Scriptures, prayer, mutual exhortations, contributions, the Lord's Supper, and vocal music. Now note carefully the fact that whenever and

wherever men have God in view as the object of their devotions these things, and these things only, may be done. Of course, if it be at a time when God is not the object of their devotions, they may perform other acts; but at all times and places, when men are paying devotions to God, he has prescribed, in clear and unmistakable terms, what shall be read, the kind of prayers to make, how to exhort one another, what to contribute into the treasury, what kind of supper to eat, and what kind of music to make. In regard to this last-named item, which is the one involved in the present controversy, if we propound the question to the Lord, "What kind of music may men make when paying devotions to thee?" the Lord's answer comes back through an inspired man: "Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord." (Eph. 5:19.) In plain words the Lord himself sends back the answer: "When worshiping me, make vocal music." He does not say "music," but "vocal music," the only kind he desires to hear at such times, thus naming not only the specific kind of music, but the particular time when it, and it alone, may be had. Now it is at this point where your fallacy is exposed and your argument completely breaks down. You admit that God is the object had in view by "those who choose to call themselves 'Disciples of Christ'" in the vocal music they are making, along with other divinely prescribed acts, and they themselves admit the same thing. This is sufficient, and from it there is no appeal. They themselves being the witnesses, God is the object of their devotions at the particular time and place in question, and the Lord himself has settled it that at any time and place whatsoever when he is the object of man's devotions, only vocal music may be made; and, unless it can be shown that some other kind of music is essential to vocal music, hence involved in the command to sing, whenever "those who choose to call themselves 'Disciples of Christ'" engage in making instrumental music at the time when they are paying devotions to God,

they are engaged in vain worship, according to the passage: "In vain do they do worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men." (Matt. 15: 9, R.V.) Thus, "according to their own statement, its use is simply a matter of" vain worship.

(4) You are mistaken about "the premises from which" I "draw the conclusion" that your use of instrumental music "involves rebellion against God." Moreover, I am aware that you have not made any argument on any "phase of the instrumental music question, such as its being rebellion against God;" but I have entered the discussion with you to see to that "phase" of the subject myself. The premises, as "briefly stated" by you, appear to conceal the point of rebellion which, when correctly and fully stated, they clearly bring out, and I, therefore, prefer to state them myself. They "may be briefly stated as follows:" The term "music" is generic, and includes both vocal and instrumental music of every description. When men were worshipping God during the existence of Judaism, they were permitted to use both kinds of music--vocal and instrumental--but when Judaism was abolished, the Lord ordained that when men are worshipping him they may use only vocal music. Hence, "the logical conclusion following from these premises is that the use of instrumental music," when men are worshipping God, is rebellion against God; and this conclusion "is simply true," as both "tyros" and everybody else "in logic ought to know."

(5) Finally, I invite your attention to the fact that, no difference what may be the motives actuating the use of instrumental music "in connection with the singing," it is the instrumental music itself that is forbidden at the particular time when men are worshipping God under Christ, and it is forbidden, as you were before reminded, "on precisely the same principle on which you and others rule out infant membership in the church, which is nowhere explicitly, but by all the facts in the case is everywhere implicitly, forbidden." Neither your lack of concern about "the exact age of this argument" nor the "argument" (?) itself has anything whatever to do

with the one vital fact that, whether intended as worship or not, instrumental music is forbidden at the particular time when men are conducting the worship of God under Christ. The final conclusion, therefore, that is forced upon us from every point of view is that its use at such a time is rebellion against God. May the Lord guide us into the way of truth.

Most fraternally, M. C. KURFEES.

APPENDIX

The foregoing discussion was abruptly brought to a close by brother Calhoun's failure to reply to my argument. The purpose of this Appendix is to state the facts concerning the origin and culmination of the discussion and to present some additional matters on the issue involved.

Brother Calhoun had produced what he claimed was an unanswerable argument, and had given it semi-publicity by reading it to numerous persons on different occasions. With seemingly unbounded confidence in the argument which he had advanced in support of his position, he boldly proclaimed his belief that no living man could overthrow it; in fact, his supposed extraordinary logical feat incited him to a boldness akin to that of the ancient champion of Gath, and, equally with the famous Philistine knight, he seemed ready to "defy all the armies of Israel" to meet him in an attempt to answer it. Moreover, the advocates of instrumental music in general were jubilant wherever their supposed new champion read his article and talked on the subject.

On this point the Gospel Advocate of January 31, 1901, made the following editorial statement, written by the editor in chief.

"On the night after Brother Calhoun read his article to me he read it to a number of preachers favoring in-

strumental music. Among them I remember were Brother Hay, of California; Brother Ellis, Brother Reynolds, Brother Myhr, and probably others; and one of these spoke of it as an unanswerable argument, and said that all the opponents, except Brother Lipscomb, owned they could not answer it, and he could not find time. On the next day Brother Hay called to see me, as he said, to beg me to cease opposition to these things, and spoke of what a harmonious consultation these brethren had on the previous night. The article had been made about as public as an unprinted document could be....It was circulated around as a wonderful discovery and an unanswerable something that struck terror to all of us. Like many another scarecrow, the light showed it was not so dangerous, after all."

But the brother's confidence in the strength of his logical bulwark continued without abatement. Even Archimedes himself, with all the splendid achievements of his inventive genius and mathematical skill, could not have been prouder when shouting over one of his discoveries, "Eureka! Eureka!" (I have found it! I have found it! I have found it!), than our elated brother seemed to be over the logical enginery which he had invented on the instrumental music question. Under these circumstances he finally sent his argument to me, with a challenge to meet it if I could.

Thus, without any solicitation on my part whatever, a discussion of the issue with him was thrust upon my hands, and the brother was promptly and cheerfully met on his own chosen ground.

After the investigation was abruptly broken off by Brother Calhoun's failure to reply, I gave up the discussion, as far as it had progressed, in response to a request from the Gospel Advocate, for publication in its columns, and it appeared in that paper in the issues of November 8 and 15, 1900. Then, in the Gospel Advocate of November 29, 1900, Brother Calhoun appeared publicly challenging me again to meet him in a further discussion of the original question. His challenge was promptly and

publicly accepted in the Gospel Advocate of December 13, 1900; but in the issue of January 10, 1901, he appeared again and publicly declined to proceed with the discussion. While I have never claimed for myself the right to run from an opponent whom I had challenged to debate, I, nevertheless, cheerfully concede this right to Brother Calhoun.

As the brother's unceremonious retirement from the discussion broke the investigation off at a point not anticipated by me, I here append some reflections for the purpose of further exposing the fallacy of attempting to defend instrumental music in the worship, and to emphasize still further the insidious and deceptive sin involved in the practice. Hence, in the fear of God, I invite attention to the following considerations:

1. **THERE IS AN INFALLIBLY SAFE WAY.** If the use of instrumental music in worship is sinful, as my opponent in the foregoing discussion concedes, then why attempt to defend its use by the churches at all? Why not advise them to put it aside altogether, that they may thus occupy the infallibly safe position? Why run the risk of possibly leading the churches into sin when there is a sure and safe way in which to walk? Moreover, even if it were not sinful, why countenance or encourage any conceivable use of it by the churches, seeing, on the one hand, that the Lord does not require it, and, on the other hand, that it is the occasion of strife and division among them? It would be difficult for those who plead for union to be guilty of a greater inconsistency in the name of religion.
2. **INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC AND THE NOTE BOOK.** Among the various and multifarious arguments advanced by the advocates of instrumental music, none, perhaps, is more deceptive and misleading than the assumption that all that is involved in the use of instrumental music as an aid to the ear is involved in the use of the notes as an aid to the eye. The

following extract from the third article in the foregoing discussion well illustrates the insidious fallacy which lurks in such reasoning:

"We use it (instrumental music) as a mere matter of convenience to ourselves. Just as a notebook, when properly used, is a convenience to the eye---giving the correct time, keeping the correct time, indicating the correct pitch, and leading each part of the music---so the organ, when properly used, gives to the ear the correct time, keeps the correct time, indicates the correct pitch, and leads each part of the music. Hence, the organ is a convenience for the ear, just as a notebook is a convenience for the eye."

The fallacy in this specious and plausible plea---which has, no doubt, misled many unwary hearts---consists in assuming that the notes and the music of the instrument are on a par; that each fills its place "just as" the other does, which is not only not true, but is a palpable contradiction of facts. If the instrument were used "just as the notebook" is used---that is, in a way so as simply to aid in doing what is commanded, and not, at the same time, in doing what is implicitly forbidden---there would be no harm in it; but this is not true. Let us look at the facts. The thing we are commanded to do is to sing---to make vocal music. When the instrument is used, in the manner under discussion---that is, so as to make instrumental music---something more than aiding the ear in doing what is commanded is done, and that something more is the very thing which, in this specific connection, the Lord has implicitly forbidden---namely, instrumental music is made. But this is not the case when a notebook is used. The notes simply indicate to the eye the tune which is to be sung, and which is the thing commanded to be done, and they do not, at the same time, do anything that is in any way forbidden. If the instrument should be so used as to do nothing but to aid in singing, which is the thing commanded to be done, there would be no harm in its use; but in the case in question, in addition to aiding the ear in doing what is commanded, if,

indeed, it be such an aid at all, it makes, also, another kind of music---namely, the very kind which God himself rejected from the new order of worship under Christ. Thus failing to discriminate between things vitally different, it is easy to beguile the unwary and to make it appear to them that the instrument and the notes do in principle the same thing, the one simply aiding the ear "just as" the other aids the eye; but it is only in appearance, for it assumes the very point in dispute. Be it ever so powerful an aid to the singing---or to anything else, for that matter---it cannot be justified on this ground, for the simple reason that it also does that which is implicitly forbidden. God has not only ordained that vocal music shall be made when men worship him with music at all under Christ, but he has also put aside instrumental music from that worship; and whoever introduces any practice whatsoever, whether as an aid to singing or as an aid to anything else, which at the same time makes the kind of music which God has put aside, is guilty of rebellion against God.

3. AN UNSCIENTIFIC CLASSIFICATION. To represent instrumental music and the notes as occupying the same place, the one simply being to the ear what the other is to the eye, as is done in the foregoing extract, is to be guilty of an egregious blunder in the way of unscientific classification. They do not belong together and whoever classifies them as on a par is, to that extent, a scientific bungler. On the contrary, the notes are related to instrumental music itself in precisely the same way they are to vocal music. In both cases they indicate the tune on the musical staff, whether it be sung or played. Instead of being on a par with instrumental music, the notes perform identically the same service for both kinds of music. Correctly speaking, instrumental music, on the one hand, and singing or vocal music (not the notes), on the other hand, should be classed together as both coming under general name of music; but whether one sings or plays,

whether the music be vocal or instrumental, the notes guide the eye in both cases in precisely the same way; and they are essential, either in fact or in principle, to both kinds of music. Hence, to say that instrumental music is "a convenience for the ear, just as a notebok is a convenience for the eye," is to be unscientific in the use of language. Thus the argument from the analogy between instrumental music and the notes is a glaring subterfuge.

Finally, there is absolutely no grounds, from any point of view whatsoever, on which to defend the use of instrumental music in the worship of God--or, as it is adroitly put in the foregoing discussion, "in connection with" that worship---except on the ground of a departure from New Testament teaching; and every attempt at its defense, since its introduction by the church of Rome, between the sixth and ninth centuries, down to the present time, which has come to public notice, is only a varification of this fact. Yet, as if determined to withstand both the authority of God and the voice of all history on the question, in order to popularize the worship and make it pleasing and attractive to men, multiplied inconsistencies and falacies are resorted to in the vain but determined effort to bolster up the practice.

Even in the preceeding discussion, although we were confronted with the high claim that the brother felt compelled, because of the bugbear of fallacies in the arguments of those who oppose the instruments, to turn away from them, yet in turning from them he not only commits himself to the most glaring and egregious fallacies, but to a logical classification that is bungling and unscientific; and, strangest of all, he pursues this course at the expense of affiliating with those who stubbornly persist in the use of the instrument even to the disruption of peace and fellowship in the churches. It is a fearful thing to divide the Church of God by the practice of things which God himself does not require; and it is equally fearful to aid and support others in committing the crime. My only desire in writing on the question is to warn churches and individuals, as far as I may be able to reach them, against making this mistake; and my earnest prayer to God is that the joint discussion and appended reflections herewith submitted to the public may contribute to this end. May we all have the courage and the patience to maintain steadfastly New Testament simplicity in work and worship.

M. C. KURFEES

COPYIST'S NOTE

With great determination and earnest endeavor, we have labored to make this a faithful copy of the original pamphlet.

We believe that all error appearing herein should be charged to the copyists, and not to the writer or the printer of the original pamphlet.

Mr. and Mrs. Thomas B. Wallace