

264.2
Q 1869

2083

APR 17 1945



Garner-Smith Debate
ON
Instrumental Music

Conducted in the Harding College
Auditorium, 8:00 P. M., April 16, 1945

HARDING COLLEGE LIBRARY

Proposition: Resolved: that Instrumental Music
in Christian Worship is Scriptural

Gaylord
PAMPHLET BINDER
Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif.

Preface

RESOLVED: "That Instrumental Music in Christian Worship is Scriptural."

AFFIRMATIVE—Albert Garner of the Baptist Church.

NEGATIVE—Emmett Smith of the church of Christ.

On April 9 in a regular Monday night meeting at Harding College the unscripturalness of instrumental music in Christian worship was being discussed. During the latter part of the meeting Albert Garner arose in the audience and asked permission to present "the other side" of the question. He was given permission to speak but was interrupted often from the audience, and for want of time was unable to complete arguments he desired to make.

Realizing that multitudes of people use instrumental music in their religious services and realizing that Harding College students would come in contact with this question all along through life, as president of Harding College I welcomed an opportunity to have presented in its favor the best arguments that its advocates can present for it, and accordingly suggested a formal discussion on the subject the following Monday night with Albert Garner representing the affirmative if he wished to do so. He was pleased with the offer and the discussion was then announced for April 16th.

Albert Garner is a graduate of the Missionary Baptist Institute in Little Rock, and has been selected a Baptist State Missionary, and since he is now a student at Harding College another student, Emmett Smith, a college junior, and a mem-

ber of the college debate team, was selected to meet him in the formal discussion.

Our welcoming this discussion does not mean that Harding College thinks there is scriptural ground for instrumental music but it does mean that we believe in open discussion: that we believe discussion and debate provide the acid test for any man's position as to whether it be scriptural or unscriptural.

On that basis I solicit your careful reading of the following discussion.

Signed:

George S. Benson, President
Harding College, Searcy, Ark.

Garner:-

Brother Chairman, Brother Moderators, respected opponent, and good evening friends. It is my happy privilege to appear on this platform to defend a proposition which I believe with all my heart, to defend it by the request of the president of this institution, Dr. George S. Benson, who apparently sees there may be some scriptural grounds for instrumental music, the position for which I shall contend this evening. I appreciate your presence, which is prompted no doubt by your realizing it to be a vital subject, and my many friends from various places, Wynne, Little Rock, Pangburn, Bald Knob and Gregory. It is my conviction that the doctrines of Christ are tonight at stake, to be weighed. I trust that you have come with open mind, with a just balance in your hand to weigh the scriptures.

It has been stated that tonight I would be meeting the best orator in this part of America, as a young man, and his brother as his moderator, who has the quickest wit and sharpest brain. Since that is my privilege and they have proved themselves to be gentlemen, accomplished in the field of polemics, since I am meeting both brains and oratory as adverse to the Word of God, I am sure this is going to be interesting. I can promise you that. For him, I assure you that I have nothing but the utmost of respect; for his doctrine, the most holy contempt.

The proposition: "Resolved that instrumental music in Christian worship is scriptural." By instrumental music, I mean any music in connection with worship service. Professor Kirk, head of the music department, I quote in saying

that there are only two musical sounds, vocal and instrumental. We must be aware that if instrumental music of no kind can be used in worship, it is sacrilegious to use a microphone, which is an instrument, for outdoor preaching, ungodly to use the radio for singing and preaching and Christ-defying to use a tuning fork, even to get a pitch. Guilty in one point? Guilty in all. If no instrument can be used or heard in worship service, we must not use a microphone or tuning fork, both of which make musical sounds.

Does the Word of God speak on the subject of instrumental music in connection with worship service? After all what God says is all that matters in particular. 11 Timothy 3:16: "All scripture is given by inspiration of God" and it concludes "that the man of God may be perfect thoroughly finished to all good works." If ALL scripture is inspired, I ask the question: Where is the scripture? The Old and New alike. ALL scripture is inspired. By ALL scriptures being inspired and our using ALL we may be perfectly, thoroughly furnished to ALL good works, if and when we RIGHTLY DIVIDE it. If Jesus spoke on the subject of the division of the Word in instrumental music or in his doctrines, did he not speak right? 11 Timothy 2:15 Paul, preaching the doctrines of Christ says: "Study to show thyself approved unto God a workman that needeth not be ashamed, RIGHTLY DIVIDING the word of truth." There are RIGHT DIVISIONS in the scriptures, all scriptures, old as well as new. If we accept the right division, we will come to the right conclusions. If we take the wrong divisions of all scriptures, we shall arrive at wrong conclusions and at such error as tonight I shall oppose after having defended the great principles of worship with instrumental music.

Jesus gave the right divisions to the Bible, right division

that there be no error. Luke 24:44; He said to them: "These are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you that all things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms concerning me." Three divisions of the Old Testament. Jesus said "rightly dividing" the Word that we may arrive at right conclusions and the truth and meet error. We study the Old Testament under three divisions, law, prophets and psalms. I hope my opponent will not say there are two divisions and flatly contradict Jesus' word. The law division of the Old Testament has been done away. Colossians 2:14-17: "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, he took it out of the way . . ." 11 Corinthians 3:7-11 tells that "The ministration of death, written and engraven in stones was done away." This was the law division. One of the right divisions of the Old Testament was taken out of the way. What was blotted out? Those things that were against them, sacrifices were against them. They had to make them. Eating of meat was against them, couldn't eat pork, couldn't eat mountain trout, catfish.

If my opponent tonight contends that any and all of the Old Testament is law then we shall see what we shall see. Jesus: Matthew 5:17-18: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." He didn't come to destroy the law and the prophets, two divisions of the Old Testament, but to fulfill them. (Why didn't he come to fulfill three divisions? He made three divisions, he came to fulfill two.) "Till heaven and earth shall pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled."

If my honorable opponent says the Psalms, the third division of the Old Testament, was law, then to him I say, placing himself under the law: Galatians 3:10; "Cursed is every man that continueth not in ALL things that are written in the law to do them." If you are going under the law, I shall say, repeating the Lord's words "Cursed is every man that continueth not in all things that are written in the Law." Then, I will ask you to make your animal sacrifice. If your brother dies and his wife has no children, then as they did under the old law, I will have you to marry his wife, if you are under the law. That's what they had to do. It made no difference, if one had two or three already, that was under the law. Luke 16:16 says "But the law and the prophets", what divisions? Two of Jesus' right divisions'. ("The law and the prophets were until John, since that time the kingdom of God is preached and every man presseth into it." All right, the law and the prophets were done away, lasted until John.)

Clearly, the law and the prophets have been done away. Truly they have. (There is NO scripture that says the Psalms have been done away,) the third right division of the Old Testament, whereby we arrive at the truth. Rather, instead, (we are COMMANDED to USE and to TEACH the Psalms. Ephesians 5:19 "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit; speaking to one another in psalms, hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord.") If you are filled with the spirit you are going to speak to one another in Psalms and hymns. 1 Corinthians 14:26 Paul commended the Church at Corinth for using the Psalms. What did that mean? Lexicons say: "The impulse, a touch of the chords of a stringed instrument." They brought a Psalm. The word Psalm was used

both for the written psalm and for instruments. It was used UPON WHICH to praise God. In this instance Paul commended the Church at Corinth for using an instrument, not the psalm but a Greek (Ekastos Psalmon) psalm. (Colossians 3:16; "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; TEACHING and ADMONISHING one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs.") We are commanded here even to TEACH the Psalms, ADMONISH with the psalms. Do you do that? If so, what do you teach when you teach the psalms? Now if you say, I am going to teach part of the psalms, I say where is the scripture that says part of the psalms are made to teach, part of the psalms? Answer that elder.

We are commanded to teach the psalms. If we teach the psalms as Jesus' doctrine demands, then we are going to teach instrumental music! (Psalms 150: "Praise ye the Lord, Praise him in his sanctuary; praise him in the firmament of his power. Praise him for his mighty acts; praise him according to his excellent greatness. Praise him with the sound of the trumpet; praise him with the psaltery and harp. Praise him with the timbrel and dance; praise him with stringed instruments and organs. Praise him upon the loud cymbals; praise him upon the high sounding cymbals.) He names 17 kinds of instruments with which to praise God, and Christ's doctrine through Paul, commanded us to teach these things, the Psalms not part of them, to teach the psalms; but the question comes there is the word "dance" in there, what does that mean? He is numerating, in a word series, instruments with which to worship God. The "dance" was an instrument of music at that time.

I have written the word, as it is, the root word Halil on the board which means a stringed instrument. I was called

in question here last Monday night on that. One brother challenged me to find it anywhere. If you will go down stairs in your own bookstore, take Smith's Bible Dictionary, page 131, column 1, you will find a picture of it. It says a dance is a stringed instrument. The word here, "praise him with the dance" Halil is a nominative, not a verb, a thing, not an act. It is a prepositional phrase "praise the Lord" with something. Now I hope you are not as one of the professors here this week said, that dance was a verb. I asked him if a verb could be the object of a preposition

"Well, I don't know for sure."

"Come on, be honest!"

"Well, I . . . I have to look upon that," he said.

Now then if there are any third, or fourth, or fifth grade children here this evening who know that a verb can be the object of a preposition, I want you to give me a reference on that. Please find it. I hope my opponent won't take any such stand as that this evening. If he does, I am sure you have fourth and fifth grade English out here, get a good lesson in it. "Praise him with the dance." If it had been, if it had been a verb to show action then certainly it wouldn't have been the object of a preposition. That should suffice for that.

Commanded to praise the Lord with these instruments, commanded to teach in this manner. The word is translated, even in the margin reference here, it says "or pipe". If the Brother, had just looked in the margin reference of his King James translation, the very same word is translated "pipe". Then 1 Kings 1:40 "the people piped with pipes." Then Isaiah 5:12 where "wicked men used the pipes." Isaiah 30:29 "a song and a pipe". It is the same word every place, is the

same word, every place if the brethren would just look it up.

Now my opponent takes the position that the tabernacle and temple were types of the New Testament Church. They were. I, too, will accept that position. In connection with the worship at the tabernacle, they had instrumental music 11 Chronicals 5:12; "The Levites which were the singers, all of them of Asaph, or Heman, of Jeduthun, with their sons and their brethren, being arrayed in white linen, have cymbals and psalteries and harps, stood at the east end of the altar, and with them a hundred and twenty priests sounded with trumpets.)" They had come to the temple to worship, 120 priests. "It came even to pass, as the trumpeters and singers were as one, to make one sound to be heard in praising and thanking the Lord; and when they lifted up their voice with the trumpets and cymbals and instruments of music, and praised the Lord, saying, For he is good; for his mercy endureth for ever; that then the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of the Lord." Recall ALL of this was typical. This was an instance of instrumental music being put on in connection with the tabernacle worship, the priests putting it on themselves. They officiated not only inside the tabernacle but also at the point where the tabernacle contacted the outside, there was a band of 120 with instruments for they worshipped and praised God together. The sound as one.

Answer this elder, "Why TAKE A PART of the tabernacle type and leave the others out? If you take PART of it, for the service to be typical of the church then why not take the music part? You take the part where they had the candles, the lights, you take the part of the incense, you take the table of the shewbread, then why leave out the music? If it was typical, of what was it typical?"

We are contending for the doctrines of Christ. 11 John 9:10 "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrines of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrines of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God Speed." Certainly we should abide in the doctrine of Christ, but WHERE is the doctrine of Christ found? In Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John? It is not found there — only in parts. The doctrines of Christ are found in the Epistles of Paul — the 13 — and the other Epistles. Surely we should contend for the doctrines of Christ, as taught. Paul preached the doctrines of Christ and in Colossians 3:16 He commanded to TEACH the psalms, "TEACH and ADMONISH in psalms, hymns and spiritual songs." Now to Colossians 2:14; my opponent contends that the law was done away and taking as he has before, and possibly will this time, the position that the Psalms are part of law. Colossians 2:14, he has Paul saying that the law is done away and Colossians 3:16 commanding us to teach with the law.

Now I turn him to the infidel and let him answer his question. The infidel says "here, you said the law is done away." In the very next chapter you said teach the law. What does it mean? Does it mean to teach the law after it is done away or does it mean anything, except to be mean?" That's what the aethist said. You contend for the law, Elder, I'll ask you then, why the contradiction? Is there one there?

I challenge you now for one scripture that forbids the use of instrumental music. The doctrines of Christ command it! The prophets and priests practiced it! The God of Heaven ordained it! Christ did not forbid it! The apostles

long and tedious

commended it! and angels are using instrumental music or will be in heaven! Since instrumental music was alright with the prophets and priests, the apostles commended it, neither did Christ forbid it! then Elder, where do you come in on this subject to oppose? Will YOU prohibit and forbid and exclude and debar what neither God, nor angels, nor apostles, nor prophets, nor priests have in any age debarred or ordered should not be? Give me ONE scripture, elder, that says that instrumental music shall not be used in worship service any time and I'll not come back to answer you. Isn't that fair? If you will give me one scripture that forbids instrumental music in Christian worship, Elder I'll quit! Just one scripture! I have given you in the doctrines of CHRIST where we are commanded under the RIGHT DIVISION of the WORD, as Jesus gave it, to teach the Psalms, Col. 3:16. Don't come back and say that we will teach part of the Psalms, if so, give me the scripture where it says part of the Psalms. Will you command, order and decree that man shall not worship with the aid of what the Lord has commanded? Time is called, Amen and Amen.

Smith:-

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen, I wish to express my appreciation for this opportunity to discuss this proposition even though it is not a scriptural one. It may justly be termed, in spite of the very fine compliments that Albert made for my brother and me, that this is not a contest to see who will win a debate. I hope, and God being my witness, I declare that as far as I am concerned in this debate, that we are searching for the truth of God and nothing short of it.

And now into the question that is before us for discussion tonight: "Resolved that instrumental music in Christian worship is scriptural." Albert has used his first speech, of 20 minutes, in placing before you some quibbles and some arguments that are used always to uphold the use of instrumental music in the worship but let us see if, in the light of scriptural teaching and if in the light of common logic and reasoning, these arguments can be sustained. It can be clearly seen from his first speech that he intends to base his arguments upon the fact that instrumental music is taught in the Psalms and the fact that he believes that the Psalms are bound upon us as much as the New Testament is tonight. Now when we have examined this and see whether or not the Psalms are bound upon us and then reason further and see whether or not his logic will continue to hold, in the way that it is used, then so far as that is concerned, the debate will be over. If we can establish the fact that the Psalms are not binding upon us tonight and that is not hard to be done because the scriptures teach it and that quite clearly, then the debate should be over.

But now before I go into the constructive part of my speech on refutation of his arguments, I have four questions that I would like for him to answer in his next speech, and he need not write these down because I have them written here for him.

1. Does instrumental music inhere in the Greek word "Psallo"?
2. Was the use of instrumental music under the law typical? Was it a type as was incense, shewbread and others?
3. Do you believe in Christian unity as expressed by the Lord in John 17:20-21 and in 1 Corinthians 1:10-13?
4. Did Christ fulfill any of the Psalms?

And now into his argument concerning the Psalms as being binding upon us today. I shall show in just a minute that the Psalms were done away with because they are a part of the law. I read from John 10:34, "Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods?" Get it. "Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods?" That is quoted from Psalms 82:6, "I have said, Ye are gods". Now will he find that statement anywhere else in the Bible. And in John 15:25 "The word is written in their law, They hated me without a cause", That is taken from Psalms 35:19, "Neither let them wink with the eye that hate me without a cause". Psalms 69:4, "They that hate me without a cause are more than the hairs of mine head". Now then, these statements are from the Psalms. We both agree that the law is done away and he need not have quoted all of those scriptures showing that either. But, we agree that the law is done away. Now then, the Lord says that this is said in the law.

Where does it say it? In the Psalms. What is the Psalms? Draw your own conclusion.

Now then, as to the question of whether or not it is the law. He asked the question, are we going to teach all the Psalms? He has contended that we will do away with a part of the Psalms and leave that part that we want to leave. I think if we will look at that carefully and consider it carefully we will find that the opposite is true — that the opposition tonight is interested in doing away with that part of the Psalms he does not want and wants us to keep that part of the Psalms that he does want. Now what part of the Psalms is he going to keep? (In the 149th Psalm we find that the literal house of God, or the children of Israel, are commanded to take their psalms with the music and the harp, and they are commanded to take the sword in their hands to take vengeance upon the enemies of God.) Now then, is he going to take that literally? Is he going to have that to mean that the House of GOD, that the churches of Christ, are to take the sword in their hands and literally to vanquish the enemy? No, I don't think he will take that position, but if he does, (what about the law of incense and the law of the altar and the candlesticks and all of those things that are referred to in the Psalms?) Now just what part is he going to take? Aaron was commanded by the Lord through Moses in Exodus to light the lamps at evening and burn incense upon the altar, etc. A perpetual incense before the Lord throughout new generations. Now, he was commanded to burn incense on the altar. When David repeats this in Psalms 66:15, "I will offer unto thee burnt sacrifices of fatlings, with the incense of rams; I will offer bullocks with goats." According to my opponent, when he said that, he has been superseded because my opponent will not use the incense in the wor-

ship of God today. But when David repeats the law concerning the music in the 150th Psalm, when David uses there the instrument of music, which is a law of God, not only under David but under all of the Law of God he will bind that upon us today. And hear this carefully. In Leviticus 23:23-24, "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, speak unto the children of Israel, saying, In the seventh month, in the first day of the month, shall ye have a sabbath, a memorial of blowing of trumpets, an holy convocation". Numbers 10:10, "Also in the day of your gladness, and in your solemn days, and in the beginnings of your months, ye shall blow with trumpets over your burnt offerings, and over the sacrifices of your peace offerings; that they may be to you for a memorial before your God". Hear it. Psalms 81:2-5, "Take a psalm, and bring hither the timbrel, the pleasant harp with the psaltry. Blow up the trumpet in the new moon, in the time appointed, on our solemn feast day. For this was a statute for Israel, and a law of the God of Jacob. This he ordained in Joseph for a testimony, when he went out through the land of Egypt. That's not David's language. God ordained that in Leviticus 23:23 and in Numbers 10:10 and David is simply repeating the law concerning the music and repeats it time and time again. Now what kind of reasoning is it, pray tell me, that would allow a man to do away with something that David has repeated if he wants to do away with it and maintain that David has not been superseded in something that he wants to retain? That will be something difficult indeed for the opposition to get around this evening because it is the truth of God that cannot be overcome. Now then, that should be sufficient along that line but we will hear more further.

And now to his argument on the teaching of error in

obedience to Ephesians 5:19 where we are commanded to sing psalms. (His argument will not stand up because it is not sustained by either scripture or sound reasoning. Listen to the comprehensive commentary by Scott and Dodridge who have comments upon Ephesians 5:19. He says that "The word "psalm" or "psalms" is not simply David's Psalms for then the article would have been used. It should seem they chiefly consisted of David's but certainly comprehended other compositions.") Now the gentleman of the opposition cannot maintain or hold us to the fact that when we teach psalms according to the commandment in Ephesians 5:19 that we are teaching David's Psalms and that only, not at all. Because it is not meaning that. Anywhere in the New Testament or anywhere in the Bible that the word psalms is used referring to the Psalms of David, the definite article the is used before it. I know that Albert quoted that. I don't think he did it intentionally. I know that he quoted Ephesians 5:19 and said it meant "the psalms" but he won't find that in his Greek nor in the New Testament in English. It isn't there. There is no definite article there. It's teaching in psalms, not definite psalms, but in psalms, and authorities have told us that that means any psalm not necessarily the Psalms of David. Now then, in Luke 20:42, the Lord says "in the book of Psalms" That is definite. Luke 24:44, things written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms preceded by "the". That's definite. In "the" psalms. But now listen, I Corinthians 14:26, "Everyone of you hath a psalm" . . . not necessarily a psalm of David but any psalm. In Ephesians 5:19, "speaking to yourselves in psalms". Not limited to the Psalms of David, certainly not. But there are no definite articles before it and again, in comments on I Corinthians 14:26 on the word "psalm", "Some think that these were extemporaneous but

of this, there is no proof or is it probable. That seems rather to apply to the psalms which must signify not merely religious, or spiritual and edifying, in opposition to the carnal, and impure songs at the heathen festivals but suggested by the Holy Spirit. None probably, but those who had the spiritual gift were allowed to sing and the subject perhaps more diversified than those of the hymns and psalms, containing, not only the praises of God, but exhortations, doctrines, prophecies, and indeed all religious subjects whatsoever." So then if he is to limit us, he must overcome these objections of scholars along that line. We cannot be limited to those psalms. But he has the question and the affirmative to show that we are to do away with a part of the psalms and to keep a part of the psalms. That is his argument and not mine.

Now then, let's go on to a few of the quibbles that were made. He mentioned the proper division and he hopes I will not make two divisions. I am not here to affirm any kind of divisions of the New Testament or of the Old or of the Bible but I have shown, conclusively, that the psalms are a part of the law and he must show where it is not. He made the quibble about the "dance" etc. and he called it a stringed instrument. He said Smith's Dictionary called it a stringed instrument. Well, I will not deny that at all, but in every translation that I have found, when it mentions the "dance" it mentions "or with the pipe". But let us hear some authorities along that line, too. What does the word "dance" mean from the Hebrew, Machol, the word here on the board? And I am glad that he told us what it would mean because otherwise, I would not know, for I don't know what that is on the board, do you? But I am glad he told us what it means so that we can use it along this line. In

Young's Analytical Concordance, page 220, we have five usages of the Hebrew word that he has there spelled "machol". I don't know how to pronounce it; It is used in Psalms 149:3, "Let them praise his name in the dance." It is used in Psalms 150:4, "Praise him with the timbrel and the dance." "In the dances of them that make merry." Jeremiah 31:4. And 31:13, 'shall the virgin rejoice in the dance." Lamentations 5:15, "Our dance is turned into mourning." Now if "machol" means instruments in psalms, why not in Jeremiah and in Lamentations? Just this question to go with others. Will Albert, on his scholarship, affirm that in all of these places, the word "machol" means instrument? Now then, further, from the Dictionary of the Bible by James Hastings, Volume 1, page 550, "in any view of it, the dancing formed an essential part of an act of worship." Bible Cyclopedia by A. A. Fossett: "dance, machol, literally moving or leaping in a circle," Smith's Bible Dictionary, page 69, "dance, Hebrew Machol, to move or leap in a circle, twist or turn around as the dancing deravishes do now in the East. The sacred psalm and the dance always go together." Now then, whether or not the word meant dance, the dance, he says, and the sacred psalm always went together. Now then, in that connection, will Albert contend that "dance" is to be brought over into the worship? If so, then we must see him in his next speech, perform a jig for us.

5 Now then, further, he asks a question. He asks for scriptures forbidding instrumental music. (No, that's not in the question. The question is, Resolved that the scriptures teach instrumental music. I could not find a scripture to save my life forbidding our praying to the virgin Mary. It isn't there. But Albert won't tell us to do that AND I can't find one forbidding a lot of other modern practices either,

but Albert won't say that we should bring those things into the worship.)

And then, his quibble on the use of the radio, the tuning fork and all of those things — This microphone, for instance. I am sure that Albert knows better than the statement he made that we are using the microphone and that the radio makes the sound. No, the radio had nothing to do with it. The radio doesn't make a sound. It carried that sound, it picks up the sound that is already made, but it has no part in making the sound — not at all. He could pound that all he wanted to, he could beat it like you do a tuning fork and lift it to his ears all day long and it wouldn't play a tune. No, somebody over on the other end would have to play that tune, sing that tune, and it would have to be done before that radio could pick it up. So you can see that that is just a quibble. And now about the use of the tuning fork in the worship . . . mind you, here on the board the word is "in Christian worship" and in his definition of the terms he said "in connection with it" but he cannot define it that way. It is "in Christian worship" and if he uses the 150th Psalm, then he will have to admit that it is "in Christian worship", not "in connection with it" but it is "in Christian worship" because he said that they are to praise him with it and in Psalms 43:4 he says that we praise him upon the harp, upon it, that means with the Harp. Now then, what were the instruments that he named in Psalms 150? Why, there was the pipe and the flute, both wind instruments, and those people that used those would have to blow in them and you couldn't sing while you were doing that. Not at all. But they, at that time, were praising God with that . . . blowing into that instrument . . . they weren't singing to God and that wasn't used in connection with the worship of individuals who were blowing into

those because they couldn't sing while they were doing it. All that composed their worship and that's what the question affirms — that it is in Christian worship and a part of it. Now then, the tuning fork is not used in Christian worship. When do we start praising God? When do we start worship? Is it when we come into the house? Well, I would be ashamed to admit it from the kind of noise and the visiting that goes on before we begin our church services. I am sure that is true with the brethren of Albert and others, too. It does not begin there. When does it begin? Does it begin when we strike the fork to get the pitch? No, because we are not singing. The worship is singing and the fork has the respect to quit and it does not go on and it is not in the worship. And I am not here to defend the use of the fork either. But it is clearly to be seen that it is not a part of the worship, but you have a hard time proving, don't you see, that the instruments back there were not a part of it and that this question does not say that it is a part of it. Now then, I think that I have answered conclusively the arguments that he has put forth, and we will wait further to see just what is done about these arguments as they come up.

Now then, I will go into further discussion of the subject of instrumental music in the worship. It seems that Albert is interested in having instruments of music in the worship and according to him that it is taught by the scriptures, too, but it is a strange thing that in John when the Lord said, "I will send a comforter and he will guide you into all truth", that when the comforter came, he failed to guide them into all truth. It is a shame that the Holy Spirit did not do his job well when He came to guide the apostles into all truth for it is a fact that if the Holy Spirit intended for them to use instruments of music in the worship that he just forgot

to tell them about it. { Because for several hundred years after the institution of the Lord's body on earth, no instrument of music was ever introduced into the worship. } Now, either the Spirit did not intend to teach them to do that, or by some means a mistake was made and He failed to do it, or else the apostles, being given the Holy Spirit, just failed to obey the commandment because it did not happen. Even in the 12th and the 13th centuries there was quite a bit of discussion over instrumental music. This is from Thomas Aquinas. He says: "Our church does not use musical instruments as harps and psalteries to praise God withal, that she may not seem to Judaize". Thomas Aquinas was the great law giver of the Catholic Church. Charles A Spurgeon was one of the greatest Baptist preachers that ever lived. He preached for 20 years in the Metropolitan Baptist Tabernacle in London, England, to 10,000 people every Sunday. Instruments of music were never used in his tabernacle. This time from Edward Dickinson, "Many of the fathers speaking of religious song make no mention of instruments, others refer to them only to denounce them. Clement, says "Only one instrument do we use, that is, the word of peace, wherewith we honor God, no longer the old psaltry, trumpet and flute." That is Edward Dickinson, New York, Charles Scribner Sons, 1931. So we can see that for a long time it was not used. By the way, just let me, right here, clarify a statement made by Albert that our president made the statement that there was at least some grounds for it. Dr. Benson did not make that statement. He said that because the majority of the religious world today use it, that we must give the subject some consideration. Now then, I want to show you that the greatest scholarship in the world has not always believed in instrumental music in the worship. I thank you.

Garner:-

I want to recall one thing. The Elder just said that I said Brother Benson said there was scripture for instrumental music. I didn't say that. It will be seen in the recording. I said that he apparently saw there might be scripture for it, at least some grounds.

Now, to take up his questions in the order:

What part will I keep of the Psalms? Man, I take all of them. I tell you. I'm not taking part of them, it is you that is taking part! Take them all like the Lord commands you. For instance, there were quotations of incenses being burned. David and the other writers of the psalms told about it. The same thing is told in the New Testament. Now then are you going to say "I'm not going to use the New Testament" just because it is quoted there as well? What about taking the sword of vengeance? It is taught in the psalms. Well, if it isn't taught different in the New Testament take the sword of vengeance into your hand! The scripture has been given to teach the psalms. "Teaching and admonishing in Psalms", Col. 3:16. Teach in Psalms. What about incense? Prove the psalms first were part of law, prove that! Then he goes and says Scott and Doddridge comment. Man, is it at your Bible? Proposition: "Resolved that instrumental music in Christian worship is scriptural." Is that the scripture that you have to use? Fine scripture it is! Then he says no definite psalm, no definite article before the word "psalm" in Ephesians or Colossians. Ephesians 5:19 or Colossians 3:16-17. That's right. Elder, will you tell me where any other

Psalms were inspired, and where that we are commanded to teach and sing any psalms, any other than the inspired ones? Do you have some more that you use and teach your people?

Then he says that the word "machol" meant to dance and gave some scriptures. I am sorry that the brother jumped in on this ground. The word "machol" is not the word that is in the Psalms there. If you will look it up, you know it, it is "halil" . . . h, a, l, i, l . . . write that down! Of course, that word you use means dance. The heathens used it and what if it were in the Psalms. If it isn't forbidden in the New Testament? Are you to say you can't use it? The fact is you shouldn't make the quibble upon the word, in misrepresenting it to the people. I didn't use that word. It isn't the word in the Psalms there. Then he goes to the dictionary of James Hastings, Encyclopedia, to quote this about "Machol" . . . "Machol", using a different word altogether in form. If the brother could read, it would be different. He could read that verse in the Psalms that I have given him . . . His word, a verb, isn't there. It is a noun! May I ask you not to take my word, take the word and write to any of your authorities on Hebrew anywhere and if I have misrepresented it, that it is used in the nominative case, Elder, I'll make confession and a written one and give it to this school. Thing is, as you quote here "Machol" is just not so, as used there.

Then he says the radio has nothing to do with sound. Elder, if this isn't an instrument I want you to get up here and start talking to someone over in England without it. If it is no part of the preaching and worship service, WHY do you USE it? Why don't you go out and bellow into the air and expect the people to hear? Professor Kirk has said there are only two musical sounds and if you think your natural

voice will go to England get out there and try it! This is an instrument, no use in quibbling about that. Of course, you know it is, that won't get you anywhere.

Then he says, these were blowing instruments in the 150th and 33rd Psalms. What if they were? Can you prove that there weren't people there singing? II Chron. 5:11-12 which I quote to you said they were singing and using these instruments.

Then he comes to the question of the tuning fork and says "I am not here to try to defend it." Brother, I don't blame you! You use it right here, and then you won't defend it! Preach one thing, practice another. Well, Well — well.

Next, "When he, the Holy Spirit is come, he will guide you into all truth", the brother says, then assumes that the brethren didn't have any truth. Didn't anyone have any truth before Jesus left? Indeed, he guided them into all truth but that did not mean they didn't have some of it already. He went ahead and completed the Scriptures that the man of God might be perfectly and thoroughly furnished unto all good works and you should study RIGHT DIVISION of which you said it wasn't any particular, didn't matter, said it in other words. What about the division, you are not discussing that? It ALL matters whether or not we will rightly divide the word, whether we are to teach truth. If you wrongly divide the word, THEN it is not going to be the truth taught!

Then, he quotes Thomas Aquinas, what he says, something about some other musical instrument. I wonder if that is some more of his Scripture? Then he says Spurgeon and Dickinson didn't use it. Is that some more of your Scrip-

ture? What if they didn't? If they didn't and the Bible teaches it, they were just as unscriptural as you are when you refuse and then with pleasure as Paul's "man of sin" speak against instrumental music, II Thess. 2:4, "Sitting in the temple of God declaring as God." If neither Christ, nor angels, nor phophets, nor priests spoke against instrumental music to say "cursed art thou for using it," what about you? Elder, give me ONE scripture forbidding it and I'll quit, otherwise, don't quibble. We are commanded TO TEACH the Psalms. (Three minutes) Thank you. Then he comes, well, that's concluded it.

I answered the misstatement relative to Dr. Benson and quoted it that apparently he saw there might be some scriptural ground for music.

Then here is a question: Does instrumental music inhere in the Greek word "Psallo". Is it in here, I suppose is what that he means. Don't ask me, go to any authoritative lexicon and it will say "Psallo", the definition, is "to twitch upon a string, to twitch and to twang." Now the commentators may say something else. Was the use of instrumental music under the law typical or a type as was incense? If any of the other was typical, then that is, and you assume that the other is and take it, so it was, and I have asked, you Elder, why you leave out the music part and take the other? You take the other! Do you believe in Christian unity as expressed by the Lord in John 17:20-21? Indeed I do. I think you ought to come on and obey the Lord when he says TEACH the psalms, Col. 3:16 "Teaching and admonishing in Psalms", Ps. 33rd and 150th, and the psalms COMMAND to use instrumental music in worship. Jesus said there are THREE divisions. The law and the prophets have been done away. Lk. 16:16. If you would follow the right divisions, you would arrive at

the right conclusions. Then did Christ fulfill any of the psalms? There is another quibble. Indeed, and we are supposed to teach that he did. When we teach the psalms, the doctrines of Christ, under the right divisions, we are going to teach that some of it is fulfilled just as some of the New Testament has already been fulfilled.

Again, I ask you, elder, will you ascend the temple as Paul's man of sin looking downward, with scorn upon your brow, and spiritual annihilation in your heart and say to others who claim to be followers of Christ, "Cursed art thou for using it." That's sufficient. We shall see. Amen and Amen.

Smith:-

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen. I anticipated that what has happened would happen. I am sorry that it has happened but it has. Albert has insisted upon hinging his part of this debate upon little things, upon the quibbles that were mentioned before. I asked him to show that Psalms are binding upon us today. He made the assertion and contradiction to the Christ that the Psalms were binding upon us. I quote in two of Christ's statements where He said that the Psalms were law, and Albert agrees that the law is done away and yet he insists upon taking all of the Psalms. Now, I want to know why it is that Albert didn't dance when he came up here. I want to know why it is that Albert doesn't have incense in his worship because it is there. It is in the Psalms and if he is going to take all of the Psalms, then he is going to have to take all of that. Is he willing to do it? We shall see what we shall see.

Now then, for further answer to some of his quibbles. I want to know if he is going to follow Psalms 81:3. I want to know if he is going to follow that and come out and admit that David knew that the Psalms were a part of the law and that he quoted the music from the law just as much as he quoted incense and the other things from the law. What I think is that Albert has aboutfaced a little from the position that he has taken in the past. I am not going to mention a lot of these quibbles that he has given because here is the proposition: He has affirmed that the instrumental music is scriptural in Christian worship. Now he must prove that, but he has contended that I give scripture forbidding it. I

told you when I arose to this platform it wasn't a scriptural subject and before it can be proved to be he must show that it is scriptural and before he can prove that it is scriptural he must show that the Psalms are not a part of the law in contradiction and over the authority of Christ who said that they are a part of the law.

Now then, about the argument he made in his first speech concerning the music in Heaven. He made it very lightly. He might have wanted me to forget it but I didn't. In the 14th chapter of Revelation we have the statement that John heard the sound from heaven, sounds as of many waters and sounds as of great thunder and also sounds as of harpers, harping upon their harps. Now that is where he gets that argument. That's where he gets the idea of music in heaven but now hear it again. He's going to bind upon us today, at the present time, music, because there might be music in heaven. In the first place, it mentions nothing about harps in heaven. It says that he heard sounds as of Harpers harping on their harps. Now if he heard harps in heaven, he heard many waters and he heard great thunders, too, and if that be true, then we must have those things here in the church. And again in Revelations 5:8 we have the statement that along with that the four and the twenty elders were to come before God praising God with the harp, each one having a harp and each one having bowls full of incense. Now then, if the music in Heaven was going to be brought down upon us today because it is in Heaven then the incense in heaven is going to have to be bound upon us today, too. Now, he is dealing with minor things and very minor. I want him to get on to the proposition and stay with the burning, blazing issue that is at stake, and he is off — far off—far gone astray. Let him come back to the issue and there we

will clash and we can't clast until he gets on to the issue. He has asked and asked that I show scripture forbidding it. Well, I will show him a scripture forbidding it when he shows me a scripture forbidding the prayer to the virgin Mary. And if he doesn't show one forbidding that, I am going to have him to pray his prayers in the name of the virgin Mary. Don't you see the inconsistency of that and the poor reasoning that he has forced upon himself? Now then, this question. You noticed he trod lightly upon the questions that I asked him and failed in fact, to answer them. I asked him if instrumental music inhered in the word "psallo" in Ephesians 5:19. Now then, I asked him about this, also, about the instrument of music in the New Testament, in Christianity, in Christian worship, that means today, under the New Testament and he has not shown the Psalms apply to us today, in opposition to Christ who said they were a part of the law and done away. And before he can debate this question, he must show these things. That is the issue. The tuning fork and all of these things are not the issue; the radio is not the issue. We might debate those things some other time, but today the proposition is: Resolved that instrumental music in Christian worship is scriptural, and he must show that it is scriptural. Then if it does inhere in the word "psallo" and if, according to his commandment in Psalms 150, the Christian is to use the instrument, here is the commandment for the Christian, the child of God, to play an instrument. Now then, I noticed this morning that Albert was singing in our worship and he didn't have an instrument. If it is a commandment in Psalms or in Ephesians to play an instrument, then Albert was singing and every time anybody sings and doesn't play the instrument, he is sinning. Don't you see the logic of that? If the word has that inherent meaning in it, why then we are not only privileged to use it.

but we are bound to use it. Not only is that true in Ephesians 5:19 but that is true in Psalms 150. If that applies to us and if Psalms have not been done away with, then we had better get our fife and flute because it is a commandment of God and we are not to do away lightly with the commandments of God because God will strike us down one of these times. And Ephesians 5:19 says, "Be ye filled with the spirit." Who is to be filled with the spirit? He says "everyone of you." Now if that means to play with an instrument, who is going to play with the instrument? The command is "everyone of you." Now then, how many play the instrument in his worship? The rest of them are sinning. That person that sits up there and plays the piano or the organ is the only one that is obeying that commandment. No, it is not inherent in the word and it is not meant for that.

Now, let us go on. I have come back to this part and I am going to stay on this part throughout this discussion. That if that was true, if Psalms was bound upon the church of the Lord Jesus Christ for 600 years after Christ, the apostles and Christ did not know it and they were sinning. We have this issue before us; we have the issue of the law. Was David a part of the law? If it was, then it was done away with. Christ said it was done away with; therefore it was done away with and he hasn't refuted it and he can't refute it. Now then, I want to show you that instrumental music was introduced a long, long time after the time of Christ and I have it, not used by the early church. Fessenden's *Encyclopedia of Music*, page 852, "That instrumental music was not practiced by the primitive Christians but was made an aid to devotion of later times is evident from *Church History*" and this time from Fred L. Humphreys, *Evolution of Church Music*, "All of the music employed in their early

services was vocal and the rhythmic element and all gesticulation was forbidden, etc." And these, and I have a dozen more of them right here, to the same effect, that it was not used in the early church and if it was a commandment of God and if it was in Psalms a commandment to do that or in Ephesians 5:19 to do it, then the church in the early days did not know that and they just couldn't get it across. Now, Albert, what are we going to do about that? Are we going to contend for all of Psalms and take incense and all of those things or are we going to do away with all of Psalms or are we going to take this commandment and then not obey it? Either you must do away with instrumental music or you must do it. There are no two ways about it. If that is a commandment, then it is sinful not to do it. I know that there are some cases in which people are not very serious about the commandments of God, but still we are commanded to do that just as much as we are commanded to sing, and if we can worship God without singing and if we can continue our worship of God without singing, then we might do without instrumental music if instrumental music inheres in the word "psallo", etc. But here we have it and it is bound upon us.

Let's get on the issue and discuss this question from the clear blazing, burning issue tonight and not get off on these other things. They are not pertinent to the issue. The question has evolved on this thing tonight: Is David binding and then does Ephesians 5:19 command the use of instrumental music? Let him bring that proof and then we can discuss this question. Until he is willing to get on the issue, then we can't discuss it. As long as he stays off over here I can't reach him over there. I am not debating those questions tonight. We are debating this: Resolved that instru-

mental music in (not an aid to) but in Christian worship is scriptural. Now don't come back and say you've got to give me a scripture that condemns it. You have got to give me the scripture that teaches it, and will you do it? Will you prove that Psalms is still binding? And will you prove that Ephesians 5:19 is a commandment to use the instrument? I thank you.

Garner:-

I regret very much having failed to answer three scriptures while ago. I overlooked them. Relative to the law. He quotes three. John 10:34 where it says: "It is said in your law, Ye are gods" and then he supposes this fastens psalms to the law. This is a quotation from Psalms 82:6. The same words are found also in the Book of Exodus. Jesus explains, if he had read on in the next verse, 35 in John, who were called gods. Where he says they were called "gods" to whom the word of God came. This is a quotation from Exodus 22:28 where the rulers of the people are called gods. "Thou shalt not revile the gods, nor curse the ruler of the people." There are the scriptures in the law. Certainly the psalms re-quote it, but it is found in the law. Evidently the word "gods" does not refer to heathern gods because the Bible teaches that we should revile heathern gods. Then in John 12:34 "The people said, we have heard out of the law that Christ abideth for ever." Well, they had heard it out of the law and then he assumes that it is only in the psalms but it is a quotation from II Samuel 7:13 "He shall build a house for thy name and I will establish his house for ever." Indeed, it is in the Psalms, but he quoted from the law first. Then John 15:25 "It is written in their law. They hated me without cause." He assumes because it is found in the psalms that it is only there and has to be law, but in Numbers 14:11 and this is evidently to what Jesus is referring, "And the Lord said unto Moses, How long will this people provoke me? And how long will it be ere they believe me, for all the signs which I shall show among them."

They were hating God as he tried to lead them out. Hebrews 3:8 speaking of this same thing says "Harden not your heart, as in the provocation" when they hated and provoked God and denied his words, in the day of temptation in the wilderness. That's that, Elder. You didn't give me one scripture that said the Psalms were law, quoting from the law? Certainly we have found where Jesus said, Lk. 24:44 "things were written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms." That was the RIGHT DIVISION and when you say that there are two divisions, the law and the prophets, then how are you going to get along with Jesus on his division of it, and come to right conclusions?

He said "little things to quibble about." This is no little thing, elder! It is a great subject! When the doctrines of Christ COMMAND to teach in psalms Col. 3:16-17 and in the psalms we are taught to use instrumental music in worship. It is no little thing. Then he supposes that everyone must use the Psalms with instruments.

"Why don't you, Mr. Garner, he says, "use instruments? Aren't you sinning if you don't?"

"He here assumes that everyone must sing and that everyone must use instrumental music together. That is, that one can't be without the other. Just an assumption, no scripture that says that. Christ said the division of the Old Testament was the law, the prophets, and the Psalms. The law division had been done away, and the prophets, BUT COMMANDS us to use Psalms that TEACH the use of instrumental music, Eph. 5:19 and Col. 3:16.

I think that's about everything that he said except he quotes, no, he mis-quotes Revelation 14:2. Elder, it said, "And I heard the voice of the harpers, harping." The word as

is not there. Turn and read it. If it is, I will get down out of this pulpit and quit. All right, "and I heard the voice of harpers harping with their harps." There is an as in the first part but then he pauses for a semi-colon, then he says, "I heard the voice of harpers harping."

(Smith steps forward with Rev. 14:2 and asks Garner to read it.)

SMITH:— "Read the Revised version."

GARNER:— "It's 'of' here just the same. You know it is here too. You don't have it? Says "I heard of voice of harpers harping" — not "as." It is not in here. Revelation 14:1-5. Since, there seems to be a clash of scholars here then wonder if we can find an "as" in this; one added in here? Revelation 5:8 "When he had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials." They had harps, not "as" harps. Elder, will you not miss the first resurrection, sitting on the throne, saying "Cursed art thou", as Paul's man of sin, II Thess. 2:4, I Thess. 4:13-18.

Smith:-

Gentlemen moderators, ladies and gentlemen; I am sorry tonight that we have just now begun to debate. I wish he had gotten on to the issue a long time ago. One hundred and one of the greatest Greek scholars in the world translated this book and Albert comes back and says they didn't know what they were talking about, that "as" is not there. I want to read Revelations 14:2, "And I heard a voice from heaven as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder, and the voice which I heard was as the voice of harpers harping with their harps" and Albert knew that that was in the Revised Version and that the Revised Version was given by one hundred and one scholars while that of 1611 was given by 47 scholars. Now, if he is not willing to take that, it seems to me, ladies and gentlemen tonight, that that's a frank admission that his position will not stand. Don't you think so? I do. Now then, let's turn to the 5th chapter and read what he says in the eighth verse. Hear what he says. He says that, "When he had taken the book, the four living creatures and the four and twenty Elders fell down before the lamb, having each one a harp." Let it be a harp; he didn't answer my argument. "And golden bowls of incense." Where are the bowls of incense?

Albert has not answered one of my arguments. I am sorry to say that. He has made the argument in trying to answer that argument that the same words were used in Exodus 22:25. This will go down on the record and I want you to read Exodus 22:25 and you will find that in that scripture that the words are not used that Christ used; and again he assumed that I was going to use John 12:34 and I

didn't even quote it. He had it in his notes. He thought I was going to quote it, but I didn't quote it. That will show in the print, too. Now then, he comes back with another one from II Samuel 7:13 which is in no wise like that. He cannot find it and he knows that he cannot find it. Now then, he has come again to Ephesians 5:19 as to "the" psalms. I quoted sufficient passages to show that that does not refer necessarily to David's Psalms and of the teaching of error there, and his point just simply doesn't carry over there.

He has not answered a one of my arguments. I have shown him by reading to him Jesus Christ that the Psalms were a part of the law. He cannot deny it. I have shown to him and he didn't carry through you notice on Psalms 81:3 which says that the music was brought over from the law the same as incense and all of those other things. But he's going to take all of that. Did you notice that he hasn't answered one substantial argument? I knew he would want to quibble on these little things when I came, but I thought he would get on some of these and stay on them for a while. I am glad he brought this up in the last speech but we can see that not one argument, not one, has been answered. Not one substantial argument. That if the command is to play, then we must play and his people do not practice that. Not all of the Baptists use instrumental music in the worship and neither do any of them believe that it is necessary to acceptable worship. Albert doesn't believe that and if that commandment in Psalms 150 holds true, then we have to use it. There is no getting around it. There is no ability of ours to choose between it; it is a commandment for each congregation at least, to use one, if it is for any to use one.

Now, then back about 150 years ago, there was a movement started by great and good men for a unity of the

brethren. I am glad that he said and agreed with me on one thing — that he believed in unity, but I don't think he believes it like he ought to. There was a search for common ground and that search was to find something in common which all people could agree to. For the word "baptism", nobody disagreed that it meant to immerse. Everybody agreed that it means to immerse. And so there is common ground for unity, and then again, for the name we shall wear. Nobody denies that "Christian" is all right and so they found a common ground for "Christian." Now then, for the Lord's Supper, nobody disagreed that each Lord's Day was all right and so there is common ground that everybody agrees on. Now for instrumental music in the worship. Get it, there isn't a scholar on earth today that will contend that you can't worship God without the instrument. All agree that we can do it. Now then, if Albert loves the brotherhood of Jesus Christ as he ought to, can we not lay down these differences of instrumental music when everyone knows that we can worship without them for the love of unity? "Behold," says David, "how sweet and how good it is for brethren to dwell together in peace." Indeed, how wonderful it is. We would be willing to lay down any thing not commanded of God. He has made quibbles on the fork and has made quibbles on other things. Why, if they would strike a bargain on that and lay aside the instruments of music and if they contended for that, I am sure, that our brethren would lay down anything, if it is necessary. But that's not the argument and the question still stands before us in the blazing print — that instrumental music in Christian worship is scriptural — and he has not proved that it is scriptural, and we have shown definitely that it is not scriptural and his quibbles go down there.

I thank you.