

APPENDIX I

CULTURAL INFLUENCE CAN AFFECT THEOLOGICAL ISSUES

BY LARRY JONAS

How much are you influenced by the spirit of the age in which you live? Are your religious beliefs shaped and changed by the economic, political, and social influences around you? Probably they are, more than you realize. To illustrate the interrelations of cultural influences upon a single set of beliefs, let us look at a controversy among the frontier American religious group, the Disciples, during the turbulent years at the end of the Civil War and the period of rapid change which followed.

The Disciples were a product of the period just before the Civil War when preachers from many different wrangling and divided denominations decided that something must be done to end the sin of religious division. They began in what Vernon Louis Parrington called the period of "romantic optimism."¹ The Romantic evangelism of this period was characterized by "emphasis upon the individual and his emotions, its central vision of the perfect man in remote antiquity..."² The Disciples decided that the answer to religious confusion was to go back to the perfect church of antiquity. They sought to restore what their leader, Alexander Campbell, called the "Ancient Order" or the primitive church. Many religious leaders had called for reform in the past, but in the age of optimism, Campbell and others gave up the idea of reform and decided to restore the church as it was originally. They took off the man-made names and restored the names, church of Christ and church of God. They discarded sprinkling and infant baptism and restored immersion of believers. They fought the "pastor system" and sought to restore the plurality of elders to teach and preach in each congregation. This found a popular response in an age when the opening of a rich new west was providing many opportunities for individual expression to the common man. It was an age of the democratization of

¹Parrington, Vernon Louis, Main Currents of American Thought, p. xix.

²Gabriel, Ralph Henry, The Course of American Democratic Thought, p. 33.

religion of many denominations who admitted the laity to a larger share in church government, according to Merle Curti.³ The popular response increased as the Disciples gained convictions against choirs, mission societies, denominational conventions and all other forms of centralization which would interfere with the individualism and direct participation characteristic of the frontier.

The Disciples were born on the Western edge of Pennsylvania in the panhandle of what has become West Virginia. They spread very little to the East but had a rapid growth in the expanding West. They soon united with the followers of Barton Stone who had developed the same romantic optimism on the frontier of Kentucky. The Disciples grew threefold in the ten years just before 1850 to a total of 118,000. They nearly doubled before the outbreak of the war. These first forty years saw their strength multiplied by sixteen.⁴ But it was almost all frontier growth. Except for the Mississippi Valley county-seat towns, "The Disciples never quite kept pace with their rivals in the cities. They lacked both the financial and the cultural resources which others drew from their constituencies in the East."⁵ Born on the frontier, they were destined for years to remain rural and village. "While other leading denominations had from 15 to 50 per cent of their membership in cities of over 25,000 in 1890, according to H. K. Carroll's statistics for that year, the Disciples were only six and two-thirds per cent urban."⁶

This rural background was to produce growing conflict as the reconstruction period brought rapid changes to the cities, changes unacceptable to the standards of a rurally oriented church. For example, before wealth was common in the west, the Disciples had spoken against "sinful luxury and extravagance of building 'great cathedrals costing forty thousand dollars'. Not more than one or two Disciples churches built before 1860 cost that much."⁷ This protest was fine when the level of housing for both saint and sanctuary was humble. What was to happen if members got better housing and the denominations around them started to erect fine church buildings in the cities? These changes were swift in coming. Railroads came into the region before the war and by 1869 were transcontinental. With rapid transportation bringing the culture

³Curti, Merle, The Growth of American Thought, p. 306.

⁴Garrison, Religion Follows The Frontier, p. 200.

⁵Ibid.

⁶op. cit. p. 248.

⁷op. cit. p. 226.

of the East onto the frontier "every village considered itself a potential metropolis. Better clothes, better houses, abler teachers, finer colleges, more books, music and lectures, more sidewalks and less mud, more leisure--all conspired to create a certain sophistication..."⁸ When Disciples got better housing they also wanted better churches.

"When after a generation of singing schools taught by wandering masters with tuning-forks, they began to put melodeons in their parlors, it was inevitable that the younger generation should want musical instruments in the church. With the increase of fastidiousness came a distaste for the repetitious and ungrammatical exhortations and the inexpert pastoral ministries of lay elders, with a consequent demand for the services of 'pastors' with some training in the arts of speech and some professional skill in the management of church affairs. The 'plurality of elders' might be all right as a doctrine, but the 'one-man system' gained vogue because one man who knew how could do what a 'plurality' of amateurs could not do."⁹

Obviously these demands were contrary to the whole spirit of romantic optimism that the good things were to be found in the past. They were not compatible with a "restoration of the primitive church". These demands show that cultural primitiveness was no longer the spirit of everyone on the frontier.

Railroads and the wealth they brought produced a new philosophy--"an urban psychology (which) would displace the older agrarian, and with this new philosophy would come other philosophies in response to the changing realities."¹⁰ In this new age materialism was becoming God. "...Progress was defined as the accumulation of capital and the proliferation of industrial inventions."¹¹ The change can be typified in architecture which was cheapened by the building of overdone mansions filled with heavy, grotesque, furniture whose only purpose was to display cost.¹² Community life was changing swiftly from simple to complex. From the time these Americans were born they were taught to

⁸Garrison & Degrot, The Disciples of Christ, p. 339.

⁹Garrison, p. 226.

¹⁰Parrington, p. 103.

¹¹McCloskey, Robert Green, American Conservatism in the Age of Enterprise, p. 13.

¹²Ibid.

think in terms of the future. The faith which had come out of Palestine was subject to these changes also. No longer was virtue found in antiquity, it now was found in steady progress and change.¹³ Moses E. Lard, a Disciples editor, recognized this change by 1865 and deplored what he termed a spirit of "innovation."¹⁴ This innovation was part of a devaluation of individual action and an increasing movement toward concentration and compulsion to conformity.¹⁵ Some Disciples were adapting these views and began to conform to the improvements with which they must compete. They began efforts to organize themselves better than they had been in the past and began to make their worship meet the standards of expectation of the growing cities. But not everyone was willing to make these changes, for few Disciples were involved in the new urban philosophy.

Most Disciples lived in rural areas or small villages which at this time were experiencing growing antagonism toward the changes taking place in the towns. While wage-earners in the town were learning to expect a shortening work-day and a two-week's vacation, the farmers lived as they always had, only now they had to spend more time in the field to make their living. They naturally began to suspect the frivolous leisure of city folk who "made amusement into business." These farmers became convinced that leisure and luxury were polite names for laziness.¹⁶ It was natural for rural Disciples to take a view similar to that of the workers mentioned by A. M. Schlesinger: "When better accommodations existed, the working class commonly regarded the church--with its fine upholstery, stained-glass windows and expensive choirs as an institution where ill-clad worshippers were unwelcome and the Nazarene himself would have been rebuffed."¹⁷ Among the Disciples these things were signs of formalism which could be avoided by keeping out the choirs, organs, etc. Some of them evidently realized the problem which faced the city churches in their efforts to have a presentable service to attract people with new values. Isaac Erret, a leading editor among the Disciples who himself favored the use of the organ if it did not cause trouble among the brethren, had advice for city churches:

¹³Gabriel, p. 38.

¹⁴Garrison & Degrot, p. 339.

¹⁵Parrington, p. 189.

¹⁶Schlesinger, A. M., The Rise of the City, p. 287.

¹⁷Ibid. p. 331.

"... if they wish to block up the way against the introduction of choirs and organs, and the formalism resulting therefrom, they must employ suitable teachers of vocal music, and spend a portion of every year in training all the voices of the church in the knowledge of musical science and the practice of suitable tunes--so that the present partial, discordant and unedifying music of our churches may be abandoned and forgotten."¹⁸

As further evidence of the clash between the city standards and determination to fight the entertaining innovations, we have only to hear the story Commodore Wesley Cauble tells of his boyhood church in Indiana. They didn't have an organ and didn't want one in their church, nor did they want the organ question raided at all; but a traveling preacher told them that their county-seat and all the city churches had organs. All the country churches were against it, according to the preacher. He demanded that this church stand for or against the organ. This clash between urban philosophy which was favoring change as progress and the rural areas which still accepted the optimism of restoring the primitive church has produced a lasting division between the Disciples of this day.

Today most of the opposition to the instruments and choir comes from Southern churches of Christ or churches planted by them in the rest of the nation. It is easy to suppose that some sectional bitterness may be involved in the division. It is easy to see that this is, no doubt, partly the case, since the vast majority of Southerners were farmers addicted to the staple-crop system.¹⁹ This high rate of rural population would tend to give them more anti-organ churches. Also the fact that wealth was slower in coming to the South after the Civil War would also slow up the advance of the innovations. However, there are some sectional differences which would have an influence upon the position Southerners would take on the controversies among the Disciples. While the ancient fierceness between the Protestant bodies was dying out, it was still strong in the South and rural neighborhoods.²⁰ In 1860 there were 1,241 Disciples congregations in the North and 829 in the South. The Disciples were most numerous in the border states.²¹ It was in these border states where loss of life and property produced the most bitterness and hatred, affecting schools, churches and business relations.²² This bitterness had not broken before or during the war over

¹⁸Erret, Isaac, Millenial Harbinger, 1861, p. 559.

¹⁹Schlesinger, p. 2.

²⁰Schlesinger, p. 320.

²¹Mosely, J. Edward, Disciples of Christ in Georgia, p. 183.

²²Dunning, W. A., Reconstruction Political and Economic.

the slavery issue, probably because the Disciples in 1851 had the highest per-capita slave ownership of religious bodies in the nation, and had purposely avoided the subject of slavery, as an issue either North or South.²³ But a more subtle result of the North-South conflict is discernable. Because of wounded feelings by political insinuations and slurs in Northern Disciples publications, several Southern Disciples decided to start a publication which would be non-offensive to their area.²⁴ The resulting weekly paper, The Gospel Advocate began to have a tremendous readership and influence in the South. It was a paper which became one of the most outstanding opponents of the organ, choir, missionary society and other innovations. So it was natural that Southerners were exposed to more of this view than were Northerners where there were far more papers, most of which were not opposed to the principle of innovation. Evidence of this importance of the Advocate is seen in one of the Disciples state histories: "The legalism consistently proclaimed by the Advocate which had loyal supporters in Georgia, thus became firmly entrenched in the state and became an important factor in resultant divisions that plagued the Georgia brethren."²⁵ This publication tried to avoid being anti-North even though it was anti-innovation-of-the-North. The editor, David Libscomb, called for and recognized in his columns, all of the material aid that could be sent by the Northern brethren to the distressed Southern Disciples. By 1899 he had over \$100,000.00 of such aid to report.²⁶ Thus we can see that sectional bitterness was kept out of the issues as much as brethren could possibly accomplish it, but sectional differences did play a part in the resultant North-South division over the instrument which resulted in separate census listings for the Disciples and the anti-organ churches of Christ in 1906.

Much of this division would not have been produced, in the opinion of this writer, if it had not been for the popularity of the debate during the reconstruction period. Debates are designed to produce victory and when brethren faced each other in this way to reach the "unity of faith" they only produced two parties, one behind each champion. Today we have panel discussions where several opinions are represented and an effort is made to find common ground on which to arrive at a solution satisfactory to everyone. We have made this effort to avoid the dangers of the two-value oriented debate; but in the period of Disciples controversy, debates were the most popular indoor sport. Societies

²³Garrison & Degrot, p. 468.

²⁴Mosely, p. 189-190.

²⁵Mosely, p. 214.

²⁶Libscomb, David, Gospel Advocate, August 24, 1899, p. 537.

and small communities entertained themselves in the winter evenings cheering their respective champions on discussions of the relative merits of Washington and Lafayette, relative importance of fire and water, and various theological doctrines.²⁷ It is unfortunate that such a small item of enjoyment in an age should have such lasting evil consequence for millions of church members today, who are still divided over the use of instrumental music.

It is interesting to look to letters to editors and editorial comments during the period of controversy over the instrument and innovations question to demonstrate that such problems are as much cultural as they are theological. One of the first comments was a letter to editor, Alexander Campbell in 1851, asking him if circus going, card playing, theater going, dancing and instrumental music in worship were to be tolerated by the churches. The article contains no reasons except strong emotional prejudice against these things, lumping the organ with the worst evils the writer, John Rodgers, could imagine.²⁸ In his answer Campbell deals with dancing but not with the instrument question.²⁹ But a little later the same year, he did deal with the instrument. He reasoned that the denominations needed the instrumental music like alcohol to stimulate them to worship, but to the Christian such aids would be as cow bells in a concert.³⁰ This again reflects emotional and cultural conditioning rather than theological reasoning. In 1861, an article appeared by Isaac Erret which presented the various views on the instrument and his solution, already referred to, of improving the singing so that organs and choirs were not needed. He said that on the one hand brethren wanted to elevate the taste of the churches with innovations and that on the other hand they objected that such "improvements" in music of the church are born of pride and tend to formalism--that it will surrender fervent piety at the shrine of fashion, and rob the church of her power over the world.³¹ He pointed out his feelings "that the highest artistic skill in sacred music has somehow generally been associated with the lowest spiritual culture--and has been far more promotive of sensuous than of spiritual attractions."³² Again the ob-

²⁷Garrison, p.

²⁸Millennial Harbinger, 1851, p. 467-8.

²⁹Ibid, p. 503-7.

³⁰Ibid, p. 581-2.

³¹Ibid. 1861, p. 588.

³²Ibid, p. 559.

jections are cultural and not spiritual, for Erret later advocated the use of instruments after they were common. "Ancient Order" wrote a letter to Harbinger in 1864 complaining about song books and part singing which excluded those not familiar with music notes. He said that any music that was not sung by all the congregation was all wrong and anti-Christian; but offered no arguments from scripture.³³ Following this article there was a long essay by William K. Pendleton dealing with the history of the instrumental music question. He quoted the church fathers to show that the whole congregation, rather than a choir, joined in the singing in the early church but he offered no scripture showing congregational singing, for indeed there is none after the foundation of the church in the second chapter of Acts. Then he proceeded to quote other ancient authorities to show that the organ was not introduced until 1250 or possibly 776. Again his facts were in error for Eusebius church history written in the fourth century (324) mentioned the controversy already at that time. Pendleton concluded by saying that he could use the instrument if it did not offend his brethren.³⁴

J. W. McGarvey, whom the Disciples held to be one of their leading scholars, began the theological arguments in 1864 when he told how it was time to stop objecting to the instrument because it offended some brethren, for whole congregations had agreed to have organs by then. It was time to go to the scriptures and decide the issue once and for all. He then proceeded to show that the instrument was used in the Old Testament worship but was never carried over by the apostles into the New Testament church and by the silence of the New Testament should be excluded in the same way burning incense and putting preachers in robes ought to be avoided because they were never included in the New Testament church which the Disciples were seeking to restore. To introduce any item which was not introduced by God would be to set up our own will to worship, according to McGarvey. He defended himself from objections that hymn books and tuning forks also are absent from the New Testament by saying that they were not part of the worship, but were only aids, whereas the instrument controlled singing and constituted the chief element in the joyful sound which fills the house of worship.³⁵

Two things are obvious from this article by one of the men most conversant with the controversy at this time. First, brethren had not used scripture, but only prejudice up to this time in order to keep the

³³Ibid. 1864, p. 123.

³⁴Ibid, p. 124-127.

³⁵Millennial Harbinger, 1864, p. 510-512.

instrument out. Second, now that the issue was serious, all that can be produced is an argument from silence and an attempt to put instrumentation into worship rather than leaving it outside as hymn books and other aids. This last effort is certainly weak. One has to assume that pitch is more a part of worship than words of a song. For if a hymn book which controls the choice of words of praise is not wrong but something which guides the pitch is wrong then the pitch patterns of singing are the main part of praising God and the words are only incidental. Obviously, hymn books had been in the church a long time and were not associated with modernistic innovations, so they passed the test. But the instruments had been decided against for cultural and emotional reasons already and now scriptural subtleries must be invented to condemn them.

You and I become so involved in the issues of our own time that it is hard for us to see the cultural influence upon our thinking. But with these problems drawn from the Disciples we can see the major currents of the whole reconstruction period influenced them. The sectional dispute, the urban-rural dispute, the coming of railroads and prosperous leisure, the change from romantic idealism to materialistic progress all played their part to divide a body which today numbers over four million members.

APPENDIX II

OBSERVATIONS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Allow me to remark at the outset of this chapter that the purpose of this discussion of the Old Testament regarding instrumental music is not to prove that we are justified in using the instrument in the New Testament. Rather, our purpose is to destroy certain claims by some who say that instrumental music in the Old Testament was displeasing to God.

A. Music Before The Law:

The people of Israel from the beginning of their national life were taught to use instrumental music in the praise of God. The first thing that they did at the crossing of the Red Sea, when they saw their enemies swallowed up in the sea, was to worship Jehovah. Exodus 15:1 says, "then sang Moses and the children of Israel this song unto Jehovah, ..." The song is given in verses 2 to 18. The singing was accompanied by instrumental music. Verses 20 to 21 says,

"And Miriam the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, took a timbrel in her hand; and all the women went out after her with timbrels and with dances. And Miriam answered them, Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea."

B. The Giving of the Law Was Accompanied by Instrumental Music:

Jehovah specifically commanded that the people be called to the sacred assembly at the mount by a musical instrument. Exodus 19:13: "...When the trumpet soundeth long they shall come up to the mount."

Even while God talked to Moses, the trumpet played. Exodus 19:17-20:

"And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp to meet with God; and they stood at the nether part of the mount. And Mount

Sinai, the whole of it, smoked, because Jehovah descended upon it in fire; and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly. And when the VOICE OF THE TRUMPET SOUNDED LONG AND WAXED LOUDER AND LOUDER, Moses spake, and God answered him by a voice. And Jehovah came down upon Mount Sinai, to the top of the mount; and Jehovah called Moses to the top of the mount; and Moses went up."

C. The Moving of the Ark of the Covenant Was Accompanied by Instrumental Music. I Chron. 13:7-10:

"And they carried the ark of God upon a new cart, and brought it out of the house of Abinadab: and Uzza and Ahio drove the cart. And David and all Israel PLAYED with PSALTERIES, and with TAMBURELS, and with CYMBALS, and with TRUMPETS. And when they came into the threshing-floor of Chidon, Uzza put forth his hand to hold the ark; for the oxen stumbled. And the anger of Jehovah was kindled against Uzza, and he smote him, because he put forth his hand to the ark; and there he died before God."

In an attempt to find support for the condemning of musical instruments, some non-instrumentalists use the death of Uzza as a warning against the use of instrumental music in worship. They argue that Uzza did something which he was not commanded to do and was punished by death. From this reasoning it is concluded that those who use instrumental music without a specific command will be punished by spiritual death. But the fact is overlooked that Uzza violated a specific law, the violation of which carried the death penalty! (Numbers 4:15) Uzza was not punished for doing something which was not authorized, but for doing something which was specifically forbidden. There is no such prohibition against the use of instrumental music. Rather, in using instrumental accompaniment today, we are doing nothing more than what has been shown to be authorized. The case of Nadab and Abihu and the offering of strange fire is also used in this same manner of reasoning. The answer is the same as in the case of Uzza.

The second stage of the journey was also accompanied by instrumental music. I Chronicles 15:16, 28:

"And David spake to the chief of the Levites to appoint their brethren to be the singers, with INSTRUMENTS OF MUSIC, PSALTERIES, AND HARPS, AND CYMBALS SOUNDING ALOUD by lifting up the voice with joy... Thus all Israel brought up the ark of the covenant of Jehovah with shouting, and with sound of the CORNET, and with TRUMPET, and with CYMBALS, SOUNDING ALOUD WITH PSALTERIES AND HARPS."

After the ark was brought to Jerusalem, instrumental music was continued as a part of their praise to God. I Chronicles 16:1-6:

"And they brought in the ark of God, and set it in the midst of the tent that David had pitched for it: and they offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings before God. And when David had made an end of offering the burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, he blessed the people in the name of Jehovah. And he dealt to everyone of Israel, both man and woman, to everyone a loaf of bread, and a portion of flesh, and a cake of raisins. And he appointed certain of the Levites to MINISTER BEFORE THE ARK OF JEHOVAH, AND TO CELEBRATE AND TO THANK AND PRAISE JEHOVAH, THE GOD OF ISRAEL: Asaph the chief, and second to him Zechariah, Jeiel, and Shemiramoth and Hehiel, and Mattithiah, and Eliab, and Behaiah, and Obed-edom, and Jeiel, with PSALTERIES and with HARPS: and Asaph with CYMBALS, sounding aloud; and Benaiah and Jahaziel the priests with TRUMPETS continually, before the ark of the covenant of God."

D. The Placing of the Ark of the Covenant in Solomon's Temple was Accompanied by Singing with Instrumental Accompaniment.

We have this account recorded for us in II Chronicles 5. Solomon had finished the temple and the day of the dedication had arrived. Solomon had "brought in all the things that David his father had dedicated," (5:1) But the Lord gave no response. The king of Israel gathered together all the leaders of Israel. (5:2-3) Still God does not respond. The Levites bring up the ark, and the tabernacle and all the holy vessels that were in the tabernacle. (5:4-5) God makes no sign. All the congregation assembled before the ark and offered a multitude of sacrifices. (5:6) The Lord remains silent. Then the priests place the ark of the covenant in its proper place in the Holy of Holies. But still nothing is heard from the Lord. But when the priests came out of the holy place and the choir and orchestra stood at the east end of the altar with one-hundred twenty priests sounding with trumpets, and they began praising Jehovah with voices and instruments (5:12-13); then the Lord responded and acknowledged what they had done by causing the cloud, the visible symbol of his presence, to fill the temple! (5:14) What manner of prejudice would cause one to conclude that the Lord was displeased with the use of instruments in praise to Him in the Old Testament!

E. God Commanded the Use of Instrumental Music in Worship.

After the death of Solomon, the kingdom was divided, and began to decay. The worship of Jehovah declined, and finally, the temple itself ceased to be used as a place of worship. In time, there came to the

throne a young man named Hezekiah who reigned twenty-nine years ,
"and did that which was right in the eyes of Jehovah." II Chronicles
29:25-28:

"And he set the Levites in the house of Jehovah with cymbals,
with psalteries, and with harps, according to the commandment of
David, and of Gad the king's seer, and Nathan the prophet; FOR
THE COMMANDMENT WAS OF JEHOVAH BY HIS PROPHETS. And
the Levites stood with the instruments of David, and the priests
with the trumpets. And Hezekiah commanded to offer the burnt-
offering upon the altar. And when the burnt-offering began, the song
of Jehovah began also, and the trumpets, together with the instru-
ments of David king of Israel. And all the assembly worshipped,
and the singers sang, and the trumpeters sounded; all this continued
until the burnt-offering was finished."

These preceding five points are sufficient to disprove the theory
that instrumental music in the Old Testament was abhorred by Jehovah.
But there are a couple of other observations that we want to notice in
the Old Testament concerning instrumental music.

A number of times in this thesis we have mentioned that in order
to properly interpret certain lexicographers and translators we must
understand that the word "sing" is a general term. That is, when we
say "sing" we have no intention of excluding instrumental accompaniment
and including only unaccompanied singing. This was illustrated by dic-
tionaries, lexicons and translations. We found that most dictionaries
have given "sing psalms" or an equivalent phrase to describe a psalm.
But when we wrote letters of inquiry we found that they had no intention
of excluding instrumental accompaniment. We found the same with lexi-
cons. We found that Robinson in one lexicon merely had "sing" for
psallo, but in a later edition he included instrumental accompaniment.
This showed us that when he used "sing" by itself, he apparently intended
that we would understand instrumental accompaniment. We also noticed
several cases (Moulton and Milligan—Abbot-Smith) where lexicographers
would use "sing" for psallo but when we checked psalmos we noticed
that the instrument was included. This does not mean that they were
contradicting themselves but it does mean that they understood that
"sing" was a general word which includes the instrument.

Now I want us to use an illustration from the Old Testament which
clearly demonstrates how "sing" is used in a general sense. Turn to
I Samuel 21:10-11:

"And David arose, and fled that day for fear Achish said
unto him, Is not this David the king of the land? did they not sing
one to another of him in dances, saying, Saul hath slain his thou-
sands, and David his ten thousands?"

This passage only says "sing". Must it be unaccompanied? To
find the answer and see what actually happened we need to turn back to
18:6-7:

"And it came to pass as they came, when David was returned
from the slaughter of the Philistine, that the women came out of
all the cities of Israel, singing and dancing, to meet the king Saul,
with tabrets, with joy, and with instruments of music. And the
women answered one another as they played, and said, Saul hath
slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands."

What has happened? All that it says in chapter 21 is "sing."
If one were trying to avoid the instrument he might be tempted to read
into chapter 21, "sing--only--unaccompanied--without an instrument."
It included instrumental accompaniment! When one attempts to read
"only" into the word "sing" he is assuming something that is not actual.
Translators understood "sing" is a general and included accompani-
ment and does not exclude it. This is also illustrated from letters that
we received from translators who simply used the word "sing" in Ephe-
sians 5:19. See Chapter V.

We want to examine one last argument from the Old Testament.
This is regarding the much used and abused passage of scripture in Amos
6:4-5. This scripture has often been used to "prove" that David "in-
vented instruments of music to himself" which displeased God. It is
usually inferred at the same time that if anyone ever uses instruments
to accompany the singing of praises of God, he too comes under the
wrath of God. To answer this argument I want to quote from James D.
Bales, Professor of Bible, Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas. Bales
is a prolific writer among the non-instrumental churches of Christ:

"...I see no indication that David acted without Divine author-
ization. Amos does not say anything about David's authorization of
instrumental music for the Levitical worship, but rather has refer-
ence to their use in connection with the wanton, luxurious revel-
lings of these sinners who were blind to the judgment which was
coming on them. They are like David in that they devise such ins-
truments for themselves. It was not wrong to sleep on a bed or
stretch out on a couch. But in this context they are 'sprawling idlers,'
who are spending their lives in folly. The context does not deal with
the worship services under the Old Testament, and thus verse five
cannot be used to condemn what David did by the authorization of
God.

It was 'according to the commandment of David, and of Gad
the king's seer, and Nathan the prophet; for the commandment was
of Jehovah by his prophets.' (II Chron. 5:29,25.) In connection

with such worship, 'the glory of Jehovah filled the house of God.' (II Chron. 5:11-14) David made the instruments (I Chron. 23:5), but they were used according to the commandment of Jehovah (II Chron. 29:25)." (From Gospel Advocate, Jan. 16, 1958; p. 35)

As Dr. Bales points out, this passage is not talking about a congregational assembly. It does not refer to the use of musical instruments in the worship of God. This is not referring to me and my use of instrumental accompaniment when I sing praises to God. But this could very well fit some who condemn my use of instrumental accompaniment in the praise of God; while they themselves are lying at home on their couches eating sweets, as they beat time to the rock-and-roll jazz that comes blaring over the radio or television!

In the months since the first printing, the following document has come to the attention of the publishers. It corroborates Mr. Burgess' conclusion that the later editions of Robinson contain corrections from his earlier work. Here is the Preface page from a later edition of Robinson:

P R E F A C E.

THE Author's earliest effort in the department of New Testament Lexicography, was a translation of the first edition of Wahl's *Clavis Philologica Novi Testamenti*, with some additions, published in 1825. This was followed in 1836 by his own *Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament*; in the preparation of which several years of diligent labour had been expended. Whatever may have been the deficiencies of the latter work, it would seem to have met and supplied, however imperfectly, a want in the theological literature of the day; as was evinced by its speedy republication in Great Britain, in three rival editions, and the subsequent appearance of two abridgments.

When the time came, three years ago, to prepare for a new edition of this Lexicon, although not desiring to shun any necessary labour, I yet hoped that the task would be comparatively light. The progress of science in this department, as in others, had indeed not ceased to be onward. Wahl and Bretschneider had issued new and corrected editions of their Lexicons, and Winer had revised and enlarged his Grammar; while the labours and improvements of Passow had been carried forward after his decease by able successors, and the more extended results spread before the English public in the very valuable Lexicon of Liddell and Scott. Still more, the Commentaries of De Wette and Meyer on the New Testament had appeared; to say nothing of many others. My own official duties, too, had called me, for the greater portion of the preceding decennium, to the daily interpretation of the New Testament before large classes of young men preparing for the ministry of the Gospel; and, in the meantime, I had visited and partially explored the Holy Land. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising, that, when I sat down to the work of revision, I found many portions of my former labours, and especially the earliest, less satisfactory than I had hoped. The result was, that a large part of the work required, in my judgment, to be rewritten; and it has accordingly been rewritten, without regard to time or labour. The remaining portions have been thoroughly revised; and have received very many additions, corrections, and curtailments.