

Instrumental Music

by

J. D. Logan

Instrumental Music

by

J. D. Logan

November 5, 2011

Instrumental Music

Introduction

Christians are instructed to sing in worship to God. This has never been disputed. There is, however, an ongoing dispute as to whether mechanical instruments should be used to accompany this singing. The object of this investigation is to explore this controversy from the scriptural and historical standpoints.

The more important of the two standpoints is the scriptural. However, the historical can shed light on the early teachings and practices of the church in the immediate post-apostolic church. This is important to know, as many practices and doctrines have been added to those of the original church as founded by the apostles.

Historical before 300 AD

Aquinas. “Our church does not use musical instruments, as harps and psalteries, to praise God withal, that she may not seem to Judaize.” (**Thomas Aquinas**, Bingham’s Antiquities, Vol. 3, Page 137).

Augustine. “Musical instruments were not used. The pipe, tabret, and harp here associate so intimately with the sensual heathen cults, as well as with the wild revelries and shameless performances of the degenerate theatre and circus, it is easy to understand the prejudices against their use in the worship.” (**Augustine**, 354 AD, describing the singing at Alexandria under Athanasius).

These will suffice to show the practice and teaching of the immediate post apostolic church. I will not quote others, but will merely name some whose sentiments reflect the same attitude. Among others, are, **Chrysostom**, (381-407), **Clement of Alexandria**, (190 AD The Instructor, Fathers of the church, Pg, 130); **Erasmus**, (Erasmus, Commentary on 1 Cor. 14:19); and **Eusebius**, (Commentary on Psalms 91:2-3).

In the intervening centuries until the time of the “Reformation” years (Calvin, Luther, Wesley) the Roman Catholic Church wholly adopted the organ. Pope Vitalian was said to be the first to introduce the organ into a church. This was in the year 666. There was much resistance to this addition throughout the churches of Western Europe. There was no general acceptance of this practice until after the eighth century.

That the Romish church would be the first to initiate this practice is not surprising, in view of the many Pagan practices that she adopted during this period. Surprisingly, this is admitted to by some of her own historians, as can be seen from the following: “We need not shrink from admitting that candles, like incense and lustral water, were commonly employed in pagan worship and the rites paid to the dead. But the Church, from a very early period, took them into her service, just as she adopted many other things indifferent in themselves, which seemed proper to enhance the splendor of religious ceremony. We must not forget that most of these adjuncts (additions...JDL) to worship, like lights, **music**, (instrumental...JDL) perfumes, ablutions, floral decorations, canopies, fans, screens, bells, vestments, etc. were not identified with any idolatrous cult in particular but they were common to almost all cults.” (Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. 3, Pg. 246).

During the “Reformation”

At the time of the “Reformation”, the leaders of this movement (in Western Europe) rejected the instrument for worship. Among those teaching against this, to name a few were **Calvin**, founder of the Presbyterian Church; **Wesley**, founder of the Methodist Church; **Luther**, founder of the Lutheran Church; **Spurgeon**, one of the greatest Baptist preachers that ever lived.

Wesley wrote, “I have no objection to instruments of music in our worship, provided they are neither seen nor heard.” (From Adam Clarke’s commentary, Vol. 4, pg 685).

Luther wrote, “The organ in the worship is the insignia of Baal...The Roman Catholic borrowed it from the Jews.” (Martin Luther, McClintock & Strong’s Encyclopedia, Vol. 6, Pg 762). (Aren’t we supposed to return everything that we borrow? JDL).

This is to name only a few, but there were literally multitudes of others of lesser stature among the “Reformers” who taught against this practice.

It has only been in relatively recent years that the use of mechanical instruments has become so widespread that many sincere persons are surprised to discover that there are religious people who do not use musical instruments in their worship. Today, however, the instrument has been accepted (with a few exceptions) throughout the denominational world and is not questioned.

Among the Churches of Christ

It was in 1860 that Lewis L Pinkerton of Midway, Kentucky first successfully introduced an instrument to accompany congregational singing. This instrument was not an organ or piano but a melodeon. It was resisted by other congregations throughout the brotherhood and was vigorously preached against by most of the preachers of the day, although some did accept it.

Following the Civil War, a majority of the churches of the North adopted the instrument while those of the South generally rejected it. **J W McGarvey**, one of the outstanding preachers of this time wrote, We cannot, therefore, by any possibility, know that a certain element of worship is acceptable to God in the Christian dispensation, when the Scriptures which speak of that dispensation are silent in reference to it. To introduce any such element is unscriptural and presumptuous. It is will worship, if any such thing as will worship can exist. On this ground we condemn the burning of incense, the lighting of candles, the wearing of priestly robes, and the reading of printed prayers. On the same grounds we condemn instrumental music.”(*The Millennial Harbinger*, 1864, 511).

Another who opposed the instrument was **David Lipscomb**. This fine old pioneer preacher fought this innovation throughout his life. Many more early preachers opposed the instrument, but I cite these to show the sentiment among those of the conservative churches of that time.

Unfortunately, the majority of the congregations accepted the instrument and, forcing the issue during the controversy that followed, caused a deep split among the churches. This continued until 1906, when the U S government in its religious census noticed what was obvious to everyone concerned: “the “Restoration” churches had become two separate churches, permanently separated. Those who accepted the instruments identified themselves as the “Christian Church” and those rejecting them identified themselves as the “Church of Christ”. I do not mean to say that the irreparable division was caused solely by the adoption of the instrument; there were other fundamental issues, but, for the present study, the instrument was a crucial one.

This is a brief recap of the historical; there is more, much more. However, the scriptural aspect is the most important so now we must look to this.

The scriptural record

The following list includes every reference to “music” as pertains to the New Testament church founded by the apostles. It is important to realize that this is the only record of what God requires of his people by way of musical worship.

- “*And when they had sung an hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives.*” (Matt. 26:30; Mark 14:26).
- “*And at midnight Paul and Silas prayed, and sang praises unto God.*” (Acts 16:25).
- “*For this cause I will confess to thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy name.*” (Rom. 15:9).
- “*I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also.*” (1 Cor. 14:15).
- “*Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord.*” (Eph. 5:19).
- “*Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord.*” (Col. 3:16).
- “*In the midst of the church I will sing praise unto thee.*” (Heb. 2:12).
- “*Is any among you afflicted? let him pray. Is any merry? let him sing psalms.*” (James 5:13).

Conclusions drawn from the scriptures

There is not a single reference in the inspired record of the New Testament church authorizing the use of instruments of music in worship. The utmost scrutiny of the entire New Testament cannot produce a single word in its favor.

The church of Christ is a New Testament institution. The New Testament reveals that which God requires, and will accept in His church. It has been shown that the New Testament is silent with reference to instrumental music. It is obvious that those who use musical instruments in worship do so without scriptural authority.

When Christ ascended to heaven at the end of His earthly advent, the Holy Spirit was sent to guide the apostles in all aspects of their worship. The Spirit guided them into singing and exhortation to sing, but never to

performing on instruments in worship. The apostles were faithful to this charge.

To evade the plain teaching of the New Testament, advocates of the instrument have adopted the tactic of what I refer to as the **fatal flaw** in order to justify this digression. This **flaw** comes from the idea that if the scriptures are silent on anything, we are at liberty to employ whatever we wish in God's service.

According to this system of reasoning, if the New Testament does not say, 'Thou shalt not use the instrument' and since there is no express condemnation of the practice, it is acceptable to God. This reasoning is false, derived as it is from the erroneous premise that the silence of the word of God is valid as a guide in the same manner as its expressed commands.

Types of commands

There are two types of commands in the Word of God; specific and generic. When God specifies an act of worship, He does not leave it up to us to decide. Consider the following:

Specific commands

- Bread and fruit of the vine were specified elements of the Lord's Supper. (Matt. 26: 26-30) The divine excluded everything else. Would anyone be foolish to argue that beefsteak or lamb-chops would be acceptable to God, based on the silence of the scriptures?
- A lamb was specified for Israelite families as the element in their Passover feast. (Exo. 6:14) Who would argue that a cow would be just as acceptable?
- God commanded Noah, "*Make thee an ark of gopher wood.*" (Gen. 6:14). Would God have been pleased if Noah had used cedar instead?

Generic commands

- God commanded, ...*Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.* (Mark 16: 15) He did not specify how to go, so any means is acceptable. But He specified what to preach (the gospel) and that excluded preaching anything other than the gospel.
- If the New Testament had simply said "Make music", we would be free to make any type we wished, either vocal or instrumental; perhaps both together. This would be an example of a generic

command. But the command is specific; sing. It is not up to us to decide the manner in which we obey.

Arguments pro-instrument

The word *psallo* occurs five times in the New Testament...(Rom. 15: 9, 1 Cor. 14:15 [twice], Eph. 5:19 and James 5:13). According to Strong, (ref. 5567) the meaning is “to twitch or twang i.e. to play on a stringed instrument (celebrate the divine worship with music and accompanying odes.)” This word authorizes the church to use instruments in worship. (From Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance)

Answer

This definition is only partial, and reflects the author’s bias. Notice Vine (Vine’s Expository of Biblical words), “...to twitch, twang, then to play a stringed instrument with the fingers, and hence in the Sept. (the Mosaic Law, JDL) singing with a harp, sing psalms...denotes in the N. T. to sing a hymn, singing praise.”

As it is with many words, present meanings are derived from archaic roots and present meanings are not the same as the original. This word has evolved and no longer carries its original meaning.

To illustrate; The word *psallo* is translated sing in 12 translations both standard and modern. Apparently, the translators believed the word means to sing or they would have specified to sing with an instrument.

In addition, the Greek Orthodox Church never has used instruments in worship. Surely, they should know the meaning of *psallo*, since it is a Greek word. This is a pretty good corroboration of the true definition of *psallo*.

Instruments were used in the temple worship by the priests and Levites. We can use this as an example for the use of instruments in worship in the church.

Answer

It is true that all sorts of instruments were used in the temple ceremonies under the Law of Moses. There was also the wearing of priestly robes, dancing to the instruments, animal sacrifices, etc. The question is not whether or not these things were part of the temple worship, but rather are they examples for us to follow during the Christian dispensation. The inspired writers of the New Covenant had something to say about this.

Under the Law, the Jews had ceremonial rituals, along with animal sacrifices in the tabernacle while on their wanderings in the wilderness.

This was under the First Covenant. (See Heb. 9:1.) Included in the tabernacle were the candlestick, table, shewbread. This was in the sanctuary which was separated from the Holy of Holies by a veil. The common priests performed the service of God daily in the sanctuary, but the Holy of Holies was entered once yearly by the high priest only. (Heb. 9:6-7).

The Hebrew writer indicates that while the first tabernacle (temple) was standing, it was merely a **figure** of the true way into the holiest of all. (vs. 8) Gift offerings and sacrifices were part of this service. (vs. 9).

David said to praise God in his sanctuary (tabernacle-temple) with the sound of the trumpet, psaltery and harp. Also, with the timbrel and dance, stringed instruments, loud cymbals and high sounding cymbals. (Psa. 150:1-6).

All this was done while the first tabernacle was standing. These things were not intended to take away sins, nor to make the worshippers perfect, as pertaining to the conscience. (Heb 9: 1-10) They served as shadows of things to come. (Heb. 8:5, Col. 2:17).

“For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect.” (Heb. 10:1). The key phrase here is “*not the very image of the things*”. The temple service merely foreshadowed a better and higher service to come. Surely, it must be seen that if we, as Christians, are to **copy** the actual service of the temple, we would have to include incense-burning, animal sacrifice, burnt offerings, dancing, as well as the priestly robes and the very priesthood itself would have to still be in place.

Is it acceptable to pick and choose from Jewish worship only what we wish to use, leaving the rest, or should we not content ourselves with that part which God wishes us to keep? Prayer was part of the temple-service, as well as incense-burning and animal sacrifice. Christians today rightly continue to pray as an act of Christian worship and reject incense-burning and animal sacrifice on the principle that today we live under the law of Christ wherein prayer is commanded and the others are not. Just so, with instrumental music in worship; the New Testament is silent. So, likewise, should we be silent.

We do not practice circumcision as a rite today, because we are to hear Christ, not Moses. (Matt. 17:5). Likewise, we do not use instruments of music in worship today because we are to hear Christ, not David.

Musical instruments were used in heaven; therefore it must be suitable for Christian worship. *“And 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 full of odors, which are the prayers of the saints". (Rev. 5:8).

Answer

First of all, Revelations is a highly symbolic book and not to be taken literally in all cases. To follow this reasoning, we would have to have beasts and golden vials full of odors (incense), as well as harps (not pianos or organs) in the church. Could anyone believe such?

Also, there will be neither marriage or giving in marriage in heaven. (Matt. 22:30). Shall we abolish it here? There will be no baptism or Lord's Supper in heaven, but Christ commanded both to be practiced in the church.

It is said that musical instruments are acceptable in the home, so why not in the church?

Answer

If one would stop for a moment to consider, he could name many things that are perfectly acceptable in the home but not suitable for Christian worship in the church. Washing hands as a hygienic act is fine in the home, but not in the church as an act of worship. (Mark 7:1-13). Eating meat and vegetables is acceptable in the home, but it would be a desecration to put it on the Lord's table. The home is governed by moral law. Anything that is morally right is all right in the home. But in the church we must employ only that which is authorized in the New Testament.

There is another practice relative to spiritual music in the church that I wish to deal with, although not strictly part of a study of instrumental music. That is the practice of forming choirs which are used for the singing service. This practice is wholly foreign to the New Testament. It antithetical to all the New Testament teaches concerning singing in the church.

We are instructed, "*Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord.*" (Eph. 5:19). For those who favor choirs for their services, we would ask, Can another serve God for you? Can another worship for you? Can another partake of the Lord's Supper for you? Why, then, would you wish to have another sing for you?

Let us strive to follow the Lord's instructions in all we do.

Yours in Christ,
John D Logan

