

Abilene Christian University

Digital Commons @ ACU

Stone-Campbell Books

Stone-Campbell Resources

1940

A Ten-Cent History of "Music in Worship"

Charles Buttz Titus

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books



Part of the [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), [Liturgy and Worship Commons](#), [Music Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Titus, Charles Buttz, "A Ten-Cent History of "Music in Worship"" (1940). *Stone-Campbell Books*. 215.
https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books/215

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Stone-Campbell Resources at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Stone-Campbell Books by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU.

A Ten-Cent History

OF

"Music In Worship"

FOURTH EDITION

By Charles Buttz Titus

Javars



Copyright 1940 by the Author

"My people are destroyed for lack of
knowledge"—Hos. 4:6

*A Ten-Cent History
of "Music in
Worship"*

A Ten-Cent History

OF

"Music In Worship"

Why "Music"? Because one of the essentials of "getting saved"? No, these are faith, repentance, confession and baptism. In "keeping saved"? No, for "beside this, add to your FAITH virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, charity; so shall there be an entrance into the everlasting kingdom." Then why urge "Music" at this time? Because it is being used to divide the descendants of the 1809 restoration movement—a movement to unite all Christ's followers even as He prayed (17th John). Did He not declare at His advent: "I will build My church?"—one church, Christ's. All other church names, then, have arisen from men, and therefore blotted out, (as at Corinth, e. g.) would extinguish the parties, and **allow** all Christians to come together in the only name under heaven given to save men.

Which to use, of the names that divided restorationists, was settled by tracing each back to its origin, where it was found that the "Disciple Church" name arose on the Western Reserve, at Wadsworth, Ohio, in 1828, the "Christian Church" name at Lebanon building, Scurry Co., Va., in 1794, and the church of Christ from the Bible record—see "A Most Remarkable Find," pp. 23-30.

In like manner, it is now proposed to trace "Music" back to its source:

I. IN THE WORSHIP OF THE JEWS.

In Genesis, we read that Jubal was "the father of all that use the harp and organ." Laban speaks of "songs with tabret and harp." When an evil spirit troubled Saul, David played upon the harp, and the evil spirit departed. King David organized the Levitical chorus and orchestra of 4,000 singers and 288 leaders, and these were also used at Solomon's temple dedication. Perhaps no more pathetic scene occurred in Israel's captivity than the hanging of their

harps on the willows by the waters of Babylon. Again, at the A. D. 70 temple destruction, their instrumental music ceased and their "wailing wall" lamentations began. They objected to any instrument that needed tuning on the Sabbath, (Ency. of Religion and Ethics, Vol. IX, p. 53), so 1800 years rolled by before they had a musical awakening. Somewhere in the 11th century, their orthodox leaders observed that the folk airs and spirited lovers' songs of other peoples were being applied to their holy psalms. They protested, but without lasting effect. In 1622, Solomon de Rossi, "the father of modern synagogue music," began the "regeneration of Zion's song."—*The Jew and Civilization* by Ada Sterling, p. 190.

From their beginning, the harp was connected with the religious life of God's "chosen people" and in the ending, all Christ's elect will have a grand accompaniment of multitudinous harps, praising Him forevermore.—*Musical Instruments* by Hopkins, p. 23. The author of "*The Jew and Civilization*," pp. 192-3, perorates thus: "How marvelously prejudice has been broken down! Music is now in every hospital and public place. Children are drilled to it at school, and entertained by it at home. You dine with it in public places and you pray with it in church. public places and you pray with it in church."

II. OF THE CHRISTIANS.

From time to time during the Christian era, this one incidental of incidentals in worship, "Music," has been used to divide God's people. E. g. when our own America was settled by the English, Dutch and others, the church buildings (as the dwelling houses) had scant equipment. Then came the improved furnishings—"innovations." The Old Order Mennonite Church opposed the introduction of the English language in the church services. The River Dunkers opposed baptisteries, and another denomination the individual communion cups. The Amish Church refused to fellowship those who wore buttons instead of hooks and eyes, and the 7th Day Adventists those who would not worship on Saturday. Certain ministers and churches of Christ refused to fellowship those who used organs and pianos in church singing. Divisions and sub-divisions resulted until the 1936 U. S. Religious Census listed 256 different "churches," each seemingly taking its worship customs more from "the traditions of its elders" than from the pattern given in the holy scriptures.

In the new dispensation, first came some Jewish converts to Antioch saying, "Except ye be circumcised, ye cannot be saved." It caused Paul and others at Jerusalem, guided by the Holy Spirit, to declare that "neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth anything, but a new creation in Christ Jesus." In other words, "circumcision" is as inconsequential in salvation as "singing" or "music," or the absence of either or both. Let us trace, then, the history of this "singing-music" non-essential through its successive caprices to the present time.

1. From the Apostles to Constantine.

Christianity itself was an abrupt change from the Mosaic worship. After the 2nd century, the church consisted essentially of Gentile Christians. These gradually eliminated Jewish elements from the hymns as well as songs from heathen sources. Justin Martyr warned that the Greek accompaniment had pagan associations. Of so little importance did he hold "singing" that he omitted it in listing the order of church services.—Christian Archaeology by Bennett, pp. 51, 304, 344, 481.

For protection from enemies, Christian gatherings took place at night in private houses—Ibid, p. 177. Pliny wrote to Trajan: "They are wont to meet before daylight."—Eusebius, Book IV, chap. 23. Diocletian issued an edict to raze all buildings and burn the sacred books.—Christian Archaeology, p. 181. The "New Archaeological Discoveries" by Cobern, pp. 219, 311, reveals that the newly discovered "Odes of Solomon" turns out to be a book of Christian songs, some phraseology of which is remarkably similar to that used by the fourth evangelist. "It may be that we have here hymns and spiritual songs" coming from the apostolic age, perhaps referred to by Paul in Eph. 5:19 and Col. 3:16.

2. Constantine to Luther.

From this time began the building of great cathedrals and their adornment under the emperor's special patronage. Hymns were more carefully written and adjusted to the improved music—Christian Archaeology, pp. 170, 321. Paid singers indulged in brilliancy to arouse admiration,—Music in the History of the Western Church by Dickinson, pp. 145-7. Under Justinian, 537 A. D., came "the splendor of the garments of the retinue of clergy and helpers, and the sonorous-voiced

priests as they intoned the sublime ritual, and the response from the hundred-voiced choir,"—Christian Archaeology, p. 258.

3. Luther to the Puritans.

(a) **In England.** Instrumental music was tabued. The Lutheran Church was without the organ till about 1650, and the Scottish Church down to 1864. The Geneva Church banned the organ for two centuries, and influenced England, under Queen Elizabeth 1558, against it. In 1571, the Puritans decreed: "We allow not the tossing of the Psalms from one side to the other with the intermingling of organs,"—Ency. of Religion and Ethics, vol IX, pp. 32-3. In their zeal to abolish "Popish practices" (under Parliament sanction 1644,) they demolished the organs, destroyed the music, drove the musicians out of the galleries at bayonet's point, and dissolved all organized choirs. This vandalism was most thoroughly carried out in the rural districts, whence the Puritan settlers of New England came,—A Hundred Years of Music in America by Matthews, p. 10.

(b) **In America.** The first New England church music consisted of the crude version of the Psalter made by Henry Ainsworth of Amsterdam. They regarded other music as a frivolous trap of the Evil One, to ensnare the souls of men. Improvement in the hymn book came slowly—the old was "holy" and "unchangeable." Appended music sheets in 1698 gave directions: "Observe the place of your first note, and how many notes above and below that, so it may be sung in the compass of your and the people's voices without squeaking above or grumbling below." They had no instruments to guide time or modulation, nor any notation to indicate pitch. In 1712, the pastor of Newbury, Mass., published the first instruction book: "A very easy way to attain the skill of singing with the greatest speed imaginable—price six pence," The affirmative discussed whether "the skillfulness in singing is an external part of divine worship." The negative said: "The practice is needless, since the good fathers that were strangers to it are got to heaven without it."—Ibid pp. 10-16.

And singularly enough, Bible history bears out both contentions. For do we read that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob ever sang a song, and yet if you and I, veteran singers to music's accompaniment, are accounted worthy by the Savior to obtain that world, we

will sit down with those patriarchs in the kingdom of heaven (Mt. 8:11). We read that David, who with harp in hand became the sweet psalmist of Israel, and who invented many musical instruments for the Jerusalem worship, was "a man after God's own heart"—(Acts 13:22.) While the musical talents of Barnabas and Mark are unmentioned, and those of Paul and Silas are extolled, yet all fell asleep alike in Jesus. From all of which it appears certain that man's eternal salvation does not depend upon his ability to sing or not to sing—on his musical talents or lack of them. Should we not, then, most fervently give thanks that the Judge of all the earth has put neither "circumcision" nor "singing" nor "music" in the terms of our acceptance with Him?

William Billings, among the first reformers, asked the congregation: "Is not our lining the hymn like saying to you: We are men of letters and you are ignorant creatures?"—The American History and Ency. of Music, vol. 8, p. 157. A certain deacon with failing eyesight apologized by observing: "My eyes indeed are very blind," and the choir thinking this the first line, immediately sang it, whereupon the deacon exclaimed, "I cannot see at all." This the choir also sang. Astonished, the deacon cried out: "I really believe you are bewitched," and the choir responded, "I really believe you are bewitched," whereupon the deacon added, "The mischief's in you all," and after the choir had sung that, the deacon sat down in disgust,—The Story of Religions in America by Sweet, p. 85.

Worcester (Mass.) history gives the final scene, 1799: The following Sabbath, venerable deacon Chamberlain rose as usual and read the first line. The singers with previous understanding proceeded to sing without pause. The white-haired deacon with full power of his voice read on till the louder notes of the singers overpowered him, when, deeply mortified, he seized his hat and left the meeting house.—The Amer. Hist. & Ency. of Music vol. 8, p. 153.

At the beginning of the 18th century, congregations were rarely able to sing more than three or four tunes, and no two individuals sang alike. One minister states: "I myself have twice in one note paused to take breath."—The Story of Religions in America by Sweet, p. 85. The tuning fork had been invented in 1711 by an English lutenist and sergeant to George I, John Shore, who used

it tuning his lute, not having a "pitch pipe," he said, "but this will do as well—a pitch fork!"—A Text Book of European Musical Instruments by Galpin, p. 48. The first heard relative to introducing an organ was at Trinity Church, New York City, in 1704. The committee said: "What we cannot afford ourselves, we shall leave it to God Almighty's good providence." (Organs were then imported.) It was 37 years later that Johann Klemm of Philadelphia constructed an organ for Trinity,—Amer. Hist. and Ency. of Music vol. 8, p. 154.

The organ, used chiefly to accompany the voice, began to call for trained players. It is to these early church organists the credit belongs for creating a taste for the beautiful in music,—Ibid, p. 257. A good voice is in part a natural gift, but it is much improved by study and practice. The listener must educate himself to appreciate the best music,—Book of Musical knowledge by Elson, pp. 312, 396.

4. Puritans to present time.

Soon American manufacturers took the lead in making reed organs so inexpensive that homes and churches could afford their purchase. The melodeon came about the year 1860. According to Woodford County (Ky.) historians, one was placed in the old Midway Christian Church by Dr. L. L. Pinkerton at a time when some questioned the use of musical instruments in worship. Dr. Pinkerton's act was denounced, but that antique melodeon occupies today a position of honor at the Midway Female Orphan School. The melodeon became popular because those who loved music could buy it. "They sang their hymns of praise to its accompaniment. It was their music at the marriage feast, and to its muffled tones they bore their loved dead over the threshold."—The Amer. Hist. and Ency. of Music, p. 264. And we opine that all the melodeons in Kentucky, or lack of them, would not keep out of heaven those saints whom the Savior accounted worthy to sing with harp in the heavenly home. For neither melodeon music nor the absence of it, availeth anything (according to scripture) in fixing man's eternal destiny.

It will be remembered that the first controversy regarding music in the churches was as to whether any singing whatsoever should be countenanced. In 1656, 21 members of the First Baptist Church of Newport, R. I. seceded and organized an anti-singing

church. They said they "disapproved of psalmody." For more than one hundred years no singing was permitted in the church. Then in 1765 by a small majority vote, permission was given to sing one psalm at the commencement of each service, and even then many of the members remained outside until the offensive exercise was ended. Many sincere Christians maintained that it was wrong to sing at all because a Christian should make melody ONLY in his heart.—Ibid, p. 141.

And this "opinion" may have been glossed from Acts 2:41 where the 3000 expressed their gladness "in the heart" and from Acts 8:39 where the Ethiopian rejoiced "in his heart," according to this "opinion." Singing comes among such "non-essentials" as circumcision (Gal. 6:15), i. e. neither singing nor no-singing, (music nor no-music, organ nor no-organ) availeth anything in "getting" and "keeping" saved. And "keeping saved" is "bearing the much fruit" (Jn. 15:8) of "love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance" (Gal. 5:22)—"singing" unmentioned. There is no word "singing" in the gospel sayings of Jesus, nor in John's record, nor in James', nor in Peter's nor in Matthew's, nor in Mark's, nor in Luke's. And why should Paul's two words ("singing") be plucked out of the 181,253 N. T. words to divide a people who avow they were "called" to get all Christ's followers UNITED? Should not the infinitesimal littleness of offering (out of 181,253 words) a non-essential to salvation, two-word excuse for causing division among ourselves, SHAME us into "quitting it," that our children hang not their heads in SHAME because we "coveted so earnestly" the divisive spirit?

The Virginia settlers were of royalist stock and brought some musical instruments with them. In the North, instrumental music was looked upon as an invention of the devil. The average Puritan reasoned that all melodies made by man were uninspired, and therefore God could not take pleasure in them. And he questioned whether uninspired tunes should be learned, and whether women should sing, or men alone. If a new tune was introduced in 50 years, it was a great event, for the whole church had to pass upon it. They reasoned: "If we once admit singing by time and note, the next thing we will be praying by rule and preaching by rote." It was the

coming of singing schools that gave church members an opportunity to learn to sing and that improved congregational singing. It took some time before either male or female singers could decide to make the attempt at solo singing, and when finally they did, they were often sneered at as being immodest.—Ibid, pp. 138-164.

The right of women to sing in church was slowly gained. The synagogue took over from the temple the silence of the women worshippers.—Ency. of Religion and Ethics, vol. IX, p. 51. By the time of Chrysostom "men, women, slaves and citizens all formed one melody together," but the synod at Antioch, 375, A. D., abolished the custom of women singing with men in the psalms.—Book of Musical Knowledge, p. 23. Women not being capable of holding office cannot be admitted to form a part of the choir—preferably employ boys—The Catholic Ency. vol. X, pp. 653-54. Until the Reformation, all singing was restricted to the male choir and the clergy—Ency. of Religion and Ethics, vol. IX, p. 26.

We ask: Is not woman's soul as precious in God's sight as man's? "The Spirit divideth to every one severally as he will," and if some women have not received the talent to sing, do they sin in not singing? When Christ says: To him that believes the gospel obediently unto death, I will give the crown of life, will He, in judging according to His gospel, refuse the crown to one who, from inability, has failed to sing at worship? Or will such a one be saved without singing? and if so, is not singing a non-essential to salvation? And is there not something pathetic in that minister's behavior who refuses to fellowship Christians who sing with harp-sounding accompaniment in earth's assembly, when all with the Head of the church in heaven will sing with harp the song of Moses and the Lamb?

Ability to lead congregational singing without an instrument shows much previous training. The "New Archaeological Discoveries," pp. 541, 660, tells that at the very beginning of the Christian era, the young were instructed systematically in the schools of Jerusalem, and this was extended to all parts of Palestine. Tarsus, where Paul was born, was the one example in history of a state ruled by a university, and, as Ramsay has pointed out, it was a providential place for an apostle to be born.

I asked the song leader of an organless

church of Christ how he could strike the right key, not having a tuning fork. He then related how he had been four years in the high school band, handling each instrument in turn, and after that he had spent several years at church choir rehearsals. He added: "I had the good fortune to marry into the church of Christ. My wife was the first one ever to call my attention to it in the New Testament. No one can lead vocal music successfully without previous instrumental training."

Thomas Synmes in 1723, in urging singing schools, asked: "Have we any more reason to expect to be inspired by the gift of singing than of reading?"—A Hundred Years of Music in America, p. 17. True indeed that singing is not acquired miraculously. He who would get it without the usual labor and instrumental help will end in the same plight as the erratic missionary who insisted he could get the Chinese language by praying for it. After three months thus spent in Shanghai, he went forth to preach to some riksha coolies on the street. No intelligible words coming to their ears, they laughed outright at his mouth's mimicry.

There is a God-given and time-honored way of mastering any calling. The Hebrews writer lovingly warns not to be carried away with any strange doctrines of men (13:9). My only sister, in obeying the gospel, fell among those who held, "Except you're against playing music in church, you cannot fellowship with us." On my return from 14 years in China, I visited in her Canadian home. There in the parlor stood the familiar piano which she delighted to play, and around which our dear father (now passed on) and three of his children used to gather and sing the four parts while sister guided by the piano.

"Sister," I said, "what would you do with this music box if say lightning suddenly destroyed the church building and you kindly invited the congregation to your house on the following Lord's Day?" She said she would just close it up and keep the devil quiet during the service.

"And after the congregation departed how would you get the devil out so you could play while you and I again sang that good old song, 'On Jordan's Stormy Banks I Stand' and 'sing the song of Moses and the Lamb'?"

"Say! what are you talking about? Don't

you, a missionary to the heathen, believe in the Bible?"

"Yes, I believe the Bible, the whole Bible, and every 'Thus saith the Lord' in the Bible. Now where is your 'Thus saith the Lord' for the devil being in the piano during the worship and getting out of it after the worship is over?"

After a hurried and vain search in her Bible, it dawned upon her for the first time that just men, humans, had fixed up this "no-organ" doctrine, and that neither instrumental music nor non-instrumental music availeth anything, according to the scriptures. "I don't ever expect to be perfect until I get to heaven," she said, "but from now on I am going to obey God rather than men. And I am glad you put me to searching the scriptures to see if what these men said were so; for I do love music, and always have, and now I can practice on my piano here what the Lord will have me do with a harp in heaven—to sing the song of Moses and of the Lamb." (Rev. 15:2-3.)

Verily, let no man think that his "much music," or his "much denying himself the joy of music," in worship is earning him merit in heaven. Salvation is the gift of God. (Eph. 2:8; Tit. 3:5). Has confession before men of the use or disuse, of instrumental music in worship any promise from Christ that He will confess such before His Father and the holy angels? Did Jesus say anything about going to prepare a place in the Father's house for those who were in favor of, or those who were opposed to, music in the church on earth? Over Bethlehem's hills a multitude of the heavenly host sang glorious praises when God's Son came. At His baptism, neither musical voice nor instrument sounded, and yet the Father was well pleased. In the prodigal parable, the father receives back the penitent son with music and merrymaking—a scene to illustrate the joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.

All of which teaches that music, vocal or instrumental, or the absence of either or both, is at times an accompaniment, and at times not, in our earthly pilgrimage. Why, then, allow it (or not IT) to divide those for whom Christ died? If we must break in on the supposed monotony of routine worship, why not tithe the weightier gold of rich stewards, and let the "mint, anise and cummin" of the poor go untithed? Would not raising money to preach the gospel in

all the world be a worthy activity of our high calling? Jesus' prayer that all His followers may be one in Him, clearly forewarns that internal division will keep the world from believing the Father sent Him. If division over playing on all the musical instruments in the world, or playing on none, in any degree is keeping the Savior's prayer from fulfillment, are not restorationists, who claim it a twin part of their mission to preach Christian UNITY, more guilty than others before high heaven?

Lastly, as a long overdue act, shall we not cease dividing over things that save NONE, and again unitedly preach Christ's gospel that will SAVE ALL—who believe and obey?

QUESTIONNAIRE

This "history" first sent out in manuscript form, has evoked some interesting responses:

One, seemingly alarmed, wrote: "Quite contrary to your contention is that of O. E. Payne on instrumental music," apparently sensing his "fighting-music" job gone, not unlike the general in a non-resistant town, who bewilderingly grumbled: "How can we fight with no one to fight us?"

Another, fearful, saw "singing" gone, too, (since no part of man's salvation), and dogmatically asserted: "GOD COMMANDED SINGING," without citing scripture, or noting that (if true) those unable to sing would be lost.

One bluntly declared: "The devil is not in the piano—the devil is in hell."

Another accused David of killing goats for worship, Uriah for his wife, and then sneered at such a man being "after God's own heart."

One wittily wrote: "Those who can sing and won't sing, should be sent to Sing-Sing."

An Ohio minister commented: "Instrumental music has no more to do with salvation and church fellowship than arithmetic has to do with theology."

Some simply requested answer to their questions, and, by "accepting the New Testament as their rule of faith and practice," simplified the N. T. answers.

1. Q. Is there singing recorded in the New Testament?

1. A. The two instances where the word "singing" is recorded are: "Let singing be

with grace in your hearts unto God" (Col. 3:16), and "singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord." (Eph. 5:19). In modern "gospel singing," the words and tune of "The Handwriting on the Wall" were composed by Knowles Shaw, a pioneer restoration preacher, singer and player, who also wrote "Bringing in the Sheaves." Jno. R. Sweeney composed the familiar tune, "My Savior First of All" and J. H. Fillmore, "Oh The Precious Love of Jesus." Jessie Brown Pounds wrote "The Way of The Cross Leads Home," and Charles Reign Scoville "Christ is King." George Bennard furnished both words and tune of "The Old Rugged Cross," said to be the most beloved song in the English speaking world.

2. Q. Does the New Testament command Christians to play instruments of music?

2. A. "Command Christians to play instruments of music" is not N. T. language, and the questioner thus betrays his possession of another gospel than Paul preached (Gal. 1:8).

3. Q. Is there a New Testament example of Christians playing instruments of music?

3. A. This "Christians playing instruments of music" is also from a source outside the N. T., and Paul warns: "As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preacheth unto you any gospel other than that ye received, let him be anathema" (Gal. 1:9).

4. Q. Is the use of instrumental music in the worship a good work?

4. A. The devout student of the N. T. will not find the saying: "The use of instrumental music in the worship." This shows the questioner again "going onward and abiding not in the doctrine of Christ" (2 John 9). In Ira D. Sankey's "My Life," p. 306, is told the wonderful origin of "There Were Ninety and Nine." In closing an Edinburgh meeting in 1874, evangelist Moody turned to singer Sankey and asked: "Have you a solo appropriate to this subject, 'The Good Shepherd?'" Sankey says: "Placing the newspaper-clipped poem on the organ before me, I lifted up my heart to God for help. Note by note the tune was given. I knew the song had reached the hearts of my Scotch audience. Mr. Moody leaving the pulpit and leaning over the organ, saw the little poem, and with tears in his eyes, said: "Sankey, I never heard the like of it in my life." Thus the tune of "Ninety and Nine" was born.

5. Q. Does the fact that David used instruments of music justify their use in the New Testament Church?

5. A. The N. T. makes such mention of David as "Jesse Begat David, the king" (Mt. 1:6), "Christ is the son of David" (Mk. 12:35), "David called him Lord" (Mt. 22:45) "Thou son of David, have mercy" (Mt. 9:27) and "the time would fail to tell of David" (Heb. 11:32), but the "used instruments of music" phrase is not in the N. T. Of how present-day hymns and tunes arise, it is related that on a sultry afternoon in July, 1864, Robert Lowry was sitting in Elliott Place, Brooklyn, when the words, "Shall we gather at the River" came into his mind. He hastily recorded them, and sat down before his parlor organ and composed the tune which is now sung in all parts of the world. On the other hand, the tune of "Savior, More Than Life to Me" preceded the words. In 1875, W. H. Doane sent the tune to Fanny Crosby and requested her to write a hymn entitled, "Every Day and Hour." Her response in the form of this hymn gave the blind hymn-writer great comfort and joy. Millions since have been refreshed and strengthened as they have sung it.

6. Q. Did Christ command His apostles to teach the use of instrumental music?

6. A. This continual reiteration of language foreign to the N. T. reminds of Jesus' upbraiding words: "Use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do, for they think they shall be heard for their much speaking (Mt. 6:7). In 1872, in England, Frances Havergal was unable to go to church one snowy morning. The minister, returning, heard her touch upon the piano. "Why, Frances, I thought you were upstairs," "Yes," she replied, "but I was there reading in the Psalms, 'Tell it out among the nations that the Lord is King.' What a splendid first line, I thought, and the words and music came rushing to me. There! It is all written out." Of "Sweet Hour of Prayer," set to music by Wm. B. Bradbury, Sankey says: "I attended a musical convention by Mr. Bradbury in Ohio, and there received my first impressions as to the power of sacred song."

7. Q. Has not an "apt-to-teach" elder the scripture for saying: "God has ordained singing in church worship?"

7. A. I find in I Cor. 9:14, "the Lord ORDAINED that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel," but nowhere

in the N. T. do I find the words, "GOD HAS ORDAINED SINGING," or "ORDAINED SINGING" or "SINGING IN CHURCH WORSHIP." Further, I do not find "singing" mentioned in what the 3,000 at Pentecost continued to do "in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers" (Acts 2:42), nor in the "whole year Barnabas and Saul assembled themselves with the church at Antioch." (Acts 11:26), nor "when the disciples came together on the first day of the week to break bread" (Acts 20:7). During the World War, Great Britain had 100,000 Chinese digging trenches. From a distant camp, I received a letter (with photo) saying: "You baptized me in Luchowfu, China." I recalled how hard those first converts tried to sing with us, but, as Sister Sue in Carleton's "The New Organ in Church," "when we were low, then they were high, and also contrawise."—they just couldn't get over their school word-shouting habit. But you and I know, if they never sing a song correctly in this life, when accounted worthy by Christ to obtain that world, they will sing in perfect harmony with the heavenly harpers.

8. Q. Why don't you give DUE HEED to the inspired words ("SINGING") in Eph. 5:19 and Col. 3:16?

8. A. Thus three men wrote: the 1st citing I. Cor. 14:26, "Every one hath a PSALM;" the 2nd, "Eph. 5:19 is an outright command to sing PSALMS," the 3rd, "In Col. 3:16 the Spirit directly commands TEACHING AND ADMONISHING one another with PSALMS." We ask, what was GOD'S TEACHING in these (OT) PSALMS that prophets wrote "by the Spirit of Christ" (I Pet. 1:11)? 73 of the 150 are ascribed to David, who singing them with harp, became the "sweet psalmist of Israel," and one of every remaining five is praising the Lord with harp, timbrel, psalter, trumpet, cornet, cymbal, or a combination. Thus the early Christians were TEACHING AND ADMONISHING with these PSALMS. And Jesus said the same "testify of Me"—75 times in the N. T. Cf. Ps. 68: "thou hast ascended on high . . . with captives . . . gifts" . . . "They have seen thy goings, O God . . . the singers went before, and the minstrels followed after." Doubtless the UPPER ROOM hymn was a PSALM! And "having harps of God" in heaven, "they sing the song of the Lamb"! (Rev. 15:2-3).

9. Q. Why do you persist with your

"scripture proofs," when we already know we will believe none of them?

9. A. You remember Jesus showed by parable that some "would not believe though one rose from the dead." His gospel command, "he that believeth," implied that some would not, therefore His "Go, preach" that "others" may. A Penn. toper had alcoholism steamed out of him. He drank again, and said: "I don't want to be persuaded." But some "others" will. That's why Paul preached to all. That's why this author "persists" in urging the Christian unity of ALL. Jas. 4:17.

10. Q. Is not the way of worship important when Jesus commanded to "worship in spirit and truth"? We may do at home many things not permissible in church worship.

10. A. Jesus declared: "The hour cometh when neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father." Erring mortals are prone to use their physical senses for assurance they have worshiped. E. g., the Adventist is SURE he has worshiped when he has done so on Saturday, and likewise may not the organless worshiper feel CERTAIN he was WORSHIP-ED CORRECTLY when he sees neither the form, nor hears the sound, of an organ at his place of worship? But is worshipping our Heavenly Father limited to the 3 or 4 hours at a non-musical place on Sunday? Does that prove the worshiper's honesty during his six days of secular transactions? In a certain town was a fine church with parsonage attached. The minister's daughter wanted a wedding march at her marriage, so the door was opened between church and parsonage. While the outlawed piano was in the home, the coveted music was in the church, and the "law of the Medes and Elders" was unbroken. There is no N. T. record of an inspired writer ever exhorting saints anywhere to worship at ONLY places destitute of musical instruments, and much profane history passed before some uninspired person did so. Paraphrasing: The new dispensation has come, when neither in this organless way, only, nor yet in this "elder-prescribed" way, only, shall ye worship, for true worshipers now worship the Father e. g. in the homes of the Marys and Marthas, Jesus Himself being guest—anywhere, everywhere, a believing soul implores the Heavenly Father. James wrote: "Is any merry? let him sing PSALMS . . . and ("not singing but") the

PRAYER OF FAITH shall save the sick." Apropos of "singing," God's Word commands to BELIEVE, REPENT, CONFESS, BE BAPTIZED, and live the Christ-like life FOR SALVATION. Are not you and I, brother, sister, willing that ALL Christians work together (17th John) as did Paul and Peter after Antioch? Christ in His great LOVE prays for the ONENESS of His "brethren." For "he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?"

11. Q. Did I do right in getting out of a denominational church?

11. A. You were indeed fortunate, and you have my deepest sympathy for getting into a local church of Christ that still retains a "no-music" test of fellowship. Albeit, you can now find a church of Christ without this "outside-scripture" test: for, as the Lord assured Elijah, there are left "seven thousand" that have not bowed to this non-musical Baal. W. H. Doane once said to Fanny Crosby, "Fanny, I have written a tune and I want you to write words for it." "Let me hear how the tune goes," she replied. After Mr. Doane had played it over for her on a small organ, she exclaimed: "Why that tune says, 'Safe in the Arms of Jesus.'" She retired to an adjoining room, and when after half an hour she returned she quoted to Mr. Doane the words of this now enduring hymn.

12. Q. What would you say if I declared: "I refuse to fellowship those who use instruments of music in worshipping God?"

12. A. I would say: Here is an incipient religious monarch: "I," "I REFUSE," and with those for whom you spcke, "WE," "WE REFUSE," is the very way the Roman Pontiff started: "I, VICEGERENT OF CHRIST, WE, THE MOTHER CHURCH, and ONLY THOSE WHO COME IN WITH US CAN BE SAVED." I would pray God to forgive those who refuse to fellowship Christians on earth, whom the Savior promises to fellowship in heaven forevermore. The author of "When the Roll Is Called Up Yonder," J. M. Black, says: "One day I met a poorly clad girl of 14, the child of a drunkard. I invited her to my Bible class, and she also joined the young people's society. One evening at consecration roll call, she failed to respond with a verse of scripture. I remarked that when my name was called from the Lamb's book of life **up yonder**, I wanted to be ready to

respond. On reaching home deeply troubled, the words of the first stanza came to me in full. In 15 minutes more, I had composed the other two verses. Going to the piano, I played the music just as it is found today, note for note, and I have never dared to change a single word or a note."

13. Q. Why do you put so much emphasis on Christian Unity?

13. A. It is the twin part of the work God's Son came to earth to do, viz: (1) to **SAVE THE LOST** (Luke 19:10), and (2) to **MAKE THEM PERFECT IN ONE** (John 17:23). The **LAST** is necessary that "the world may believe," the **FIRST**. Returning from world-wide mission work, I found the restoration people thrice divided by "church" names (see p. 2). From Christ's own words: "**I WILL BUILD MY CHURCH.**" I asked myself, Whose church does Christ say He will build? The answer came: "My church," His church. Christ's church. And I certainly want no other than the only name under heaven given to save men: do you, brother? Next I found the "same people" doubly divided over "music." Again, I started for the "source." Incidentally came the surprising (to me) discovery that neither "music" nor "singing" is in Christ's terms of **SALVATION**. Since Christ came to **SAVE**, why preach things outside **SALVATION**? Rather let us unashamed (Rom. 1:16) preach God's power to **SAVE ALL**—harpers, or non-harpers, singers able or unable—whom Christ will call to His marriage supper. And when a "good soldier of Jesus Christ" lays his armor by, may it be said, He hath done what he could to **UNITE** all God's people, even as his Savior prayed. May it not be that the heavenly Father (as in the days when His "chosen" wanted a king) is letting His children try out their "**CHRISTIAN Church**," their "**DISCIPLES Church**," and their "**No-MUSICAL-INSTRUMENT Church**"—doubtless to their sorrow, and Babylon-like return? "For whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning and **admonition.**" While some here below hear worshipful praise self-denied to voice only, **ALL** in **FREE Canaan** above will hear "the song of the Lamb" amplified by "God's harpers harping with their harps" praises that will never end.—Rev. 14:2.

14. Q. Do improvements men now make in buildings and furnishings indicate that they can thus improve the church of Christ?

14. A. The N. T. says Christ will build His church of "living stones" (1 Pet. 2:5) "fitly framed together unto an holy temple in the Lord" (Eph. 2:21). The inspired evangelists were ever turning men's minds from the temporal "furnishings" that save NONE to the "everlasting gospel" that will SAVE ALL. Certainly a lesson for our 20th century, when so many strange, non-scriptural "church" names are "held-so-dear," and little proprietary, non-saving worship regulations so earnestly contended for. Do we not know that these, like the foolish man's barns (Luke 12:18) will be left on earth, and only Christ's bride (church) appear in heaven? Rather ought we not so to live that when the Master calls, it may be said: "Behold—how pleasantly these brethren dwell together in UNITY!" The author of "Sweet By and By," S. Fillmore Bennett, says: "In 1861, I was residing in the home village of the composer, Joseph P. Webster, Elkhorn, Wis. Like many musicians, he was very nervous and sensitive. One day, on his entering, I said: "Webster, what's the matter now?" "It's no matter," he replied, "it will all be right by and by." The idea of the hymn came to me like a flash of sunlight, "The Sweet By and By." Turning to my desk, I penned the three verses and the chorus as fast as I could write. I handed the hymn to Mr. Webster. As he read, his eyes kindled, and he began writing the notes. Presently, he took the violin, and played the melody. In a few minutes more, he had the notes for the four parts jotted down. I think it was not over 30 minutes all told before four of us there were singing the hymn in the same form it is sung today."

15. Q. How much time did I spend in **verifying** your "History of Music in Worship?" My dear friend, not any. I do not need to go to a college library: I have a library of 66 books, called the holy Bible. I challenge you to debate the proposition, "mechanical instruments in worship." I will prove that those who play organs in worship are going to a place not called heaven—are lost.

15. A. I rejoice that you prize so highly your library of 66 books, the Bible. And I most deeply sympathize when, like the Galatians (1:6), you so soon turn to something OUTSIDE. The word "mechanical" appears nowhere INSIDE the scriptures. Really, would you not have to get OUT-

SIDE knowledge to speak intelligently on your "mechanical proposition"? Perhaps you are idealizing the son (Mt. 21:29) who said he would not go, and afterward went. At first, you would not, but now offer to take your "mechanical" campaign even into "a far country." This recalls Lincoln's story of the small boy whose apple rolled off an Ohio steamboat, and the mother cried, "Captain, stop the boat." On the great gospel ship of salvation, you would implore the Captain to stop for a "mechanical" something floating OUTSIDE. And you go still farther OUTSIDE the Bible—to JUDGE a man "lost" who plays music in worship. Have you not read INSIDE the book John (5:22) "The Father hath committed ALL JUDGMENT unto the Son, the Father judging no man?" Are you presuming to do the judging the Father has committed wholly unto His Son (Ps. 19:13)? If so, again pause to read INSIDE God's inspired book, Matthew 7:2, "With what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged." Verily, brother, ought not you and I stop trying to usurp the Son's work, and get to doing that He assigns us, viz: PREACH THE GOSPEL so "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"?

16. Q. Does the New Testament command Christians to sing?

16. A. The N. T. quotes from Ps. 18:49 the word "sing" in Rom. 15:9 "I will confess to thee among the Gentiles and sing unto thy name," and from Ps. 22:22 in Heb. 2:12: "In the midst of the congregation will I sing thy praise." In 1 Cor. 14:15, Paul writes: "I will sing with the spirit and understanding also" and James (5:13) "Is any cheerful? let him sing praise" (Also see 1A and 7A.) Thus there appears in the N. T. no COMMAND to sing to be saved, as there is to "BELIEVE" (Acts 16:31), "REPENT" (Acts 2:38), "BE BAPTIZED" (Acts 10:48) in getting SAVED (no "singing" mentioned): and in keeping SAVED, "add to your FAITH virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, charity" ("singing" unmentioned). "FOR IF YE DO THESE THINGS, YE SHALL NEVER FALL, for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you ABUNDANTLY into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ" (2 Pet. 1:5-11). That will be an ALL-SUFFICIENT entrance for me: Will it not for you, brother?

17. Q. Do you affirm that a man can-

not learn to sing and sing well without a musical instrument?

17. A. You have related to me your own start from written music, coached by your older brother who imparted "inflection, pitch, modulation," acquired songs at high school and college, took voice lessons three years at Louisville, was under the head of Voice Department of the New England Conservatory of Music, who taught you more by indicating with his voice than by instrument, and practiced twice a week in Harvard Glee Club. You played no instrument: You composed no hymn. You received your "singing" from others, as the moon its light from the sun. (In other words, man first fashions an instrument to perfect the diatonic scale and then in turn, trains his vocal chords to imitate that perfection.) And we seem to be fellow pilgrims. I, too, am only an "ordinary" in singing. My folks early put me in singing school, but never told me till afterward that I at first made the same distinction in singing do, re, mi, fa, sol, la, si, do, as in reading them. They said I improved by "hard work and awkwardness." You and I are aging. We've no time now for giving "aid and comfort" to the "gospel of men" while souls are perishing for the gospel of Christ. The apostle Peter gives us wise counsel: "Be not ashamed to suffer as a Christian, but (be ashamed) as a busybody in other men's matters." This "singing-music—busybodying" appears nowhere in all the teachings of Jesus recorded by the four evangelists, but ever His GOSPEL is to BELIEVE in Him and BE SAVED. "Saved?" Yes, that's our heart's desire, and not for ourselves only, but "for all those who love His appearing." Won't it be glorious, brother, after the end here, to hear the "well done" over there, and with harp join in singing the Lamb's praises forevermore?

This Booklet is the latest historical survey of "SINGING-MUSIC" in "getting saved" and "keeping saved." 10c. 10 copies, 50c.

A TEN-CENT HISTORY OF "CHRISTIAN CHURCH," a wonderful voyage to find the first "Christian Church," in history, 10c.

CHRIST'S ONE CHURCH FOREVER, "name, doctrine and life" interwoven in 108-page African mission story, 50c.

WHO GOVERNS THE CHURCH? A 25-week N. T. course, 25c.

Address the Author:

CHARLES BUTTZ TITUS
Cherokee, Oklahoma

A Most Remarkable Find

I have made a most remarkable find—the “Christian Church” origin.

Why, that has been known ever since Saul and Barnabas were at Antioch. Doesn't Acts 11:26 say “the disciples were called Christians first” there?

My friend, believe me, Paul never wrote the word “Christian,” so far as the New Testament shows.

Why, haven't you read, “Almost thou persuadedst me to be a Christian”?

Yes, but King Agrippa said that, and Luke wrote it. Paul never put the word “Christian” in any of his (extant) writings.

Well, then, who wrote, “Be not ashamed to suffer as a Christian”?

That is in Peter's first epistle, 4:16. Further, I have never read where Paul used the “Christian Church” name.

Well now, it's easy to see you haven't read all the New Testaments. Doesn't Paul say in Gal. 1:22 that he “was unknown by face unto the Christian churches of Judea”?

In what New Testaments did you read that?

In Moffatt's, Goodspeed's, Weymouth's, and in the Twentieth Century.

That reminds me I have recent letters from some of these authors. James Moffatt wrote me Oct. 8, 1938: “About Gal. 1:22, ‘Christian’ is an idiomatic rendering of ‘tais en Christo’ after ‘ekklesiais,’ (churches in Christ, not in Christian—Ed). And Edgar J. Goodspeed wrote in the same month, same year: “The question is not whether you can find the phrase, ‘Christian Church,’ in ancient Greek documents, but how you would express in present day English what Paul meant by his Greek phrase in Gal. 1:22. Most modern translators, myself included, think he meant what we mean by Christian churches. I don't think ‘Christian Church,’ in Greek or Latin, is found before Irenaeus A.D. 185.” (Perhaps this author overlooked what Paul himself said he meant in 1 Thess. 2:14, viz: “ton ekklesion tou Theou ton ouson en ta Ioudaia en Christo Iasou,” (the churches of

God which in Judea are in Christ Jesus—Ed).

You certainly are arousing my curiosity. And how did you proceed to find the origin?

To get help from any possible source, including archaeology, I offered an award of \$50 for a fac simile of "Christian Church" on any parchment, vellum, palimpsest, papyrus, clay tablet, artifact, ostrakon or stele of NT times: and the President of Research Science Bureau Inc. at first wrote he remembered seeing the name "Christian Church" on an ostrakon in London, and later graciously sent these words: "At last, I have received word from my London colleague concerning the ostrakon—it was a memorial plaque. The translation in English of the Koine inscription was: 'Rejoice! Omnophros, a Christian, has departed to be with Christ. The church rejoices at the translation.' I find I was mistaken in the exact rendition of the word."

What did you do then?

I then extended my offer to cover the first four centuries AD because the post-apostolic "fathers"—Polycarp, Clement, Ignatius, Barnabas, Hermas, Justin, Origen, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Dionysius,—did not mention this "Christian Church" name,—The Ante-Nicene Fathers, 14 vols.

I think I have seen it in a published letter of Clement of Rome.

No, that citation was given by one of the contestants for the award, but proved to be a mistranslation of the original Greek, "ekklesia tou Christou" (church of Christ). Eusebius, "the father of church history," mentions no "Christian Church," nor do Socrates, Sozomenus, Augustine, Chrysostom, Jerome, Rufinus, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril, Basil, Hilary, Damascene, Ambrose, Leo I, or Gregory I—The Post-Nicene Fathers, 1st and 2nd Series.

How can you be so sure? Can you read the Greek that these authors wrote?

It is quite true that I cannot read their Greek, but I now find these works in English translation. From a perusal of all of them, it appears conclusive that the "Christian Church" name never entered their minds. The first earmark of a denomination is that its name displaces Christ's; e. g., "Disciples Church" confesses themselves, "Disciples," before men, and Christ says:

"Who confesses ME, I will confess; who denies ME, I will deny," (Matt. 10:32-33). In poring over the works of medieval authors, I noticed the tendency of translators to let words of their own time slip into their renditions unawares. A very interesting case is that of Sir Henry Yule's best English edition of the "Travels of Marco Polo" (1275-1292). In Book II, he makes the famous traveler say: "During the three years that Mar Sarghis, a Nestorian Christian, abode at Chinchienfu (China), he caused two Christian Churches to be built." M. G. Pauthier's 1865 edition from the purest French MSS reads: "Et si y a deux eglises de cristiens nestorins" (two churches of Nestorian Christians).

Could not a long-established information bureau tell you the origin of the "Christian Church" term?

No, one of the leading information bureaux at the National Capital replied that their force had examined all the extant reference books, and found no indication that any research had yet been made of this particular word-combination: that separately the words were easily traced—"Christian" to Acts 11:26, and "church" to the Greek "kuriakon," the Lord's house or assembly. The Library of Congress consultant on Church History wrote: "As the phrase does not occur in the Bible, and as we can find no allusion to any entrance into the field of creedal translation by those rendering the King James or revised versions, I have been hampered in applying the customary methods of research."

Why, when you speak of the English Bible translation, that brings us up to the year 1382, the date of Wycliffe's first version. You don't mean to tell me that the "Christian Church" expression was not used until 1300 and more years after the apostles wrote! I was under the impression that "Christian Church" had always existed.

To quiet your alarm, let me relate an incident but a year old. A prominent American minister touring the Holy Land, reported being shown the "Christian Church of St. John the Baptist" at Damascus—the name from literature bought there. It turned out to be an instance of a tourist slipping in a familiar word from "force of habit." Josias Porter's "Five Years in Damascus," 1895, Vol. 1, p. 71, says: "The Great Mosque of Omeiyades stands where once a

heathen temple was converted into a church by Christians. Later M. Anton Bulad read the Greek inscription on a stone at Bab Jeirun: "This church of the Blessed John the Baptist was restored by Arcadius (395-408), son of King Theodosius."

Doesn't this searching among musty, antiquarian tomes get very dull and boresome to you?

On the contrary, it becomes a most intensely fascinating work—that of detecting a translator unconsciously using words of his own time. E. g., I recall two such insertions in one English rendition of a Latin work. John Henry Bridges in an 1897 translation makes Roger Bacon in "Opus Majus" (1207) say: "At one time in Armenia (where Noah's ark rested) there were eight hundred Christian Churches," while the Latin original simply said, "octingentae ecclesiae" (eight hundred churches), and in Vol. II, p. clxx, he says: "The Sacrament . . . accepted by the whole Christian Church," while the original is "sectae Christianae" (Christian sects).

You are surprising me: did you find any more?

Yes, this ferret-like work uncovered two other notable cases, viz: (1) Thomas Forster in 1854 translated the "Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy" (1120) Vol. III, p. 521, with "Melaz admitted into the Christian Church," from an original "Melaz in ecclesia catholica" (church universal), and (2) Murray's New English Dictionary, under "church," gives "cristen kirc, C. Mundi, 19498," while in Trinity College library it is "cristis chirche" (Christ's church).

Do you mean to tell me you kept on reading ALL—every line—of medieval literature?

Not all, for the Superintendent of Reading Room, Library of Congress, wrote: "Without prolonged investigation, it is impossible to give an accurate statement as to the availability of translations into English of works between the Nicene Fathers and Luther's Reformation." I then extended the time of the \$50 award to cover the occurrence of the "Christian Church" term in any language before A.D. 1485.

How did you come to fix on that date?

It was quite incidental. A friend handed me Martin Luther's 1529 catechism, wherein the changed Apostles' Creed read in German, "I believe the holy Christian Church."

And as Prof. F. Bente, in *Concordia Triglotta* introduction, had said: "This form was used before Luther's time," I made inquiry of Lutheran colleges, and the President of Wartburg Seminary kindly gave me two earlier instances, viz:

(1) Surgant's *Manuale Curatorum* (Handbook for Priests), 1502, edition of 1506, leaf 50, "die heilige christenliche kirche," and

(2) "Erklerung der Zwolff Artickel Christenlichen Glauben" (Explanation of the Twelve Articles of Christian Faith), leaf 90, press of Conrad Dinckmut, Ulm, 1485: "The Holy Ghost makes holy the whole Christian Church" (*Die heiligen Kristenlichen kirchen*). This 1485 date continued until David S. Schaff's translation, 1915, of "The Church (*De Ecclesia*) by John Huss" (1412) from the Frankfort edition (1715), based on the earliest collected work "Historia et Monumenta Joh. Hier. Pragensis, 1558, Cap. II, p. 198: "quae quadam proprietate dicitur ecclesia Christiana" (which by a certain fitness is called the Christian Church).

Was there anything remarkable about that?

Yes, in that (1) John Huss was excommunicated (and finally burned at the stake) for championing the teachings of John Wycliffe and Wycliffe mentions "the chirche of Crisen men" (*Select English Works*, edited from MSS by Thomas Arnold, Vol. 3, p. 15) and not "the Christian Church," and that (2) Huss wrote Wycliffe in 1410: "The church of Christ in Bohemia greets the church of Christ in England" (*Letters of John Huss* translated by Herbert B. Workman and R. Martin Pope, p. 38).

What would this show?

It would show the "Christian Church" name coming out of the crucible of the papal inquisition when the cruelly persecuted could no longer call the church of Christ by the "Roman CATHOLIC" name. Those nearing martyrdom craved to speak some church name other than that of the inhuman hierarchy at Rome—yet still one of "universal" (catholic) meaning. Martin Luther said as much when putting "Christian Church" in the Apostles' Creed, viz: "It is equivalent in substance, for the children pray thus: 'I believe the holy (catholic or) Christian Church.'" Thus from these two groups have descended two non-scriptural church names—"Roman Catholic Church" and "Christian Church," forerunners of the

present profane multitude of church appellations. To get the papal side, I wrote The Catholic University of America, and they endorsed Dr. Carlton J. H. Hayes as the "Best Catholic Historian," who replied (1935): "From the 2nd century right down to the present time, the official name has been The Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. So far as I know, the phrase, 'Christian Church,' was not employed . . . it was always taken for granted."

Do you now say the "Christian Church" expression was first used in A.D. 1412?

So History thus far examined (\$50 awaits an earlier date)—And that name continued for two-and-a-half centuries to be used as a synonym for Christendom, which word Martin Luther favored, viz: "Best of all, it ought to be called holy Christendom"—The Large Catechism, Art. 3. Then in 1794 came the first LOCAL "Christian Church," at Lebanon building, Surry Co., Va.

How did it occur there?

After James O'Kelly and congregation had withdrawn from the Methodist Episcopal Conference in 1792, they took the name, "Republican Methodist Church." Two years later, a member asked, "If we take the Bible only as our rule of faith and practice, what are we?" "Simply Christians" was the answer. "Then," said he, "let us call ourselves a Christian Church."

Did they take the name from the Bible?

No, they reasoned it out for themselves. Around them were "churches" of many kinds, and they were trying to name the kind they wanted. Barton W. Stone and congregation at Cane Ridge, Ky., adopted this "Christian Church" name in 1804, after renouncing all connection with their Springfield Presbytery. And they still retained this church name after the union meeting with the "Disciples of Christ" messengers at Lexington, Ky., in 1832. The "Christian Churches" that followed this one at Cane Ridge, merged with the Congregational Church at a union convention at Seattle, Wash., June 26, 1931.

Was that in the transition period when denominationalists twitted "Christians only"—"Oh, you're Christ-yans, are you?"

True, and the "Christians only" made reply, "Yes, and we hope you are, too." That was when restorationists refused the church-name of religious reformers, and determined to use only the Bible name for the church. In response to a recent ques-

tionaire, the NT Greek department heads of our leading Bible colleges and universities say there is no adjective form for "Christian" in the NT. Albeit so long had the "Christian Church" name been in vogue then that its unscripturalness went unquestioned by denominational and undenominational people alike. It was not uncommon then to hear a "soap-box" wit remark "Sure, Christian Church is church of Christ just like hay stack is stack of hay." Later, some "children of light" mustered courage enough to reply: "Yes, hay is hay and stack is stack, and church is church, but Christian is not CHRIST—never was, is not now, nor ever shall be." Grammatical construction was rather loosely observed in those days. Today common school pupils are taught the rule of syntax that the predicate nominative and subject name the same person or thing: so that in the sentence, "Christian Church is the church of Christ," they would take notice that "Christ" in the predicate and "Christian" in the subject refer to two different beings: but that in "Christ's church is the church of Christ," "of Christ" in the predicate is equivalent to the possessive modifier "Christ's" in the subject. Briefly analyzed, "the Christian church" is: "the Christian," the human, "church," body—the human church body, without the head of the church CHRIST.

Were not the denominational divisions at that time becoming so numerous, it was increasingly difficult to find a Bible-like name for any "new" organization?

Yes, and that was the reason the great leader, Alexander Campbell, gave for preferring "disciple" to "Christian," because more often used in the NT, and not yet appropriated by any other group.

What has been gained by this research?

KNOWLEDGE to go into books of reference for future students (incidentally turning history's searchlight on Restoration's HUGE HUMAN-CHURCH-NAME BLUNDER—"CHRISTIAN" church).

Does there remain a possible palpable excuse for the "Christian Church" name displacing Christ's?

No, for Christ purchased the church with His own blood, and declared (Mt. 16:18) its NAME and OWNERSHIP His, Christ's, (not Christian's) forever.

Do you mean there is a proper term for the improper "Christian Church" locution?

Yes, "CHRISTENDOM" would eliminate

the word "church," which, with the human name "Christian" attached, dishonors God's Son (John 5:23), and "History of CHRISTIANITY" instead of "History of the Christian Church" would automatically stop the current fiction of "many churches" when there is but ONE, Christ-purchased, in all the universe of God. "For" (paraphrasing Mt. 5:19) "whosoever shall say there is another church than Christ's, and shall teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven, but whosoever shall say and teach that the church is Christ's, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."

Well now, tell me frankly, of the many-named "churches" in the world, which name do you want?

None other than the only name under heaven given to save men, Acts 4:12.

And pray which church?

None other than the church Christ says He is building. Mt. 16:18.

Why?

Because it is the only church (bride) He will have at "the marriage supper of the Lamb" (Rev. 19:9) and for evermore.