

NAME _____
DATE _____

Who are they?

Most (not all) congregations of the Church of Christ denomination claim that they can trace their roots back to the original New Testament church, almost in the same way that the Catholic Church claims that they can trace the papacy back to the Apostle Peter. Both claims are equally false. The difference is that the Church of Christ doesn't claim an actual physical lineage but claim that they are an exact duplicate of the original church.

The reality is that in 1906 the Church of Christ denomination broke away from the Christian Church, which was established in the mid-1800s by Alexander Campbell during the so-called Restoration Movement.

They claim that they are not a denomination, but rather they are the TRUE Body of Christ! To justify this they believe that they have the only biblically correct name of any church. They look down on other denominations for naming themselves after a man (Lutherans) or a doctrine (Baptists) or forms of church government (Presbyterian) and claim that the only scriptural name given to the church is the name that they bear.

Since the word Christ simply means "messiah", that translates into The Church of the Messiah. A better name would be The Church of Jesus Christ, which would also be a scriptural name.

As would: *"The Church of God"* (I Cor. 1:2) *"The Church of the Faithful in Christ Jesus"* (Eph. 1:1) *"The Church of the Saints in Christ Jesus"* (Phil. 1:1) *"The Church of the Holy and Faithful Brothers in Christ"* (Col. 1:2) *"The Church In God Our Father and the Lord Jesus"* (II Thess. 1:1) *"The Church of God's Elect"* (I Peter 1:1) *"The Children of God"* (I John 3:1) Etc...Etc...Etc...

So we see that the Church of Christ denomination does not have a corner on scriptural names for the body of Christ, which brings up our next dilemma, which division of the Church of Christ denomination are we talking about?

For there are at least three different branches of the Church of Christ denomination that have the exact same name, but believe different doctrines, and often each considers the other to be virtual heretics. One of the dilemmas in dealing with this topic is that each Church of Christ denomination congregation is autonomous (independent).

Even though there does seem to be some light at the end of the tunnel, most Church of Christ denomination still adhere to the same doctrines that they have taught for the last 100 years.

With this in mind, let's look at the three predominant Church of Christ denominations.

The first group, most commonly known as the "**One Cup Brethren**" has no musical instruments in their worship service and one single shared cup for communion.

The second group known as the "**Cups Brethren**" has no musical instruments but has multiple cups for their communion service.

Then the third group known as the "**Instrumental Brethren**" has multiple cups and musical instruments.

The "One Cup" branch commonly refers to the "Cups Brethren" as the "Digressive Church of Christ" and calls the "Musical Instrument Brethren" the "Liberal Church of Christ". Then lastly (as if this wasn't confusing enough) there is a branch of the Church of Christ that has actually changed its name to the **International Church of Christ**. The other three branches have branded this group (sociologically and theologically) to be a full-blown cult! But this leads us to our first major point, is the Church of Christ denomination a denomination?

The Church of Christ denomination is much more prevalent in the southern portion of the Bible Belt. Not being a denomination is one of their foundational tenets. You might be asking yourself, "What's the big deal? Who cares if they think they are a denomination or not?" The answer is that it's not a big deal, unless you know the logic behind why they make the claim. It is simply this: if they accept being called a denomination, then that would relegate them to a position within the Body of Christ. But their claim is that they are not just a *part of the Body of Christ*, but that **THEY ARE THE BODY OF CHRIST!**

The sad thing is to hear what great lengths they will go to in order to shun the label of "denomination." They will actually redefine the term in such a way as to cause those unaware to agree with them. The most common term that they use is that a denomination is "a group or thing that has come out from an original group or thing."

Now that fits their theology because it allows them to say that all denominations are "groups that came out from the original group" which, you guessed it, the original group is them... the Church of Christ! This also allows them to claim that you are not a true Christian, and you are not going to heaven, ***because you don't belong to the one and only, true Body of Christ.***

So what is a denomination:

A denomination is simply a certain type of the same thing, such as a denomination of money. Let's say I had \$50 in my pocket. And we'll say that it was a \$20 bill, two tens, and two fives.

Each of those denominations is a form of paper money. They are different denominations and are of different values, but they are each considered to be currency. But according to the Church of Christ denomination, some of the bills are real money but others are not, because a denomination is a "group or thing that has come out from an original group or thing." Their obvious flaw in this scenario is called "circular logic." Why are they not a denomination? Because "they are the true body of Christ!" And why are they the true body of Christ? Because "they are not a denomination!" The word "denomination" comes from the Latin word "nomin", which means "name" and the prefix "de" means "of." So, "de nomin" simply means "of the same name." And in the case of the church, it would be of the same name... Jesus!

If I were to go into a new city and I wanted to go to a Church of Christ, I simply look in the Yellow Pages under "Churches of Christ." If I want to go to an Assembly of God, I do the same. This way I don't unknowingly go to a Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormon). I'm sure that the Lord would prefer perfect doctrinal unity in all his congregations, but He knows that won't happen this side of Heaven. Even the three Church of Christ denominations can't decide on the issues of multiple cups, musical instruments or multiple loaves for communion. So basically we are back to square one, it doesn't matter so much what you call your church (Church of God, Church of Christ, Church of Jesus Christ, etc.), but more importantly, what you teach.

Paul also addresses this issue in I Corinthians 12:12-21,

12"For even as the body is one and yet has many members, and all the members of the body, though they are many, are one body, so also is Christ. 13For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether slaves or free, and we were all made to drink of one Spirit. 14For the body is not one member, but many. 15If the foot says, "Because I am not a hand, I am not a part of the body," it is not for this reason any the less a part of the body. 16And if the ear says, "Because I am not an eye, I am not a part of the body," it is not for this reason any the less a part of the body. 17If the whole body were an eye, where would the hearing be? If the whole were hearing, where would the sense of smell be? 18But now God has placed the members, each one of them, in the body, just as He desired. 19If they were all one member, where would the body be? 20But now there are many members, but one body. 21And the eye cannot say to the hand, "I have no need of you"; or again the head to the feet, "I have no need of you."

So we see that God says that there is one BODY of Christ (one Church) but it has many members or parts. Those parts all have their own individual callings and functions. Unfortunately, the Church of Christ denomination says to all other members of the body: **"I have no need of you...you are not a part of the body!"**

Oddly, the Church of Christ denomination focuses on one focal point to "prove" that they are not a denomination. It is that they have no headquarters. They are individualistic or autonomous (which is just an excuse for being divisive). In other words, they say that because the early church had no headquarters, and THEY have no headquarters, that proves that they are not a denomination AND they are more like the original church than YOUR church. Sadly, this is just another example of being blind to the obvious. If you ask them what would designate a "headquarters" they would usually say, "a centralized governing body that decides doctrine and behavior for multiple congregations." We would agree with that definition. Unfortunately, that leaves the Church of Christ denomination out in the cold, because the early church DID have a headquarters, using the church of Christ's own definition. It can clearly be found in the 15th chapter of Acts. The sticky subject of what to do with the Gentiles came before the leadership of the church. So, they got together as a body of leaders and came up with an official decree, determining the doctrine and behavior to be adhered to by the different congregations, which was sent to many (if not all) of the then known congregations in many cities and countries.

So, this proves that the early church DID have a headquarters with a governing body that set down the guidelines for doctrine and behavior. Strangely, this example sets them at odds with the early church, and yet they see it as something to brag about.

Jesus prayed in John 17:22, *"I have given them the glory that you gave me, that they may be one as we are one—I in them and you in me—so that they may be brought to complete unity."* Jesus stressed UNITY, but the Church of Christ denomination stresses AUTONOMY. They accuse other congregations of causing division, when in reality, they are one of the most divisive groups in the church.

Examining the Doctrine of the Church of Christ Denomination

They believe in Baptismal regeneration. This is a term used to describe the belief that you are born again, and receive your salvation, at the moment of water baptism. There are certain verses that they use, out of context, that they feel substantiate their belief. But if you examine each of their verses in context, you will see that the verses clearly do not substantiate their claims. Not to mention the myriad of verses to which they must turn a blind eye, in order to continue believing their work- oriented doctrine.

They use four main verses to try to establish their position:

- 1. Mark 16:16**
- 2. Acts 2:38**

3. I Peter 3:21

4. Act 22:16

Mark 16:16 says, "**He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.**" You notice that this verse does not say, "**and he who has not been baptized shall be damned,**" which is exactly what the Church of Christ denomination would like for you to believe. Jesus is simply making a natural assumption that all believers will be baptized. I would concur with that assumption. There is absolutely no reason whatsoever that a believer should not get baptized, unless there is positively no water available, or in the case of a death bed conversion. In such cases the Church of Christ denomination shows absolutely no mercy.

They will say that it was the individual's fault for waiting to the last minute. Tell that to the thief on the cross! He didn't have the opportunity to be water baptized and yet because he cried out to Jesus for mercy, Jesus promised him that he would be in Paradise that very day with Him! Now the standard answer that the Church of Christ denomination member will come back with is that you can't use the thief on the cross as an example because Jesus made that promise to the thief while they were both still under the Old Covenant (which as we all know wasn't fulfilled until Jesus died). But you see, the key issue is not when Jesus made the promise to the thief. The key issue is, under which covenant did the thief die? We know for a fact that the thief died under the New Covenant. How do we know? Because the gospels tell us that when the soldiers came to break the three crucified victim's legs, they marveled that Jesus was already dead. They didn't marvel at the two thieves, because they were still alive. So, if the New Covenant was ushered in at the death of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, then anyone who died from that point on, died under the New Covenant. And that would include the thief on the cross!

Sometimes their rebuttal then switches to the sovereignty of Jesus. They'll say, "Well, that was Jesus forgiving the thief. Jesus is God so He can do whatever He want. If he wants to save an unbaptized thief, that's His prerogative." They are right. But that's still true today. He is still sovereign, and He will save anyone He wants to, baptized or not.

Next we take a look at **Acts 2:38** in which the apostle Peter says to the remorseful crowd, "**Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sin, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.**"

Now here is a verse they feel is stating that your sins are remitted (or put away) at baptism. As we all know, if your sins are not forgiven, then you are not saved. But the question that needs to be asked here is: "Is it the baptism, or the repentance that brings about the forgiveness?" Now we could get into the structuring of the sentence and try to argue our point from that perspective (the word "for" can be translated "because"), but usually a member of the Church of Christ denomination is not willing to accept that form of reasoning, so we go with a much

more powerful position. If the forgiveness was brought through the baptism rather than the repentance, how do you explain the presentation that Peter gives in his very next sermon in Acts 3:19? He is speaking to a very similar group and says almost the same thing, but when he gives the plan of salvation, the topic of baptism is left out altogether! He said, ***"Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord."***

So, we see from this second sermon, that it wasn't the baptism that brought the forgiveness, it was the repentance. Then in Acts 10:43 Peter once again states, ***"To Him give all the Prophets witness that, through His Name, whosoever believes in Him shall receive remission of sins."*** Most people reading these Scriptures see the pattern that is developing... it is ***faith*** in Jesus that wipes away our sin!

Paul says in Eph 1:13, ***"In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: In whom also after that he believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise."*** So, were we sealed with the Holy Spirit at baptism or when we believed? Paul says you received the "deposit of your inheritance" (the Holy Spirit) WHEN YOU BELIEVED.

Some Church of Christ denomination members will take their doctrine of baptism from the extreme to the absurd. They actually will void the efficacy of someone's baptism, if the person didn't realize that their sins were remitted, at the moment of their baptism! Someone once asked a Church of Christ denomination preacher if he thought Billy Graham was saved, and his reply was, "Absolutely not!" When pressed for a reason for his conclusion he said, "Even though Billy Graham has been baptized, he doesn't preach baptism for the remission of sin, so he is not a true Christian, and he is also a false teacher!"

Jesus was baptized, and I guarantee you it wasn't for the remission of sin... for He was the perfect, sinless Lamb of God! When Jesus was baptized, He said He did it to "fulfill all righteousness." In other words, it's the right thing to do. The Church of Christ teaches if you got baptized because, "it's the right thing to do" your baptism didn't count. They teach that you have to believe that baptism is what saves you, and that when you are baptized that you have to believe the baptism is what saves you. If your mind is on something other than that the baptism does not count and you must get baptized again.

There are more than one kind of baptisms. When you are born again you are baptized or immersed into the body of Christ. This is the baptism that Peter is preaching about in Acts 2:38. The people's hearts were pricked, or another way of saying it, they were under conviction of their sin, and knew they needed to repent. Peter said when they repented, they would be baptized or placed into the body of Christ. This wasn't water baptism. The Holy Spirit places or baptizes us into the body of Christ at repentance and conversion.

I Peter 3:20-21, states, "*...in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.*"

What Peter is saying is that it is not the "ritual" of baptism that saves us, but the appeal to God for a good conscience. In Peter's day the Jews were obsessed with rituals. Some were from God, others were man-made. Jesus referred to one of those rituals in Matthew 15:11. The Jews were upset that His disciples did not wash their hands before they ate, which would have made them ritually "unclean." Jesus set them straight by saying, "*It is not what goes into a man that makes him unclean, but that which comes out of him.*" In other words, what a man thinks and says can make him unclean, not eating with unwashed hands. So, washing the body with water (baptism) will not cleanse a man's heart.

Peter is saying that the ritual of baptism does not save, but the appeal of a good conscience. Look closely at the analogy that he uses, the ark. Did the water save Noah? No, it almost drowned him. So, what did the water do for Noah? It separated him from the world, just like water baptism is our declaration that we are separating ourselves from the world. We are dying to ourselves to live in Christ. This verse goes on to say that the water baptism doesn't actually cleanse our flesh, but it renders a good conscience toward God, because we were obedient to follow His command to be baptized.

So, to be as correct as possible, it was the ark that saved Noah, not the water. The ark represented Noah's faith. The order was: Noah built the ark by faith, then came the water. Likewise, you are saved by faith, then baptism is your first act of obedience.

If you look at this verse in context, it has a "qualifier" before and after the verse, to keep you from taking the verse to an extreme like the Church of Christ does. We've looked at most of those verses, but there's one last word that deserves our attention. The King James version translates the beginning of the verse as, "The like figure whereunto." That's the Greek word "antitupo" which literally means "antitype." What is an antitype? A symbol or a picture. So, the verse itself says that baptism is just a **SYMBOL**.

- With Noah, the ark is what God used to save them from destruction. The ark was a man-made wooden object. Likewise, we are saved now in the same way, by a man-made wooden object, **the Cross**. What Jesus did on the Cross is what saves you. Without the shedding of blood, there is no remission of sin. Because the Church of Christ denomination puts so much emphasis on the water, they end up taking away from the blood. It's all about Jesus, not water. Baptism is just a symbol or picture of the actual death, burial and resurrection of Christ.

Lastly, we want to take a look at **Acts 22:16**, *"And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."* Many in the Church of Christ will say that the water "washed away" Paul's sin, but most of the rest of the Body of Christ says that it was Paul "calling on the name of the Lord," that saved him.

Is there a scriptural foundation for that belief? In Joel 2:32, Acts 2:21 and Romans 10:13, all three verses say, *"It shall come to pass that whosoever calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved."*

Is baptism mentioned anywhere in those verses? Obviously not. So once again, the Scriptures clarify that your salvation is by Grace through Faith, calling on the Name of the Lord.

Here again we must reiterate that no true believer should continue in an unbaptized state. Whereas we can see that God expects us to obey Him in this sacrament, nowhere do we see Him judge those without mercy, who have accepted His Son as their Savior. Bottom line? If you have accepted Jesus Christ as your Lord and Savior...get baptized. It's the right thing to do! The Church of Christ denomination somehow seems to think that they are the only ones who baptize their members. I have never attended a Church that did not baptize their members. It is a command that we simply *should* not, *can* not, and *will* not ignore. But we also cannot point to it (baptism) and say, "That is what saved me." If you are going to point... point to the Cross.

In Colossians 2:11, the Apostle Paul correlates baptism in the New Testament with circumcision in the Old Testament. He says, *"... In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ:"*

Let's take a close look at this verse, to see what it says and what the ramifications are. First of all, we see that Paul says that the *"circumcision of Christ"* is a removal of the flesh that is symbolized in baptism. In the Old Testament, the Jews would circumcise their boys as a part of fulfilling their covenant with God. It was a literal cutting away of the flesh. Baptism was a symbol of dying to the flesh and rising to new life in Christ. You notice that Paul says in verse 12, *"by the circumcision of Christ having been buried with Him in baptism."* Paul is saying that baptism is the circumcision of Christ, "through faith."

Now why would this distinction be important to understand? Because in Romans 4:10 Paul states emphatically that Abraham was considered righteous by faith, BEFORE he was circumcised! He then goes on to say in verse 11, *"...and he (Abraham) received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised ..."* In other words, Abraham was counted as righteous before he was circumcised, and the circumcision was simply a "seal", or an outward sign, of the righteousness that he already had! Which is exactly the case with the "circumcision of Christ" (water baptism).

It is an outward sign, or seal, of the righteousness you already possess through faith in Christ Jesus.

Another good analogy from the Old Testament regarding baptism and circumcision can be found in Joshua. In Joshua 5:2, we see that the first thing that the Israelites do after they entered the Promised Land was set up an altar and were circumcised. What a beautiful picture of baptism! First you get saved by faith (enter the Promised Land) then you get baptized (circumcised).

The point that the Church of Christ denomination seems to miss is that baptism is **SYMBOLIC**. They readily chastise the Catholic Church for believing in transubstantiation, yet when it comes to baptism, the Church of Christ denomination makes the same mistake as the Catholic church: taking something literally that what was supposed to be symbolic. The Catholic church says that the bread and wine (during Communion) *literally* becomes the body and blood of Jesus. The Church of Christ denomination says that baptism actually remits your sins. They say that according to the book of Romans that you are literally buried with Christ through baptism. Noooo....baptism **SYMBOLIZES** Christ's death. It SYMBOLIZES your death, burial and resurrection. You don't come out of the water with dirt in your mouth from being buried, do you? Now, we realize that it can sometimes be hard to discern when something is to be taken literally as opposed to being a type or symbol. When it comes to baptism, though, there are simply too many Scriptures that give the plan of salvation...and leave the subject of baptism out altogether.

Paul says in Ephesians 2:8-9 that ***"We are saved by GRACE through FAITH and not of ourselves, it is a GIFT of God, NOT as a result of WORKS, that no one should boast."*** If you ever stand before Christ Jesus and He asks you why should He let you into Heaven?... you had better say, "Because of what You did for me on the cross," not, "Because I was baptized"!

Truth is always true. If you believe a certain doctrine, but through the study of God's Word, you find that your belief is not upheld scripturally (even if only once), then you need to seriously re-examine that belief. Regarding baptismal regeneration, a good case in point can be found in Acts 10:1-48. Here we find an example of a man named Cornelius, receiving the Holy Spirit, evidenced by "speaking in tongues and exalting God." And being amazed by the whole ordeal, the Apostle Peter (who had been preaching the gospel to the Cornelius household when the Holy Spirit fell upon all of them) stated in verse 47, ***"Surely no one can refuse the water for these to be baptized who have received the Holy Spirit just as we did..."*** Clearly we have in this example, a case where a person was obviously saved before he was water baptized. The Apostle Peter declares their salvation by saying that they had ***"received the Holy Spirit, just like we did!"*** The only way around this scenario is to deny that a person that is filled with the Holy Spirit (evidenced by speaking in tongues and glorifying God) is actually saved.

The Apostle Paul, on the issue of baptism, states in I Cor. 1:17, "**Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel!**" Now if baptism is the point of salvation, this statement would be utterly blasphemous. In reality, it simply confirms what the rest of the Bible already teaches... that we are saved by grace, not works of any kind! As human beings, it is in our nature to want to earn our salvation. There is nothing wrong with wanting to please God! The problem comes in when the way we want to please God conflicts with the way He wants it. If we look at Romans 10:9-10, we see God giving us the plan of salvation in a very simple and straightforward way. The Apostle Paul says that we are saved by confessing that Jesus is (our) Lord! Now can that be true? Do we get saved by simply believing and confessing that Jesus is Lord,? That sounds too easy. There must be more to it than that, isn't there? Don't we have to do something to earn it?

According to human wisdom, we have to do something to earn such a great gift. But in issues of life and salvation, sometimes we have to set aside our earthly "wisdom" and simply accept God at His Word. It's like the bumper sticker that says, "God said it; I believe it; and that settles it." Whether we understand God's Mercy and Grace or not, doesn't change His terms. He has made it simple so that anyone can be saved. But man comes along and tries to make it "better." But you cannot improve on perfection! God's ways are higher than our ways, and He says that salvation is a gift, that no one can earn. So my advice is to take God at his word and receive the greatest gift ever offered; Salvation by Grace through Faith in Jesus Christ!

MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS

Their main reason for outlawing musical instruments in the church service is because they say that it is not mentioned in the Bible. You may remember their slogan is, "**We speak where the Bible speaks; and we are silent where the Bible is silent.**" Unfortunately for them, ignorance is not bliss... it's just plain folly. Unbeknownst to them, the Bible very clearly does give us permission to have musical instruments in our worship to God, whether it's in a corporate worship service or in the privacy of our own home, car or wherever the Spirit might lead.

Ephesians 5:19 says "**... speaking to one another with psalms, hymns and spiritual songs...**" and correspondingly Colossians 3:16 says to "**... admonish one another with psalms, hymns and spiritual songs.**" So, Paul makes it clear that we are to sing "psalms," but which psalms? Obviously, he is referring to the Psalms of David! And many of the Psalms say to worship God with musical instruments, such as Psalm 150. Also, many of the Psalms were directed by David to be accompanied by a musical instrument, such as a harp or lyre. We also see that the worship of God in heaven will also include musical instruments as found in Revelation 15:2, "They held harps given them by God."

But let's dig a little deeper into the actual definition of the word psalm. If you were to take the time to look up the word "psalm" in the Greek dictionary, you would find this definition

(#5568): "A set piece of music, i.e. a sacred ode (accompanied with the voice, harp, or other instrument)." The root word of psalm is "psallo" which means to means "to twitch, twang or pluck," such as pluck a string of a musical instrument.

If you applied the Church of Christ legalistic perspective to the entire verse of Ephesians 5:19 and Colossians 3:16, then we could not even *sing*. They say, "The verse says making melody in your HEARTS not with your HANDS!" Meaning you cannot "make melody" with your hands playing a man-made musical instrument. But if the melody HAS to be "made ONLY in your heart" then that would also preclude the vocal cords.

Unfortunately, this is a perfect example of what happens when you establish your doctrines in haste! Can you find the words "musical instruments" in the New Testament? No. "Then let's keep them out of our worship!" But wait, Brother, doesn't the word "psalm" mean: "a song accompanied by a musical instrument?" Well, at this point they will choose their tradition over the Bible, because they don't want to be confused by the facts!

What they say is that there were never any musical instruments used in the Temple worship, in the Old Testament. The reason that would be an issue to them is that they make a correlation between the Temple and the Church. Then you can point out that they are completely wrong in their assumption, by citing one of many scriptures, such as II Chronicles 5:12, which clearly shows musical instruments in the Temple.

II Chronicles 5:11-14 (NIV) took place at the dedication of the Temple: ***"The priests then withdrew from the Holy Place. All the priests who were there had consecrated themselves, regardless of their divisions. All the Levites who were musicians -Asaph, Heman, Jeduthun and their sons and relatives-stood on the east side of the altar, dressed in fine linen and playing cymbals, harps and lyres. They were accompanied by 120 priests sounding trumpets. The trumpeters and singers joined in unison, as with one voice, to give praise and thanks to the LORD. Accompanied by trumpets, cymbals and other instruments, they raised their voices in praise to the LORD and sang: 'He is good; His love endures forever.' Then the temple of the LORD was filled with a cloud, and the priests could not perform their service because of the cloud, for the glory of the LORD filled the temple of God."***

So, we clearly see God sanctions the use of musical instruments in worship by endorsing the proceedings by filling the Temple with His Glory.

And I'm sure Paul would say the same thing about musical instruments, especially when he already said they were permitted in Eph. 5:19 and Col. 3:16! The Church of Christ denomination says that if you include musical instruments in the worship of God, then your worship is Pagan (Godless) and could cost you your salvation!

Like we said earlier, no one cares if the Church of Christ denomination wants to leave out musical instruments in their worship, that is their prerogative. The reason that this issue is so wrong is because they judge and condemn everyone else who chooses to use musical instruments like David did, as the angels in Heaven do and as the Apostle Paul instructed. In Conclusion, always remember that when we add anything or take anything away to the Gospel of Jesus Christ **we are in error**.

Would I recommend the Church of Christ as a follower of scripture? No, I would not.