Lipscomb

&

Munnell

Debate

1867

Missionary Societies

The following pages are photocopied from Harding College Lectures, 1967. {Edited by W. Joe Hacker, Jr.
They are from the chapter entitled, "David Lipscomb," by Bill Humble beginning on page 162.

vigorous writer, an earnest man, and one who knows and loves the truth." Fanning added, "Of course, he is mortal —has faults, is not an angel, but we know not where to find a writer amongst the brethren better qualified to instruct in apostolic Christianity."[1] Beginning in 1868, Lipscomb assumed full control as the sole editor of the *Advocate*. Two years later, E. G. Sewell (1830-1924) became an associate editor of the *Advocate*, and the names "Lipscomb and Sewell" were soon to be known and trusted throughout the brotherhood in the South. F. D. Srygley became an editor of the *Advocate* in 1889, and Earl West has called the next decade a "golden era" in the *Advocate's* history.

The *Advocate's* strong and unwavering opposition to missionary societies and the use of instrumental music in worship is well known. Another important concern of Lipscomb's was the Christian's relationship to civil government, and during the first year that he edited the *Advocate* (1866) Lipscomb wrote a series of 18 articles on the subject, "The Church of Christ and World-Power." These articles were later (1889) published as the book *Civil Government*. It was Lipscomb's view that civil government originated in rebellion against God's government, and consequently, the Christian can have "no part, or lot, or inheritance in these kingdoms of human mould, over which the wicked one reigns."[2] Needless to say, this is one of Lipscomb's views that is not accepted by most of our brotherhood today.

David Lipscomb's activity was not limited to his work with the *Advocate*. He preached regularly but refused to think of himself as a "professional preacher." He raised over $100,000 for the relief of destitute Southern Christians during 1866-1867. Lipscomb had relatives in Texas,

[1] *Gospel Advocate*, August 28, 1866, p. 560.
[2] *Ibid.*, November 13, 1866, p. 723.

from lecture on David Lipscomb by Bill Humble

and the *Advocate* was widely circulated in the Lone Star state; so it is not surprising to find Lipscomb touring Texas a number of times. In 1872 he visited Galveston, Bryan, Houston, Fort Worth, Dallas, and Quitman and described his tour in a series of *Advocate* articles—articles which now provide interesting insights into frontier Texas. Fanning Orphan School was established in 1884, and Lipscomb served on the Board of Trustees for the remainder of his life. Lipscomb was also an elder, serving the South Nashville church for many years after its establishment in 1887. Nashville Bible School (later to be renamed David Lipscomb College) was established in 1891, and its first faculty consisted of David Lipscomb, William Lipscomb, and James A. Harding. Lipscomb later wrote, "I have found more satisfaction in teaching the Bible to young men and women at school than in any work of my life." Lipscomb was not adept at the oral debate which was so popular with his generation. However, he engaged in many significant controversies in the *Advocate*. As examples, there was a written debate with Thomas Munnell in ~~1872~~ 1867 on the missionary society, and a long editorial debate with Austin McGary, editor of the *Firm Foundation*, on the question of "rebaptism." When the United States Census Bureau officially recognized the reality of a division between churches of Christ and the Disciples of Christ (Christian Church) in 1906, it was a correspondence which the Director of the Census Bureau had with David Lipscomb which convinced him that a separate listing for the two groups was necessary. By 1912 the infirmities of old age made it impossible for Lipscomb to continue his work with the *Advocate*, and he sold his interest in the journal to E. A. Elam, M. C. Kurfees, and A. B. Lipscomb.

There are many aspects of David Lipscomb influence on the Restoration Movement that are worthy of careful study, but only three can be considered here: his faith in the

Scripture, his forbearing conservatism, and his role in the 1906 statistical division.

Faith in the Scripture

As one reads through David Lipscomb's editorials and attempts to assess his greatness, the thing that will impress him, perhaps more than any other, is Lipscomb's unwavering, child-like faith in the absolute authority of the Scripture. In 1896 as Lipscomb reflected on thirty years editing the *Advocate*, he wrote:

> The cardinal thought in my religion has ever been to follow the will of God, as expressed in precept or by approved example; to stand on safe ground; to be sure of the approval and blessing of God. Guided by this principle, we took our position in favoring of following the approved examples of scriptures in spreading the gospel—and urged it.[3]

The goal of following the Scriptures was one from which Lipscomb had not deviated through three decades as an editor. During the second year that he had edited the *Advocate* (1867) Lipscomb had conducted a written debate with Thomas Munnell on the question of missionary societies. Munnell was a worthy opponent and would later become the highest officer, corresponding secretary, of the American Christian Missionary Society. Shortly before the debate had begun, Lipscomb had written that many churches, even 10,000, could cooperate in doing the Lord's work. Munnell, mentioning this point in the debate, insisted that there was no way for 10,000 churches to cooperate "without some kind of an organization." And he challenged Lipscomb to suggest "a business-like, practical way of getting at the work of cooperation without organization." Lipscomb's response was typically Lipscomb in its child-like faith in the Scripture:

[3] *Ibid.*, January 2, 1896, p. 4.

W. Joe Hacker, Jr., Editor

> We do not know that God proposed to convert the world in a business-like way. Wise men, intent on the accomplishment of a great object, would scarcely choose a babe, born out of wedlock, cradled in a manger, as the efficient superintendent in the accomplishment of that work. Business men . . . would have hardly sought out unlearned, simple hearted fishermen as their agents . . . would not have chosen the infamy of the Cross, and the degradation of the grave. . . . This is so unbusiness-like that, business men, entering in strive to change it to a more business-like manner. . . . God's ways are not man's ways . . . the foolishness of God is wiser than man.[4]

Later in the debate, Lipscomb told Munnell that if God had commanded that the world be converted *through the church*, it could be done, even though men might not understand how. What mattered to Lipscomb was fidelity in following God's plan. "God's plan for the spread of his religion is to inspire his children with that degree of zeal, devotion, and fidelity to his laws, that every one, whether a doctor, merchantman, trader or slave, male or female, becomes a missionary of the cross wherever providence casts his lot." Lipscomb charged that the societies were substitutes for the true missionary spirit of New Testament times, and he added, "The above is not a very business-like way of spreading the gospel—I admit. It *is* a very divine way."[5]

What impresses one about Lipscomb, above all else, is his determination to follow the Scripture. There is no inclination to dodge the obvious meaning of a passage, to hedge or explain it away. Lipscomb's whole life was dominated by this spirit of total surrender to the word of God —an unwavering child-like trust in the Scripture.

[4] *Ibid.*, March 14, 1867, p. 208.
[5] *Ibid.*, May 13, 1867, p. 407.

The following photocopied pages are from Crying In The Wilderness: a Biography of David Lipscomb, by Robert E. Hooper.

"Why Do We Not Write More?" Making no apologies, he answered:

> The Gospel Advocate we consider ably edited without a line from us. We are not disposed to flatter, but we find Bro. D. Lipscomb a strong and vigorous writer, an earnest man, and one who knows and loves the Truth. Of course, he is a mortal—has faults, is not an angel, but we know not where to find a writer amongst the brethren better qualified to instruct in Apostolic Christianity.[8]

The young boy of Franklin College days had learned well. But he was no longer a college boy. He was now a mature man who had the added responsibility of wearing the mantle of his teacher. Fanning's observations concerning his "Child in the Faith" were not misplaced. Throughout the next fifty years it seemed that Lipscomb possessed a list of the topics Fanning first introduced in the *Advocate* prior to the Civil War, discussing them over and over as if his teacher were directing his pen.

The year 1866 demanded men of conviction, with courage to follow that conviction wherever it might lead. In the South the need was overwhelming. There was a demand for men who might stir to action the hearts and imaginations of hundreds, even thousands, from a lethargy that stemmed from four years of devastating war. Whatever the subject or demand, Lipscomb possessed that rare quality to stir in others a response. The destitution of his beloved South demanded his attention. If his people needed a reprimand, he gave it. If the people of the victorious North needed a reminder of responsibilities both to the Southern people and to God, Lipscomb did not shrink from the task. Although a generally retiring person in public, David Lipscomb never hesitated to speak with thunder through the pages of the *Advocate*.

Lipscomb's first words on January 1, 1866, were to his people. "God in his providence," Lipscomb warned, "sent a fatal besom of destruction over our land and how fearful a desolation! Where once abounded wealth and comfort and happiness, what deep poverty now much more abounds; what pressing want; what sorrow of heart. . . ."[9] Yet one week later he reminded: "To our friends of the North we would say, 'be not high-minded, but fear.' "[10] The end of the Civil War provided an opportunity for both North and South to show their Christianity.

The Civil War left the South prostrate. It was not possible for the section to quickly rebound to the strength it had known previous to the war. Even had they possessed money and seed, the droughts of 1865 and 1866 stymied quick recovery. Therefore, the needs of the South were overwhelming in January 1866. The calls for assistance from

Lipscomb were not heeded until a letter from Nathan W. Smith of Acworth, Georgia, appeared in February.[11] So touched was Lipscomb with the plight of this Christian man that he urged all readers, North and South, to respond to his needs. This was the beginning of a great outpouring of Christian fellowship from all sections of the United States, from Massachusetts to California, from Illinois to Georgia.

A trip to Louisville, Kentucky, in June 1866 was the breakthrough for major support to be channeled south. After Lipscomb read Nathan Smith's letter to the Second Christian Church of Louisville, over $1200 in money and goods were sent to Nashville. The Louisville and Nashville Railroad provided free transport for all provisions marked "For the Needy." It was Lipscomb's hope that aid sent south might help rebuild the unity of the United States lost because of war.[12]

Christian love and concern did bind many wounds. Thomas Munnell, the Corresponding Secretary of the Kentucky Christian Missionary Society, however, could not allow such extra-congregational work as Lipscomb was performing—especially as the consultation meetings at Murfreesboro and Franklin officially recognized the work he and Metcalfe were doing—go unnoticed. Was not Lipscomb practicing the same thing in serving as a rallying point for helping the destitute as the missionary society was doing for the preaching of the gospel? Lipscomb recognized no inconsistencies; he was only doing work that needed to be done, work in which he was engaged prior to the meetings. The public recognition only told others how help might reach the destitute.[13]

And Lipscomb did his work well. When the crisis had passed, he and his colleagues had raised $100,000 to help the Southern needy. Recalling the critical years at N. W. Smith's death in 1899, Lipscomb remembered the outpouring of help as one of the highlights of his life. Never had churches of Christ raised such large sums of money in such a short time for such a worthy cause.[14]

Help for the destitute South was only one example of Lipscomb's Christianity. Writing in the second issue of the paper, he remarked: "We esteem it our highest privilege in conducting the *Advocate* to devote much of our time and space to the subject of personal religion; on application of the precepts and examples of the sacred Scriptures to the private walk and everyday transactions of life."[15] However necessary the application of Christian principles might be, Lipscomb held firmly to the necessity of obeying the will of God. Accordingly, much space was reserved for articles dealing with the theme of the Restora-

comb only entered the controversy after the *Standard* and the *Christian-Evangelist* had taken opposing sides. The *Evangelist* chided the *Standard* and Errett for publishing another hymnal in competition with the society songbook. Errett's arguments were based on alleged errors in the society book, claiming 150 in the revised edition. Lipscomb, however, scored Errett for turning against his promise to Alexander Campbell in 1864.[22] Lipscomb openly wondered if Mr. Errett had turned against the old hymnal because he had lost the publishing rights. The wounds of 1866-1869 were painfully reopened. Lipscomb's mind had not changed concerning the hymnal; he still opposed it because each hymnal sold aided the society.

Issues raised by Lipscomb, possibly understood by Errett as questioning his integrity, caused a heated response from the Cincinnati editor. Why, asked Lipscomb, did Isaac Errett leave the Central church in Cincinnati? Was it because several of the trustees of the hymnal were elders of the congregation? Whatever the truth of the matter, Errett lumped Lipscomb and the hymnal trustees with Herod and Pilate. On the other hand, Lipscomb believed Errett saw himself as the sweet, gentle Jesus. Errett, his pen just as acid, thought Lipscomb guilty of unfounded suspicions, adding: ". . . we now inform the author of these suspicions and evil imaginations that *we do flatly deny them*, as if it were anyone else than David Lipscomb, with his marvelous facility for transforming his impressions and suspicions into facts, we should be astonished that anyone would risk his reputation on such statements."[23] In the same year Errett, who had grown tired of the discussion, wrote that he would pay no more attention to Lipscomb. The relationship, strained during the 1860's was completely severed amidst the hymnal controversy of the 1880's. From the viewpoint of Lipscomb, it was nothing more than the culmination of the controversy begun by the war-advocating society in 1861.

The missionary society was the most divisive issue within the Restoration Movement. The reason should be obvious to the student of Restoration history. It was the one thing that divided the more conservative elements of the disciples. This is best illustrated by the views of J. W. McGarvey, the most respected Bible student among the disciples. He was as adamantly opposed to the instrument in worship as Lipscomb. He saw nothing wrong, however, with churches working in concert through societies. Thus in later years the Restoration Movement became divided three, possibly four ways, mainly because of the society issue. The attempt to reconcile Lipscomb and McGarvey

is the subject of a later chapter.

It was McGarvey who took exception to Lipscomb's contention that the missionary society was opposed to individual churches sponsoring missionaries. This was only one of many misunderstandings between the two men. Early in 1866, McGarvey suggested that men of wealth should sponsor missionaries. This met with total rejection by Lipscomb. However, the lengthiest discussions of the society involved Lipscomb and Thomas Munnell. Arguing from the principle that the society was no worse than consultation meetings, publishing the *Advocate*, or operating Franklin College, Munnell wondered why Lipscomb was so opposed to the society. Lipscomb, of course, failed to agree with Munnell's conclusions, but added: "We are frequently inconsistent, perfectly conscious of it, but that does not make any organized human society to do the work of the church right or scriptural."[24] Lipscomb's chief objection to the society was man ignoring "the overruling and guiding hand of God, and organize a human association to do that which God has reserved for himself."[25]

* * *

The Civil War made an indelible impact on David Lipscomb, especially in his attitude toward the Christian and government. His life was closely involved in the conflict without actually serving in either army. He saw the destruction and plunder brought by the armies crossing and recrossing Middle Tennessee. He could remember learning of his own kinsmen being killed by bullets of fellow-countrymen. He remembered a neighbor in Bell's Bend losing his life at the hands of foraging Yankee soldiers. It was a senseless war.

Prior to the war, Lipscomb's views of government were prodemocratic. As early as 1848 he wrote glowingly of democracy as a government based on Christian principles. In 1855 he called democracy "the first fruits of the Christian religion." He even designated the voting place "holy ground." Moreover, he cast his ballot in 1860 for John Bell of the Constitutional Union Party. Every indicator pointed to David Lipscomb being a staunch advocate of political participation by the Christian.

During and after the war his views changed dramatically. Studying the subject in depth during the years of conflict, he recognized an inconsistency in his own thinking. Thus, he was led to conclude that all participation in the governments of the world is anti-Christian.[26] Notebooks kept during the war indicate his study of the various church historians, leading to his total non-participation position in civil gov-

always looking to the future. After eleven months of publication, Lipscomb wrote: "Our efforts in the future, as in the past, shall be to build up no party, no denomination or interest, to cater to no prejudices, political or sectional, but shall be to know the truth, the whole truth as it is revealed in the Scriptures, and to induce perishing mortals to obey the truth." It bothered him that all did not share his search for truth. It was his desire that the *Gospel Advocate* might ever be open to all who are searching for truth. He then added: "We are willing to walk with you without regard to denominational, sectional, political or personal interest, wherever God, through the truth may lead us. . . ."[33]

Lipscomb was never blind to the weaknesses of the *Advocate* or its editors. Dr. T. W. Brents, one of the better preachers and debaters in Middle Tennessee, advised the editors that articles on first principles—what a person must do to be saved—were needed.[34] The criticism brought a positive response that a department would be added in 1867 emphasizing basic doctrine. To improve the journal, the editors encouraged various ones to write occasional articles. Philip S. Fall, the long-time preacher for the church in Nashville, was added as a contributing editor in January 1867.[35]

Predictably, there were disappointments during that first year. At the top of the year, Lipscomb promised a year's work without compensation; however, he probably did not anticipate the paper costing him $350, money not easily obtained in 1866.[36] As disappointing as the financial loss was, the greatest hurt was the realization that opposition arose from all directions. Nevertheless, he added: "We have not withheld a word from fear of the disapproval of any class or individual."[37] Nor had the *Advocate* reached such a position that its future was secure. Early in 1867 he candidly told his readers that the *Advocate* was still on trial as a weekly.

Lipscomb's illness grew worse during those early months of 1867. By June he was in a very weakened condition, but carried through with his intentions to attend the Kentucky State meeting in Paris. His other plans included continuing his trip north where he hoped to find a cure in Cleveland, Ohio. The trip turned out to be a very profitable one for him as he had the opportunity of meeting several men whom he had never met before, plus seeing country he had never viewed. At Paris, Lipscomb first met William T. Moore—"We are truly happy in finding him an earnest and true defender of the ancient order of things." This attitude would change dramatically in years to come. Also he made the personal acquaintance of Thomas Munnell with whom he had discussed the society issue during the previous year. Lipscomb found him to be a "kind, courteous and Christian in his bearing." Possibly the most revealing discovery at the meeting was the general attitude of his Kentucky brethren toward himself. "We were at once amused and mortified to find that our brethren in Kentucky had concluded we were peevish and offensive. We feel sure, if we have made any distinctive character as a preacher, it has been while speaking plainly, we do so without giving offense to anyone." Evidently some felt him too harsh in his writing, because he added: "Our object shall be to set an example of perfect freedom of investigation and plainness of speech in discussion, in the spirit of true Christian kindness and love."[38]

Following the meeting, Lipscomb continued north by train through the Miami River valley of Ohio. This was the farthest north he had ever traveled. Being a keen observer of things around him, especially of land and crops, he wrote openly of his impressions of Ohio as compared with his native South. He was impressed with the valley, but felt it was not equal to the South he knew before the war. He used the opportunity to comment on the problems of the South, especially those caused by slavery. The institution had encouraged large farms, a sparsely settled country, and a lack of manufacturing industry. These, in turn, caused bad schools and churches, a scarcity of small independent farmers and mechanics. In general, slavery retarded the growth of the South. Arriving in Cleveland, he was impressed with the small, airy homes with shrubbery and shade trees in the yards. He contrasted these with large showy mansions of the South. Too, he was impressed with the neat clothing styles of Cleveland, hoping such styles might find their way South where dress styles were too "showy" for Lipscomb.

For the first time Lipscomb met Isaac Errett, the editor of the *Christian Standard*. The paper had not yet moved to Cincinnati. Lipscomb and Errett shared a number of meetings. The *Standard* editor impressed Lipscomb as having a "uniform Christian character." Lipscomb was pleased that he found "no intentional bitterness with the brethren toward our Southern brethren." However, he did find "a most mortifying and distressing misapprehension of the feelings and purpose of the Southern brethren and the Southern people." Over the next several years the relationship between Lipscomb and Errett would be courteous and kind even though disagreeing on a number of subjects. However, the late 1880's would bring a sharp disagreement that, in turn, would cause a cessation of relationships.

two sentences copied into the *Advocate* in 1870 summed up Lipscomb's feelings fully: "Modern liberalism is but the old device of splitting the difference with God. King Saul was liberal enough to spare Agag, thereby losing his throne."[2]

* * *

Lengthy discussions of the American Christian Missionary Society during the early years of the *Advocate's* republication were not the rule. Actually the society was not an issue in the *Advocate's* circulation area except in the northern parts of Kentucky. In 1867, however, Lipscomb did become involved in lengthy discussion of the society's merits with Thomas Munnell, the corresponding secretary of the Kentucky Christian Missionary Society. To Munnell, Lipscomb stated: "A chief objection we make to your societies is, that they ignore the overruling and guiding hand of God, and organize a human association to do that which God has reserved for himself."[3]

Instead of discussing the merits of the society, Munnell questioned consultation meetings, the *Gospel Advocate*, and Franklin College as being comparable to what Lipscomb condemned in Kentucky. Lipscomb answered by suggesting that he might personally be inconsistent, but inconsistency never makes something right when it is wrong.[4]

As the discussions continued into April of 1867, Lipscomb humorously chided Munnell concerning the society's inability to see obvious wrongs in the organization. He illustrated:

> When we were younger than we are now, we sometimes would fall desperately in love with the girls, when in this state of enchantment and freckles, splotches and warts of our charmer were all bright beauty spots, her silly freckles of temper, her eccentricities and foibles became infallible marks of superior genius and worth, and for one to dare insinuate she was not a perfect paragon of excellence, only to my eyes intensified her charms.[5]

The *Advocate's* editor surmised that defenders of the society find themselves in similar difficulties: blindness to the faults of the system.

Because of failing interest in the American Christian Missionary Society, a move was initiated in 1869 to organize a different plan for missionary work among the disciples. A number of disciples had never been pleased with the scripturalness of the society; others were unhappy with the war spirit exhibited by the society during the Civil War. When Benjamin Franklin, editor of the *American Christian Review*, editorially opposed the society, the organization found itself mired deeply in trouble. Thus in 1869 a committee was appointed to study a

new type of organization, hopefully acceptable to all disciples, including David Lipscomb. Made up of better known disciples from all sections of the country, the committee gave its report to the annual meeting of the American Christian Missionary Society at Louisville, Kentucky, during October 1869. The organization of the Plan on the local level allowed half the funds collected to be kept for local work. The remaining half was passed on to a regional level where half of the remainder was allocated, leaving one-fourth of the total collected to be sent to the national organization of the General Christian Missionary Convention, as the society was called after 1869.

From across the brotherhood came praise for the Louisville Plan. It was an organization all could accept. Among these was Benjamin Franklin; his objections to the society seemingly removed. However, others, both favoring the society and those against it, recognized weaknesses in the new organization. In fact, David Lipscomb called the Plan simply the old society in new dress.

Whether disciples were working through the American Christian Missionary Society or the Louisville Plan, Lipscomb remained adamantly opposed. As the society question invaded Tennessee, Lipscomb correspondingly became more vocal in his opposition, even suggesting that such organizations were opposed to everything Thomas and Alexander Campbell held dear. When reminded that Campbell was the first president of the American Christian Missionary Society, Lipscomb argued with some justification that Mr. Campbell at the time was so senile that others were able to lead him to do and say anything they so desired.[6] Tolbert Fanning believed him to be easily influenced by those around him, an idea shared by Robert Richardson, Campbell's biographer.[7] Lipscomb believed that after Campbell's return from England in 1847 and the death of his favorite son by drowning, that he was never the power he had been during his *Christian Baptist* days. Moreover, Lipscomb argued, most older persons tend to revert to ideas of youth. Campbell was no exception: he reverted to his old Seceder Presbyterian views of the pre-Restoration Movement era.[7] Whatever Mr. Campbell's attitudes toward the society were in 1849 and even until his death in 1866, Lipscomb always referred to Campbell's *Christian Baptist* writings as the most authoritative.

Shortly after the Louisville Plan was accepted, Lipscomb voiced a serious concern for the Restoration Movement. Under the title "How Shall Christian Unity Be Maintained?," he observed differences creep-

38. GA, 1874, p. 492.
39. GA, 1874, p. 1175.
40. GA, 1874, pp. 469-470.
41. GA, 1874, pp. 1016-1021.
42. GA, 1874, p. 1138.
43. GA, 1875, pp. 65, 98.
44. GA, 1879, p. 42.
45. GA, 1875, p. 64.
46. GA, 1875, p. 136.
47. GA, 1875, p. 376.
48. GA, 1871, p. 793.
49. GA, 1875, pp. 435-438.
50. GA, 1876, p. 102.
51. GA, 1875, pp. 1131-1132.
52. GA, 1873, p. 1013.
53. GA, 1876, p. 934.
54. GA, 1877, p. 217.
55. GA, 1877, p. 70.
56. GA, 1877, p. 598.
57. GA, 1877, pp. 709-710.
58. GA, 1877, p. 662.
59. GA, 1877, p. 726.
60. GA, 1877, pp. 726-727.
61. GA, 1877, pp. 756-758.
62. GA, 1879, p. 571.

CHAPTER TEN
Weep with those that Weep

1. GA, 1866, p. 496; 1869, pp. 889-891.
2. Alan Conway, *The Reconstruction of Georgia*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1966) p. 34.
3. Walter L. Fleming, *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama* (New York: Peter Smith, 1949), pp. 277-283.
4. Francis B. Simkins, *A History of the South* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959), p. 248, 252.
5. GA, 1873, p. 619.
6. GA, 1866, p. 661.
7. GA, 1866, pp. 756-758.
8. GA, 1866, p. 46.
9. GA, 1866, pp. 87-88.
10. GA, 1866, pp. 335-336.
11. GA, 1866, p. 431.
12. GA, 1899, p. 537.
13. GA, 1866, p. 431.
14. GA, 1866, p. 405.
15. GA, 1866, pp. 494-495.
16. GA, 1866, p. 496.
17. GA, 1866, pp. 619-620.
18. GA, 1866, p. 736.
19. GA, 1866, p. 719.
20. Examples: GA, 1866, pp. 365, 464, 720, 765; 1867, p. 24, 137.
21. GA, 1867, p. 175.
22. GA, 1867, pp. 176, 330.
23. GA, 1867, p. 418.
24. GA, 1866, p. 639; 1867, p. 365, 489, 626.
25. GA, 1867, p. 477.
26. GA, 1867, p. 489.
27. GA, 1867, p. 167.
28. GA, 1867, p. 476.
29. GA, 1899, p. 537.
30. GA, 1880, pp. 285, 615.
31. GA, 1871, pp. 972-975.
32. Davis, "Cholera," pp. 10-11.
33. GA, 1866, pp. 621, 639, 655, 659.
34. Davis, "Cholera," p. 11.
35. Ibid., see also *Nashville Union* and *American*, June 21, 1873.
36. *Nashville Union* and *American*, June 25, 1873; GA, 1873, p. 652.
37. CS, 1917, p. 391.
38. GA, 1873, p. 619.
39. GA, 1873, p. 650.
40. GA, 1873, pp. 651-653.
41. CS, December 22, 1917, p. 391.
42. GA, 1873, pp. 774-776.
43. GA, 1873, p. 911.
44. GA, 1878, p. 605.
45. GA, 1878, p. 636.
46. GA, 1878, p. 685; 1879, p. 10.
47. Gerald M. Capers, Jr. "Yellow Fever in Memphis in the 1870's," *The City in American History*, ed. by Paul Kramer and Frederick L. Holborn (New York: Capricorn Books, 1971), pp. 172-191.

CHAPTER ELEVEN
To Obey is Better Than Sacrifice

1. GA, 1889, pp. 630-631.
2. GA, 1870, p. 570.
3. GA, 1867, p. 208.
4. GA, 1867, p. 248.
5. GA, 1867, p. 264.
6. GA, 1884, p. 358.
7. Robert R. Richardson to P. S. Fall, July 30, 1857, Microfilm Copy, David Lipscomb College Library.
8. Scobey, *Franklin College*, p. 10.
9. GA, 1870, p. 607.
10. GA, 1870, p. 698.
11. GA, 1874, pp. 1166-1167.
12. GA, 1874, p. 1065.
13. GA, 1873, p. 516.
14. Moore, *History of the Disciples*, pp. 619-625.
15. GA, 1875, pp. 49-50.
16. GA, 1875, p. 1106.
17. Moore, *History of the Disciples*, p. 606.
18. GA, 1891, p. 23.
19. GA, 1878, pp. 694-695, 778-779.
20. GA, 1888, pp. 246-247.
21. GA, 1870, pp. 35-39; 1891, pp. 532-533.
22. GA, 1882, p. 694.
23. GA, 1883, pp. 115, 193.
24. GA, 1870, pp. 35-39, 424-426.
25. GA, 1882, pp. 708-709.
26. GA, 1884, p. 17.

27. GA, 1871, p. 276.
28. GA, 1873, p. 854.
29. GA, 1873, p. 855.
30. GA, 1878, p. 215.
31. GA, 1878, p. 551.
32. GA, 1886, p. 470.
33. GA, 1886, p. 386.
34. GA, 1886, p. 710.

CHAPTER TWELVE
Her Husband is Known in the Gates

1. GA, 1878, pp. 86-87.
2. GA, 1876, pp. 64-66.
3. John Graves' written recollections about David Lipscomb and his farm.
4. Margaret Dunn, "Reminiscences of David Lipscomb."
5. Graves' recollections; Margaret Dunn, "Reminiscences of David Lipscomb."
6. Margaret Dunn, "Reminiscences of David Lipscomb;" Conversation with Mrs. Zelma Dunn Stroop.
7. Van Zandt, *Force Without Fanfare*, pp. 143-144.
8. Margaret Lipscomb to "Davy" Lipscomb, October 9, 1876.
9. Margaret Lipscomb to Fannie Moore, 1881.
10. Davidson County, Tennessee, Warranty Deed Book, 71, p. 211, December 24, 1881.
11. Margaret Lipscomb to Mrs. Daniels, April 9, 1875; August 30, 1875.
12. GA, 1926, p. 365.
13. Margaret Dunn, "Reminiscences of David Lipscomb."
14. Margaret Lipscomb to Mrs. Daniels, April 9, 1875.
15. GA, 1876, pp. 113-114.
16. Conversation with Mrs. Zelma Dunn Stroop; Margaret Lipscomb to Mrs. Daniels, April 9, 1875.
17. Conversation with Mrs. Zelma Dunn Stroop.
18. GA, 1926, p. 363.
19. Margaret Lipscomb to Mrs. Daniels, December 30, 1877.
20. Graves' recollections about David Lipscomb and his farm.
21. Conversation with Mrs. Zelma Dunn Stroop.
22. Margaret Dunn, "Reminiscences of David Lipscomb."
23. Graves' recollections about David Lipscomb and his farm. The building still stands in 1979.
24. Margaret Lipscomb to Mrs. Daniels, April 15, 1874.
25. Margaret Lipscomb to Mrs. Daniels, August, 1875.
26. John Graves, *Northwest Davidson County*, p. 24.
27. Graves' recollections about David Lipscomb and his farm.
28. Margaret Lipscomb to Mrs. Daniels, July 7, 1878.
29. Margaret Lipscomb to Mrs. Daniels, April 9, 1875.
30. Margaret Lipscomb to Mrs. Daniels, August 30, 1875.
31. Margaret Lipscomb to Mrs. Daniels, January 10, 1876.
32. Margaret Lipscomb to Mrs. Daniels, June 18, 1876.
33. Margaret Lipscomb to "Davy" Lipscomb, October 9, 1876.
34. Davidson County, Tennessee, Warranty Deed Book 58, September 11, 1877, p. 340.
35. Margaret Lipscomb to Mrs. Daniels, July 7, 1878.
36. GA, 1866, pp. 206-207.
37. GA, 1879, p. 259.
38. GA, 1879, p. 377.
39. GA, 1879, p. 422.
40. Ibid.
41. Davidson County, Tennessee, Warranty Deed Book, 200, May 25, 1895, p. 262.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN
The Paths of Righteousness

1. GA, 1880, p. 406.
2. GA, 1880, p. 553.
3. GA, 1880, p. 406.
4. GA, 1876, pp. 931, 934.
5. GA, 1880, p. 453.
6. Ibid.
7. GA, 1880, p. 581.
8. GA, 1880, p. 636.
9. GA, 1880, p. 630.
10. GA, 1881, p. 468.
11. GA, 1881, p. 483.
12. GA, 1881, p. 19.
13. GA, 1881, p. 372.
14. GA, 1882, p. 579.
15. GA, 1882, p. 628.
16. GA, 1882, p. 230.
17. 17. 1882, p. 523.
18. GA, 1880, p. 237.
19. GA, 1880, p. 343.
20. GA, 1881, p. 729.
21. GA, 1883, p. 105.
22. GA, 1883, p. 43.
23. GA, 1883, p. 534.
24. GA, 1883, p. 566.
25. GA, 1884, pp. 59, 578, 546; 1886, p. 198.
26. GA, 1882, pp. 100-101.
27. GA, 1884, pp. 471, 519.
28. GA, 1884, p. 583.
29. GA, 1884, p. 710.
30. GA, 1884, p. 651.
31. GA, 1884, p. 726.
32. GA, 1884, p. 683.
33. FF, July, 1885, pp. 257-258.
34. FF, May, 1886, p. 7.
35. GA, 1885, pp. 3, 23, 55.
36. GA, 1887, p. 763.
37. GA, 1885, p. 343.
38. GA, 1885, pp. 723, 747, 779, 822.
39. GA, 1886, pp. 199, 278; 1912, p. 1261.
40. GA, 1887, p. 6.
41. GA, 1887, p. 62.
42. GA, 1886, p. 103.
43. GA, 1882, p. 648.
44. GA, 1894, p. 336.
45. GA, 1885, p. 378.
46. GA, 1885, p. 422.

The Missionary Question.

Brother Lipscomb :—A few weeks ago I proposed to discuss the subject of Missionary Societies with you in your paper, to which you very courteously assented. Since I wrote you, several changes in the "situation" of affairs induce me to suggest the postponement of the discussion for the present in the way intended, and to make the same proposition to you that I have made to the Review, as a test of our respective plans for missionary work. It is understood that the "society men," as Brother Franklin terms us, think it best to unite all the churches in a whole State, at least to do this work through a common treasury and a Board of Managers; you, if I understand you aright, think it best to accomplish the end proposed by smaller combinations—by a few churches—just enough to support an evangelist—or by a single church or by individuals. The Review terms the two plans the "society plan" and the "individual and congregational plan."

Now I propose that, before we make any change in existing plans, *you try the new plan in Tennessee and see how it will work*. I do not wish you to accept this proposition as a banter, or as coming from a debater, or as intended merely to offset objections to societies, for I am very conscious of the kindest feelings towards all the brethren who honestly differ from me in this matter. I propose it because it is neither safe nor wise to attempt a revolution in our present method *without some assurance* that the substitute you propose would do better. Tennessee is an open field, no society being in your way. Now, if you will all go to work and demonstrate the superiority of your way, I pledge you my word that I will then give it my influence in Kentucky, and can almost pledge the assent of all the brethren in our State. I say *your* way, for there is no more chapter and verse authority for the co-operation of four churches than for *four hundred*. God intended our common sense to fill its mission as to colleges, universities, endowments, missionary

work, Sunday schools, periodicals and many other "good works." This remark is made not by way of arguing the case at all, which you see is not my present purpose, but merely as explanatory of the expressions *your plan* and *our plan*, that there may be no unnecessary halting on these phrases.

The issue is thus fairly made, and the people will decide upon the merits of the respective plans by their respective results. If you and Brother Fanning, and Franklin and Creath will feel your responsibility as a committee of four to start the scriptural plan, and will accomplish more good in Tennessee, in proportion to your number, than we do in Kentucky, we'll give the subject a most favorable consideration. I have sent a similar proposition to the Review, and Brother Errett has submitted substantially the same in the Standard. This is the shape the discussion must take until decided by facts and figures, and not by theories and theorizing about what *could be done* if we had the Lord's plan.

Our State Society is working in more ways than one. Single churches, as Lexington, Paris, Grassy Springs, are sustaining evangelists alone. Four others are uniting to sustain an evangelist in the South, (not in Tennessee, for we leave that State for your experiment,) several counties are individually about to do the same, besides our other ways of sustaining preachers from the general fund. But mark it well; *It is the society organization that has waked up this activity—it's the society that's doing this work*. It is growing in efficiency every day.

I must be allowed to throw in one very important caveat, viz: You must be careful in starting your work not to trench upon our plan—must not borrow from us, for we wont lend—it must be a perfectly scriptural, chapter and verse sort of a plan, having no committees, must pass no resolutions, make no motions, have no Board nor Corresponding Secretary, even under another name, no conventions, no adjournments, no minutes, no President, no Vice President, for these are the chief elements of a missionary society.

The above, I think, is the true way of discussing this subject, but if you think differently, I still feel perfectly competent to defend the societies. But the brotherhood are now waiting to see if the test, the practical test, we have submitted will be accepted as a settlement of the controversy. You will do me the kindness to submit these to your readers, with any remarks you may be disposed to make upon them and believe me Yours truly,

THOMAS MUNNELL.

Comment.—We received the foregoing, a few days since, from the postmaster at Franklin, Tenn., where it had been directed, and where it had been, we suppose from the date, several weeks. Our address is, and has been for several years, Nashville, Tenn. We had prepared an abridgment of, and some strictures upon, the last report of the Kentucky missionary society, soon after its publication. We received a request from Bro. Munnell, about that time, to discuss with him, through the pages of the Gospel Advocate, the question of human societies to do the work of the Lord. To this we promptly responded that we were perfectly willing; and wishing in no way to forestall the discussion, we laid our article aside. After several months' waiting, the foregoing comes to hand, declaring "the situation" changed, and proposing to postpone the discussion, and the foregoing proposition made, which, when stripped of all its words which conceal ideas, means, "we will not discuss the right or wrong of the question whether God has left his work imperfect, and whether man can amend or add to the appointments of God for the performance of his work; but simply if our human plan, worldly motives, and politic devices (we are prepared to prove that these are inseparably connected with all institutions of human mould) raise more money and induce more individuals to join the party thus made worldly, than the operation of God's appointments bring into

the Church of the living God—then we shall be considered the Church of Christ, and our plan the approved one. If you beat us, you shall be declared winner. Bro. Munnell, we are anxious to treat with seriousness and respect whatever you write; but it does seem strange to us that a man professing to be a follower of Christ, should make such a proposition, when the sanctity and purity of Christ's institutions are at stake. Now, the question with us is, not whether a wiser and more efficient human plan can be proposed, but has man the right to invent new ones, or amend the institutions of God's appointment for the conversion of the world. We believe that the whole duty of the Christian is, to use diligently and faithfully the appointments of Heaven, and leave all beyond to God. The failure to accomplish a given object by the diligent and faithful use of all of God's appointments, is clear demonstration that God does not yet design the accomplishment of that object. There is a Providence that yet controls the affairs of men. The lead of that Providence we must follow, we cannot force it. By the test proposed—simply one of facts and figures—we can prove the Romish hierarchy the most divine and best of all agencies known to Christendom in bringing men to God. By the same rule we can prove honesty to be a vice, and dishonesty a virtue—nay, by the same rule, we will undertake to prove, beyond a doubt, that the devil is God, and God is a vile interloper and usurper. For after eighteen hundred, yea, six thousand years of teaching and preaching that God and honesty are right, the large majority of the human family serve the devil and practice dishonesty. We cannot submit the claims of the authority, sanctity, purity, and sufficiency of the appointments of our Father to any such uncertain test. We utterly deny this to be a question of facts and figures, but one of authority, involving many of the most sacred principles of the teachings of God to man. It is in this light, and this only, we can propose to investigate it. We will correct one error into which our brother has fallen. We do not object to his plan because of the number engaged in it. There is as much authority for a human organization embracing one thousand churches or individuals, as there is for one confined to two or four, to do the Lord's work. We object to all human *organizations* to do the Lord's work, whether they embrace ten thousand churches, or be confined to two individuals. We insist on the duty of churches of Christ co-operating in every good work; and when the work is of sufficient magnitude, it is as legitimate for ten thousand churches to co-operate in it, as for two individuals. It is the *human organization* to do God's work, to which we object. Because, in doing God's work, God's Spirit must direct—God's Spirit cannot dwell in human organizations, in temples made by human hands. The church is the temple which is "builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit," Ephes. xi: 22. It dwells in no other temple than that of God's own build. Hence, we are prepared to show the acts of service which these societies touch, have lost the Spirit of Christ, and have been perverted by them from their divine simplicity. Again, we can start no plan for doing the Lord's work in Tennessee, or elsewhere—would not for this world attempt such a thing. God's plan, as we understand it, has been feebly and lamely acted upon by us here for a number of years. That it has not effected what it would and should have done if we had been more zealous and faithful in operating it, we are free to confess. Yet so far as the result is concerned, in producing a zealous, faithful, devoted, self-sacrificing, and intelligent membership of the churches of Christ—were not such comparisons odious, and perhaps a violation of the law of God—we would most cheerfully invite a comparison. The plan upon which we aim to act is no new one—no untried one: it is your society—one that is the new, untried, unproved plan. Under the one by which we propose to operate, Peter and James, and Paul and Barnabas operated;

2

by this plan the gospel was preached to all the world, was sounded forth to every nation and tongue under the whole heaven. Its progress was unexampled, and is still the wonder of the world. By this plan the gospel traveled from Jerusalem to this Western World. By this plan, simple and divine, Alexander Campbell, B. W. Stone, Walter Scott, and their compeers, preached and planted the gospel in every nook and corner of our country. Under this plan, J. T. Johnson, in your own State, made almost as many converts, in one year, as your whole society, with its wealth of intellect and money embodied in two hundred churches, and acting through twenty or more preachers, in its most successful year, has accomplished. Of the great body of churches now almost encircling the globe, how many thousands of them have been planted by men acting as the embassadors of the living God? We thus refer you to the "facts and figures" of what the churches have done, of what they are now doing, and, in turn, ask you, by your own lame rule, what have human societies in religion to point to as their trophies? Mosheim (p. 141) tells us: "During a great part of this (the second) century, the Christian churches were independent with respect to each other; nor were they joined by association, confederacy, or any other bond than those of charity. But, in process of time, all the Christian churches were formed into one ecclesiastical body, which, like confederate states, assembled at certain times in order to deliberate about the common interests of the whole. These councils, of which we find not the smallest trace before the middle of this century, changed the whole face of the Church, and gave it a new form." This is result No. 1, of human societies in religion—changed the form of the Church, as Christ and his apostles left it, into that form that produced the Romish hierarchy, with its long catalogue of crimes and oppressions. Rome is still the fruitful mother of effective human societies for doing the Lord's work. The churches of Christ brought the gospel

d—then we
h of Christ,
. If you
l winner.
is to treat
t whatever
trange to
a follow-
a propo-
purity of
e. Now,
hether a
plan can
ie right to
institu-
the con-
eve that
tian is, to
appoint-
beyond
plish a
d faithful
is clear
not yet
that ob-
that yet
lead of
follow,
e test
and figh
h hierar-
l agen-
inging
ve can
dishon-
ile, we
doubt,
a vile
r after
usand
that
ge ma-
rve the
e can-
ority,
of the
ay such
his to
, but
f the
achings
, and
igate
into

which our brother has fallen. We do not object to his plan because of the number engaged in it. There is as much authority for a human organization embracing one thousand churches or individuals, as there is for one confined to two or four, to do the Lord's work. We object to all human *organizations* to do the Lord's work, whether they embrace ten thousand churches, or be confined to two individuals. We insist on the duty of churches of Christ co-operating in every good work; and when the work is of sufficient magnitude, it is as legitimate for ten thousand churches to co-operate in it, as for two individuals. It is the *human organization* to do God's work, to which we object. Because, in doing God's work, God's Spirit must direct—God's Spirit cannot dwell in human organizations, in temples made by human hands. The church is the temple which is "builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit," Ephes. xi: 22. It dwells in no other temple than that of God's own build. Hence, we are prepared to show the acts of service which these societies touch, have lost the Spirit of Christ, and have been perverted by them from their divine simplicity. Again, we can start no plan for doing the Lord's work in Tennessee, or elsewhere—would not for this world attempt such a thing. God's plan, as we understand it, has been feebly and lamely acted upon by us here for a number of years. That it has not effected what it would and should have done if we had been more zealous and faithful in operating it, we are free to confess. Yet so far as the result is concerned, in producing a zealous, faithful, devoted, self-sacrificing, and intelligent membership of the churches of Christ—were not such comparisons odious, and perhaps a violation of the law of God—we would most cheerfully invite a comparison. The plan upon which we aim to act is no new one—no untried one: it is your society—one that is the new, untried, unproved plan. Under the one by which we propose to operate, Peter and James, and Paul and Barnabas operated;

by this plan the gospel was preached to all the world, was sounded forth to every nation and tongue under the whole heaven. Its progress was unexampled, and is still the wonder of the world. By this plan the gospel traveled from Jerusalem to this Western World. By this plan, simple and divine, Alexander Campbell, B. W. Stone, Walter Scott, and their compeers, preached and planted the gospel in every nook and corner of our country. Under this plan, J. T. Johnson, in your own State, made almost as many converts, in one year, as your whole society, with its wealth of intellect and money embodied in two hundred churches, and acting through twenty or more preachers, in its most successful year, has accomplished. Of the great body of churches now almost encircling the globe, how many thousands of them have been planted by men acting as the embassadors of the living God? We thus refer you to the "facts and figures" of what the churches have done, of what they are now doing, and, in turn, ask you, by your own lame rule, what have human societies in religion to point to as their trophies? Mosheim (p. 141) tells us: "During a great part of this (the second) century, the Christian churches were independent with respect to each other; nor were they joined by association, confederacy, or any other bond than those of charity. But, in process of time, all the Christian churches were formed into one ecclesiastical body, which, like confederate states, assembled at certain times in order to deliberate about the common interests of the whole. These councils, of which we find not the smallest trace before the middle of this century, changed the whole face of the Church, and gave it a new form." This is result No. 1, of human societies in religion—changed the form of the Church, as Christ and his apostles left it, into that form that produced the Romish hierarchy, with its long catalogue of crimes and oppressions. Rome is still the fruitful mother of effective human societies for doing the Lord's work. The churches of Christ brought the gospel from Jerusalem to America—a society at Cincinnati endeavored to send the gospel from America to Jerusalem, and failed. The society of Kentucky undertook to sustain, during the past year, twenty evangelists, and failed—dismissed every one of them. The churches that had been taught for years that they were inefficient, and could do nothing, caught them in their arms and sustained a number of them. (See last report of Ky. C. M. Society.) I will not multiply other examples of contrast. Bro. Munnell, while entering his *caveat*, (which was entirely needless) should have remembered that in Kentucky this society, with which he proposed to test his plan, had not confined its operations to the society plan, but had endeavored to dovetail the Lord's plan into the human association; and that, too, to reconcile good brethren who had lost confidence in the human plan, from its failures, and to render it more efficient. I agree with him that it is "*the society plan*" *that has waked up this acting of the churches* of which he speaks. But, Bro. Munnell, was it not the failure of the society plan last year, and their loss of confidence in its operations, that made these churches come to the conclusion that they could do better sounding out the gospel by directing their own means and men, than by placing them in the society's hands? Is not this so, Bro. Munnell?

In conclusion, we simply submit that the churches have done and are doing the work of evangelizing the world. The societies are the outgrowth of a zeal that we think is misdirected. We believe that their organization is an assumption of power not warranted by the Word of God; but that the tendency is to destroy man's respect for and confidence in the appointments of heaven—to destroy the sense of responsibility to God, both of the individual and of the church; and in doing this, destroys the activity, devotion, liberality, and zeal of both. If Bro. Munnell wishes to test his society operations by "facts and figures," we will propose to him that the churches of Christ in the counties of Williamson and Maury, Tenn., have given twofold

2 A

more of means to support the gospel, and forward the work of the Church of Christ—have been more steadfast in the work, during the last five years—taking into consideration their means and surroundings—than any similar number of congregations he can find, acting through human societies, in the United States. We furthermore lay down the proposition, that these churches have given liberally and unostentatiously, in means, time, and devotion; just in proportion to their freedom from human societies and arrangements. We appoint Bro. Munnell a committee to come down and collect the "facts and figures."

"If these things be true, why do we not hear of them?" "Therefore, when thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the society men do, narrating it through the papers and the annual reports, that they may have glory of men. Verily, they have their reward. But when thou doest thine alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth; that thine alms may be in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret, himself shall reward thee openly."

But we have not a complaint to make of our society brethren. They preserve the fitness of things. In a human organization a human spirit properly dwells, human wisdom devises, human motives and human incentives fitly prompt to action. The human spirit and motive prompt to publish abroad our good deeds and actions, to let the world know how liberal we are. The human incentives excite us to give that the world may know and honor us. Hence, these human societies publish to the world their contributions, and offer "engraved certificates" in gilt frames, to hang in parlors and public places, for the edification of our human friends, that they may honor us. There is consistency and fitness in all this; but don't pretend to do it in the name of the Lord. The Divine Spirit, Bro. Munnell, dwelling in the divine institution, prompts us to do our acts of service quietly, unostentatiously, that we may find a certificate indelibly engraved by the hand of Him who seeth in secret, on the Lamb's book of life, of our acceptance with God.

We have made these references to what our brethren in Tennessee have done in no boastful spirit—perhaps in violation of a law of the Spirit. We know, my brother, that the best church in this State has not begun to realize its responsibility to God, as his institution for the salvation of the world, and, as a consequence, has not half done its duty. But do not charge our failures, weaknesses, and shortcomings to the imperfection and insufficiencyof God'sappointments. They are perfect and fully sufficient for every work for which they were designed. The insufficiency is ours. Instead, then, of mending and improving the Divine appointments, let us strive to improve our zeal, fidelity, and steadfast trust in God.

Your brother,

D. L.

A Hint.

We know of several persons who, though not in the habit of attending preaching, were interested in the subject of Christianity, went to hear and obeyed the gospel, during the past year. Brethren, if you have neighbors that will not attend preaching, induce them to read the Advocate, and it may result in their salvation. If they will not pay for it themselves, give it to them. And do not look out the rich and influential, but seek the poor to perform this work for. The poor are the more easily taught Christianity, feel its need, and are the more willing to labor and suffer for it. D. L.

Delay.

We have been unavoidably delayed in getting the Advocate out. With the next number we hope to be up to time, and shall try to mail promptly to subscribers hereafter on Thursday of each week. We ask the patience and aid of our friends and brethren. D. L.

Against God's wrath no house is strong.

2 B

come through an institution like this. No money can pay for such deprivation. No circumstances but those of utter poverty can justify you in denying these influences to your children.

The Days of the Week

The English names of the days of the week were given by our Saxon ancestors, who, you know, settled in England many hundred years ago. They were idolators, and named the days in honor of their deities.

Sun-day means the day of the sun, as on that day they worshipped an idol representing that luminary. This deity was set up on a pillar, with outstretched arms, holding a burning wheel before his breast.

The moon was worshipped under the form of a woman with long ears, dressed in a short coat and hood. She held in her hand a figure of the moon. Hence we have *Moon-day*, or our *Monday*.

Tuesday was named from their god of war—Tuisco. His was the figure of a warrior, clad in armor, with a huge uplifted sword.

Wednesday was the day on which the supreme divinity Wodin was worshipped. He was represented as a venerable old man, clothed in the skin of an animal, holding a scepter in his right hand.

Thor, the oldest and bravest son of Wodin, was placed on a throne, with a crown of gold on his head, adorned with a circle in front, in which was set twelve golden star. He gave name to Thursday.

From Friga, or Frea, the wife of Wodin, was derived Friday. She had a drawn sword in her right hand and a bow in her left.

Saturday was the day of Saeter, another name for Saturn. He was set on a perch, like a bird. In his right hand was a wheel, in his left a pail of flowers and fruit.

Of course they were all fanciful and

absurd, but they go far to prove that men, in the most ignorant condition, feel that there is a Superior Being, whom they must worship. Their superstition was, indeed, pitiable, but was not their blind devotion preferable to the thoughtlessness and neglect of many who have been taught the existence of a God? If we have more light than they, surely we should profit by it.

Societies.

From the following our readers may expect as thorough a sifting of the question as Bro. Munnell and the writer of this are able to give it. I hope we will be able to do it in a kindly spirit.

D. L.

NEW CASTLE, KY., Feb. 2, 1867.

Bro. Lipscomb:—As you regard the test I submitted inadmissible, I am ready to go on with the discussion. I propose that we request the Review also to publish our articles, and that we try to make it a good natured, close contest, in hope of developing the truth in the matter. Of course, if our discussion be worth anything it would do good to have it before the readers of the Review also. The matter is now before the public mind and may as well be discussed as not. If you approve of it, you will please sign the enclosed request and forward it on to Cincinnati. I would like to hear whether you do send it forward with your signature added to mine. I'll forward my articles as regularly as circumstances will permit.

Yours in the search after truth,

THOMAS MUNNELL.

"I have in my congregation," said a venerable minister of the gospel, "a worthy aged woman, who has for many years been so deaf as not to distinguish the loudest sound, and yet she is always one of the first in the meeting." On asking the reason of her constant attendance, as it was impossible for her to hear my voice, she answered: "Though I cannot hear you, I come to God's house because I love it, and would be found in his ways, and he gives many a sweet thought upon the text when it is pointed out to me. Another reason is, because I am in the best company, in the most immediate presence of God, and among his saints, the honorable of the earth. I am not satisfied with serving God in private; it is my duty and privilege to honor him regularly and constantly in public."

Obituary.

Died, on Thursday, February 1, 1867, of pulmonary consumption, in the 19th year of her age, Adelaide Augusta Davis, third daughter of Mr. Luckett and Sister Eliza Davis.

Thus, in the spring-time of life and womanhood, has our sister fallen. Many friends weep over her early grave. Long will we remember her sweet and cheerful disposition.

The writer of this knew her well from childhood. Her presence ever spread joy and gladness among her associates—all loved her because she loved them. No bitterness found an abiding place in her heart. Patient and resigned during her last illness, conscious of the near approach of the last great enemy, with serene composure she gave her last requests, and died as only a Christian can die.

But, father, mother, kindred and friends, let us not sorrow as those who have no hope. Sister Adelaide had done all that she could do. She had bowed in humble submission to the Savior, and endeavored to walk in his commandments.

Now it is our blessed privilege to hope and try to prepare ourselves to meet her, crowned with victory, and clothed in robes of spotless white, in that bright and beautiful city, where sickness, sorrow, pain and death can never come.

A BROTHER.

deavor to exhibit them. We recognize no authority but that of the Lord, and the Holy Twelve. They alone can open and shut; can bind and loose; can retain and remit sins. They alone can govern a church, or can construct one; and every congregation of believers founded, constructed and governed as they prescribe, is a Church of the Son of God—and nothing else can be. F.

Discussion—Missionary Societies.

Bro. Lipscomb:—Since you regard the proposition I made, to transfer the controversy about Missionary Societies from the pen to the field, as altogether inadmissible, I am ready to go on with the discussion as at first submitted. I now propose a good natured, logical examination of the whole question. I will send on my articles regularly every week if possible, but as I am full of writing and business connected with our "human institution" up here, I may fall below my expectation as to punctuality. Moreover, being absent from home most of my time, it will be impossible to respond to your articles as they come out, my mail not always overtaking me in time. I am not among the number who think enough has been written upon this subject, nor that the public mind is already sated, nor even satisfied. Nor do I believe it right for the advocates of the Societies, in the conscious rectitude of their principles and plans, to disregard the common objections made against them, weak and illogical as I think they are. The public mind must be informed—must have right theories to have right practices. The discussion thus far has done good, by reducing the real points of difference to a very few fundamentals. In illustration of this, we find that all opponents of the Societies agree in advocating *unorganized* church co-operation, and unorganized individual co-operation, and only object

to organized co-operation. In your issue of January 10th you would allow "ten thousand churches" to co-operate, provided "the object to be gained should be important enough to demand such a force." It is not *co-operation* but *organized co-operation* you all object to. Do I represent you fairly in this statement? If not, please to be very explicit in telling us what you do mean, for I wish to put myself in your place, and look at it fairly from your stand-point. I wish to carry on no unworthy logomachy, and desire to know the very centre of your thoughts on this question.

Assuming that you are not misunderstood, you will confer a favor by telling us *how you can secure co-operation without organization.* Our difficulty is, that we have never known or heard of a co-operation of ten thousand churches, or half that number, without some kind of an organization. It may not be necessary to have the *kind* of organization we have in the societies, but your views admit of no organization of any sort. You cannot have a general agent under any name for your hundred churches, to collect their contributions, for that would be a partial organization; you can have no common treasurer, for that implies an organization; you can have no secretary, to note the amount collected, and not a soul to tell the churches where their money had been expended, nor how it was expended, nor with what results, for no one is authorized to take this work to himself. If he is to be authorized, who gives him his commission? The Bible? Then show us the chapter and verse. A general convention of the brethren? That is a *human organization.* The members of your body can co-operate because they are organized. The faculties of your mind co-operate for the same reason. The members of a single church can co-operate because they are organized. How a thousand, or, as you would allow, ten thousand churches could co-operate without organization, allowing each church to be a member of the general body, is what the "society men" do not quite understand. If further illustration would be necessary, we might refer to civil society, to governments of all forms, monarchical and democratic, from the most autocratic down to the ultra republicanism of ancient Poland, and find that they can co-operate for no purpose, either good or bad, without organization in some degree; and the more perfect the organization, the more perfect the co-operation; while on the other hand as organization becomes feeble, co-operation inevitably grows feeble too, and dies on the self same day. Even the heavens would fail to co-operate in glorifying God if the various systems were disorganized. The same principle holds true both in Heaven and Hell. I am not justifying all organizations, for there are as many bad ones as good ones. On which side the missionary organizations will fall may be seen hereafter; the only point before us now is to determine *whether there can be co-operation without organization.* I will not decide it to be impossible till I hear from Brother Lipscomb. We "society men" would not know how to start the one without the other, and we crave a little light. We have organized to effect co-operation. If the machinery is unnecessary we do not want it, but we insist upon a little plain instruction as to the manner of the proposed co-opertion—HOW *to get at it—how to start it* without a convention, without a general agent invited by the convention to take the field, and without every other element of an organization. We cannot be satisfied by the usual platitudes about "God's appointments," "human organizations" and "worldly policies," we must have a real outright statement of a business-like, practical way of getting at the work of co-operating without organization. Nor will it do

to refer to any supposed "Scriptural plan" of a hundred churches co-operating in a model way without organization, for although you admit it would be right, we have no account of such a thing. The church at Antioch *co-operated* in sending Paul and Silas out as missionaries, but it was an *organized body;* and so all the individual churches that helped them on their way were organized congregations.

A remarkable fact has been noticed in the writings of all the brethren who oppose societies, viz: *an unwillingness to give us any business-like view of what they mean by co-operation without organization.* Bro. Fanning has been opposing Missionary Societies, I am told, for fifteen years, but never could be induced to submit a practical plan for inaugurating the work in any other way. The brethren would say: "Bro. Fanning, are you in favor of church co-operation?" "Certainly I am, brother." "Well, Brother Fanning, you are opposed to our co-operation, please tell us what you want, give us your plan." But fifteen years have failed to draw him out. Bro. Oliphant indulged the same unbusiness-like platitudes about the Lord's plan, without ever condescending to tell us what the Lord's plan would be for sending the Gospel to the Sandwich Islands, provided he should resolve upon that work. Of course the cannibal had better die in sin than be redeemed through the instrumentality of an organization outside the church. Even Bro. Franklin could not draw him out of his platitudes.

But Bro. Franklin after having, ten years ago, with a master hand, answered every objection to Missionary Societies that could be adduced, (for there has been nothing new offered since,) has got into the rut himself, and not likely to get out, but is grinding over again the same grist of objections that he once scattered to the four winds. I have no controversy at present with either of these good brethren, and only refer to these facts to *sharply point my request* that you give us something practical about sending the Gospel to the Cannibal Islands, or any where else, without some sort of organization to raise the means, and keep raising them, with certainty, every year, to support either one or one hundred missionaries in such a field. If the Bible furnishes the plan, let us have the chapter and verse—*please;* if not, tell us at least how to co-operate in a "human" way without organization, and you will do a work that all your predecessors have failed to accomplish.

Very truly yours,
THOMAS MUNNELL.

RESPONSE.

We confess to a very serious embarrassment in responding to the foregoing. We understood that we were to have a "close, good natured, logical discussion" of the Society question. Are human societies admissible for doing the work of God? Has man the right to sit in judgment upon the appointments of his Maker, pronounce them inefficient for the work for which they were created, and either amend or supercede them with institutions of his own?

We distinctly disavowed any intention of discussing them on the ground of expediency, but were willing to discuss them on the ground of authority. Has God ever granted to man the liberty or right to form institutions through which he would do God's service? Has God ever, in his dealings with the human family, permitted man to add to the agencies and institutions of his own ordering to render them more efficacious, when man thought them inadequate to the work for which they had been ordained? These are questions that properly and legitimately come under the investigation proposed. But none of

5

these questions are touched by our brother in his article, and while we appreciate the good nature of the article, we utterly fail to see its logical relevancy to the question at issue. Our brother wishes to see our stand-point. The negative of the foregoing questions furnish it. Suppose we utterly fail to remove one of the difficulties proposed, has that established the truth of the proposition that man has a warrant from his Maker to form institutions, through which he will do the work of God? You will perceive, Bro. Munnell, that our objections to your societies lie deeper than you possibly supposed.

In reference to the organizations, we stated distinctly that it was the human organization, which must always be animated by the human spirit that formed and controlled it, that we objected to. We can conceive of no body existing without an organization, on the other hand we cannot conceive of two distinct organizations to one body. God has organized his Church, his Spirit rules in it. When another organization is formed by man, it can no longer be the same body of Christ, and it must have a distinct and separate spirit to abide in and animate the new body; then it is a Divinely organized body that we propose shall co-operate with another Divinely organized body. One body cannot be said to co-operate with itself. Different members of one body viewed separately, may co-operate one with another but the actions of a body viewed as a unit, are only operations until they come in connexion with the operations of some other body, if the operations of these two distinct bodies harmonize together in the accomplishment of one and the same object, there is co-operation between the bodies. But if these two distinct bodies be blended into one, their works then become the operations of this third body, and not a co-operation of these two bodies. When you organize two or more churches into a society, they cease to be churches, for the one body can *have* but one organization, and all co-operation of churches is destroyed by this new organization, and gives place to the operation of the one new body. Two churches can co-operate, 1st. By one sending a messenger to the other, (this is Scriptural,) and through a messenger conferring in reference to the work that is to be done. 2d. They may co-operate in sustaining an individual, as the churches did Paul. By that individual's communicating with each as to his necessities, and each supplying a portion of those necessities. 3dly. One church knowing of a pressing want that she is not able to relieve, may send a messenger to any number of churches, to inform them of this want and ask them—not to meet together and form a society, and thus destroy the congregations, but to aid in this work, and they, as congregations of Divine mould, each may aid by sending a preacher, money, means of any description that will aid in the desired work, or if she has none of these she can contribute freely of her prayers for the success of the work.

4thly. A common work being needed in a certain point, churches may come to a knowledge of it without even the intervention of a messenger, and all guided by the same spirit that dwells in all Divine organizations, and *in none other*, are prompted to act by the same rule, and without previous concert a most perfect co-operation goes on under the direction of the Spirit of God. For instance, severe and distressing want has fallen upon our Southern brethren. The extent of this destitution was first made known to the writer of this. He at once made it known to the churches through the columns of the Gospel Advocate. A few churches co-operated for a time, others gradually began the work, and now more Churches of Christ are co-operating in the work of relieving their destitute

brethren than ever before co-operated in one special object in this country—and that without the shadow of an organization except the congregations of Christ. The number would have been greater even than it is, had it not been for your human societies, which have stood in the way of universal church co-operation as otherwise would have existed. I do not mean to insinuate that the members of your society do not sympathise with the destitution South, and are not disposed to relieve it. I have never believed this, nor intimated it, but other interests, and a cumbrous human machinery have hindered their work. It will be found that this unorganized co-operation of churches, without cost, has raised more means and distributed it in a few months than your human societies have done with all their paid agencies.

5thly. Every church doing the will of God, operating in accordance with his laws, will be found, under the providence of God, co-operating in perfect union and harmony with every other congregation that works for him according to his law—under the supervision and control not of a human association but of God himself in every good work.

A chief objection we make to your societies is, that they ignore the overruling and guiding hand of God, and organize a human association to do that which God has reserved for himself. God says to man: You operate according to my directions in the various spheres, and with the instrumentalities I ordain for you, I will overlook, I will guide, I will harmonize the various parts, and direct the vast complicated whole forward to the accomplishment of the designed mission without a jar or a discord. All I require of you is to faithfully operate the parts I assign to you. The action of the societies seems to me to say: No, Lord, we are not content to operate in the limited sphere assigned us, we will take a general oversight, and take upon ourselves the responsibility of harmony, and controlling the vast whole. We will sit in the place of God, and do his work. The great misfortune to the churches, Bro. Munnell, is not a lack of co-operation—but a lack of *operation* If man will only faithfully operate then, God will superintend the co-operation. It is man's work that is faulty and imperfect, not God's. But can we point out a business-like way of sending the Gospel to the "Cannibal Isles?" Business-like way, is like men do their business, accomplish their work. We did not know that God proposed to convert the world in a business-like way. Wise men, intent on the accomplishment of a great object, would scarcely choose a babe, born out of wedlock, cradled in a manger, as the efficient superintendent in the accomplishment of that work. Business men with such agencies as God controlled, Kings, Princes, potentates, wisdom and learning, would have hardly sought out unlearned, simple hearted fishermen as their agents to vindicate their cause before the world—with power to avoid it, would not have chosen the infamy of the Cross, and the degredation of the grave, as the lot of the founder of the chosen empire that is to be established, would not have made special choice of the poor and unlearned as his preferred and honored subjects for all time. This is so unbusiness-like that, business men, entering in strive to change it to a more business-like manner. Verily, Brother Munnell, the plan of salvation was not established in a very business-like manner, and its great author, according to human wisdom, was not a very business man. Hence God, Isaiah iv: 8, says: "My thoughts are not as your thoughts, neither are your ways, my ways—for as the Heavens are higher than the Earth, so are my ways higher than your ways." To endeavor to prescribe the ways of God's workings by man's ways and thoughts is the heighth of human folly

and presumption. 1. Cor. i: 20: "Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world." 25th. "The foolishness of God is wiser than men." 27th. "God has chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty." Verily, God does not propose to convert the world in a business-like way. When Brother Munnell tells us how the Gospel was sent to the Cannibal Isle of Great Britain and the Cannibal continent of America without organization of human societies, we will answer him how it may be sent to every other isle and continent of the world without them. The only reliable way of constantly raising means for any purpose of the Lord, is to do it as the Lord has directed, by weekly contribution. There are many other things that we might say, but we have written quite enough at this sitting. We would like to examine the society operation from a business stand-point. We ask Bro. Munnell to affirm the proposition at issue. Or if he is unwilling to do this, we will affirm the negative, and maintain that God has not authorized man to form associations for doing God's work, and that the assumption to do so is treason against God. If he wishes to investigate the question, "Are God's appointments sufficient for the work for which he ordained them? we are willing to discuss that also, but let's have one at a time. The Society question is before us.

D. L.

"Pray for the peace of Jerusalem." This is the teaching in one of the Psalms; and another shews us how to do it, by urging the following petition before the Lord: "Save thy people, and bless thy inheritance; feed them also, and lift them up forever."

Youth is the time to serve the Lord;
The time to insure the great reward.

Mar. 21, 1867

Discussion—Missionary Societies—No. 2.

Bro. Lipscomb:—To show still more completely the impossibility of missionary work to any creditable extent without "*organized* co-operation," I would invite attention to foreign missions in Asia, Africa, the South Sea Islands, or in any other benighted portion of the world. That a little irregular, home missionary work, hardly worthy of the name, may be done without the co-operation of even half a dozen churches, may be conceived; but even then the supposed four or five churches co-operating must have some common understanding about it, and a common treasurer, and a report made to them from the evanglist, or they would never know whether they are doing any good or not. If each church sends on their money to the evangelist without knowing what he receives from the rest, they can never tell whether he gets too much or too little for a support. The funds, therefore, must pass all through the hands of a common treasurer, like that of the mission societies. These four churches could not even be brought into their little, timid co-operation without some one getting it up, and this would be trascending the chapter and verse plan, for the Scriptures are silent on four churches co-operating for such a purpose. One church, that is its members, may co-operate together and sustain an evangelist a little while, but this they can do because they are *organized*. A single man may sustain one or more missionaries, because he is an *organization* in himself—the members of his body, and the faculties of his mind, and the affections of his soul all being duly organized co operate to any proposed end. But if his will was not connected with the nerves of motion and volition, and these nerves were disconnected from the muscles, and these from the bones, his body could do nothing; and if reason, judgment, memory, comparison and will were disconnected, there could be no intellectual co-operation for want of intellectual organization; and so of faith, hope, love and all the powers of the soul. Now, a number of such individual organizations unite to form a church to effect what each one, being alone, would fail to do. But suppose a work is to be accomplished which no one church is adequate to, such as sending a missionary family to the Sandwich Islands. He must have an outfit, his passage paid, his family supported entirely until after years of toil he raises up a little band to partially support him I will suppose that in Tennessee there are one hundred churches, no *ten* of which might be able to do this work. Or suppose you were doing a work in said Islands that would require all the missionary liberality of your State; how would Brother Lipscomb undertake to raise the means without co-operation of all the churches? You say you would not undertake it without *co-operation*, but without *organized* co-operation. Very well: then please tell us how you would do it without *organized* co-operation. Would you have a general agent to lay the matter before the congregations? If so, who is to appoint that agent? Would you call a convention, or a "consultation meeting?" That would not only be unscriptural, but would be a little too much like a Missionary State Convention. Would this agent appoint himself? Then let him show us his authority from the Scriptures. Would you get the matter before the churches through the columns of the Gospel Advocate? Who would authorize or even request you to do this unless you had your consultation meeting first? And even then, where is your authority for reaching them through the *Advocate*, for *it is one of our "human inventions."* Now I do not say the Advocate is any thing but a first class paper, but only

that like the rest it is a "human invention." For my part I do not object to human inventions if they are good ones, and I am glad to see Bro. Fanning turning a little orthodox on this subject, for when *commending the Canada Hymn Book* he pronounced it a very elever "human production," and thought it about as near right as "human genius" could make it. Much obliged to you, Brother Fanning. Hope you will build up your University, even if it should not be quite all Divine, for there is the Divine side and the human side to "every good work"—Colleges, Hymn Books and Missionary Societies.

But I am wandering. In the next place, would you have a common treasurer for your Sandwich enterprise? Or would each church send its own thirty or forty dollars in a separate package, at a separate expense, and a separate risk? This would preserve church independence, and prevent consolidation, and might be beneficial in other ways that you may be able to point out to us. But should you have a general agent, and a common treasurer, this would be half of the missionary organization and would necessitate the other half. But if you reject a "consultation meeting," that is, a convention, reject the general agency and the treasurer, I would be delighted to learn how you would carry on your Sandwich missions. Please inform us.

I have been supposing only a single mission to one place; but imagine yourself interested in an enterprise equal to that of the United Brethren, called Moravians—missions to Greenland, Iceland, Labrador, St. Thomas, St. Croix, Jamaica, Antigua, St. Kitts, Barbadoes, Tobago, Mosquito Coast, Surinam, South Africa, Australia, Mongolia, etc., etc. Missions, embracing eighty-nine stations, eight hundred and nine native assistants, besides two hundred regular missionaries; one hundred and seventy-one day schools, with 14,369 scholars; ninety-one Sunday schools, with 12,122 scholars; not to mention their "missionary ships," one of which, the "*Harmony*," has just "completed the ninety-seventh of the consecutive voyages performed by the Society's vessels" for the service of the mission cause in Labrado alone. I say, imagine yourself interested in missions to this extent, and ask yourself how you would carry it on without a convention, without missionary agents, without a treasurer, without a secretary, or a Board of Managers—that is, without an organization, and give us the results of your best deliberations, and if there is an "individual or congregational plan" for all this, we surely ought to have it explained to us.

I am not saying that the Moravians understand and teach primitive Christianity with accuracy, but that if *we* had such extensive missions on hand how would you manage it on what you regard as the Scriptural plan? You will not deny that we ought to do as much, at least, as the Moravians, who are only about 70,000 in number, not many more than we are in Kentucky alone. They expend about $300,000 annually on missions to bring the heathen to God. It may be the narrowness of our conceptions of the magnitude of the work of converting the 800,000,000 of Godless men to Christ, induces our inefficient theories and faltering work. What are we doing for missions on any or on all plans? A part of us are struggling to inaugurate a work that will result, we trust, in glory to God, (and a part of us are throwing every possible difficulty in the way.) raising, as a people, about $50,000 annually, and this nearly all spent at home, while the Baptists are raising $200,000; the Wesleyan Society of England $600,000, and the Methodists $2,000,000, and each of them gaining tens of thousands to their cause. But how do they accomplish so much? By not

being alarmed at a little simple machinery to collect funds—by not allowing a supposed Bible plan to defeat every sensible way of coming at the work. If we profess to love the word more than others, it is high time we were giving a better proof of it in this direction. The only point, however, I intended to make in this and the previous article is *to learn of you* how to secure co-operation, especially for foreign missions, without organization. To this please give your special attention. I intend to dodge no fair issue that you make, and I confidently look for the same fairness from you. THOMAS MUNNELL.

RESPONSE.

We might pass the above without a word of reply, so far as the question proposed to be investigated is concerned. Bro. Munnell proposed to show the authority for individuals forming a society to do the work of evangelizing the world. A work that God has committed to his church. God organized his Church here through which he proposes to convert the world. He tells his servants, that in this work they are to be coworkers with him. Tells them that they are to faithfully observe certain appoir tments, operate faithfully his organization, and the instrumentalities he has devised, and then through the working of these instrumentalities God will bring about certain ends. But some of his servants cannot see how God can accomplish this work through the simple agencies he has proposed, and propose to organize new ones that, in their judgment, are better adapted to the work. Is this lawful—has God in any age or dispensation ever permitted man thus to set in judgment upon the ordinances of God, and exercise his judgment upon their efficiency and inefficiency. If so, when and where is an instance on record? When God has ordained a certain appointment to accomplish a certain end, has he ever permitted man to add to it without visiting his hot displeasure upon him so acting. If so, when and where? Has God ever commanded a man to do a work without giving him direction how to do it? If so, where and when? If so, perhaps our sprinkling friends are right about baptism being of that character. Now we shall make no attempt to answer Bro. Munnell's difficulties and objections. For our faith is of that character, that we believe if God has proposed to convert the world through the agency of the church, although I may fail to see *how* he will do it, nevertheless he is able to remove the difficulties, and my duty is in simple, trusting faith to do what he has commanded me and leave the result with him. More than this is presumption on man's part. Now we can find numbers of instances, in which man did try to operate in a different way from that ordained by God. The Jewish people thought just as Bro. M. does, that the institutions of man, by which they were surrounded, were much superior and more effective than the appointments God had made for them. Bro. Munnell thinks the plan of our Baptists, and Methodists and Moravian friends much superior to the simple ordinances of God. The Jews thought the human governments of the nations superior to God's simple government, and wanted, like Bro. M., to be like them. But, my brethren, will you carefully read the 8th chapter of 1st Samuel—remember that this was written for our instruction, and take warning. Will you remember that Saul when he went to improve upon the Lord's direction, even with the design of honoring God, was rejected from being King, and through him the lesson was taught to us: "To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." 1 Samuel xv: 22. To obey God, then, in his simple appointments is better than to bring an offering of a million of dollars a year

without that obedience. The one would attract the applause of men, the other will meet the favor of God. Saul was rejected for adding to God's appointments, for thinking he could honor God in some other way more than in submitting to God's simple appointments. The shepherd lad from the plains of Bethlehem was exalted to his royal seat, because he refused to fight the Lord's battle in human armor, unapproved by God —but chose rather to use the, to human wisdom, inefficient armor of God's approval, the sling and the stones. 1 Sam. xvii. We might multiply instances, but this must suffice. Now, Bro. Munnell, if you had been present when the Lord proposed to knock down the walls of Jericho, with the blowing of ram's horns, dont you think you would have thought the means insufficient? Dont you think you would have thought it folly to be tootting around with the ram's horns, when they could get a battering ram, and in "a sensible way" knock the walls down? Dont you think you would have thought Saul's armor much more effective, sensible and "business-like" than that little sling and stones that David *would* use, because he was so much of a stickler for express authority that he would not use the more effective armor without the express approval of God. And Gideon, with only those three hundred, with the trumpets, pitchers and lamps, to fight a great multitude. Now, do you not think the whole army of thirty and two thousand, with their swords and lances, would have been more effective. God said the *three hundred*, the trumpets, the pitchers and lamps in them. But why stickle for "a thus saith the Lord?" Why not exercise a little "business sense," and adopt some sensible way of doing the work? We ask, my brother, these questions not by way of ridicule, but to point a request to examine carefully the stand-point you occupy. We are aware that the Baptists and Methodists and others do not allow a supposed Bible plan to defeat every sensible way of coming at this work or any other. They do not allow a supposed Bible plan to defeat a sensible and effective way of converting men at the mourner's bench, of making Christians of them by sprinkling when babes, or if grown, without submission to God's appointments. They do not let a Bible plan prevent fairs and lotteries. But, Bro. Munnell, we started out to let a Bible plan prevent our doing any thing at variance with the Bible plan; shall we be true to this our fundamental and distinctive principle?

Now we would most cheerfully respond to the question, How Christianity is to be carried into a foreign land by the operations of the church? were it the question before us. We only say to Bro. Munnell, tell us how it came to America, how it has gone to England and Australia without societies and we will tell how it can go to other points. How was it preached to every nation under the Heavens without societies of human organization? Tell us this, and your own question is answered. Tell us, again, why and how the mission of our Bro. Barclay to Jerusalem failed. and we will tell you why every mission to carry abroad the word of God in its purity by *human societies must fail.* The church has spread abroad the word of God, the religion of Jesus Christ, and human societies have performed the work of corrupting it. But to show how Bro. Munnell is disposed to depreciate the work of the church and appreciate the work of the societies, we call attention to his reference to the Moravians. He holds them up as examples to us, yet they have existed for at least four hundred years—have in that time, with all their wise societies and a disposition to look abroad to the neglect of home, increased to seventy thousand. Our brethren freed themselves from the corrup-

tions in which human organizations had involved the church of God about thirty years ago, and in the single State of Kentucky number as many as the whole Moravian body—have grown to a body numbering at least half a million, and this without societies. Is a soul worth less in this country than in Labrador? But we will cheerfully agree with Bro. M., that we are doing not a tithe of what we ought to do. A portion of us are trying to excite the spirituality and devotion of our brotherhood, by inducing them to highly appreciate and more faithfully use the appointments of our Father, and in those appointments where God's Spirit dwells to diligently seek a higher spirituality, a more earnest self-sacrificing devotion, we are striving to wean them away from the institutions of man, from the spirit that dwells within those institutions, and from a trust in man's devices, and to induce them to place their affections wholly upon the church of the living God, to be willing to deny themselves, and to sacrifice their all—soul, mind, and body, talents, money and affections upon the altar of God. So that through the spirit and strength that is imparted by a faithful submission to God's appointments, they may be anxious and prepared, with their lives and their money, to exalt this kingdom of OUR FATHER to the Heavens, and to extend it to the ends of the world. But while some of us are striving to thus exalt God's institutions, others of us—"chief men among the brethren"—are decrying these institutions, pronouncing them weak and inefficient, and are exalting the institutions of man unknown to the word of God, in which God's Spirit cannot dwell, as of superior efficacy to that church which Christ our Savior died to establish, and which the Holy Spirit called, "the pillar and support of the truth," and which is the chosen dwelling place on earth of that Spirit.

Thus our efforts, weak and frail at best, are counteracted, and we in endeavoring, under the guidance of God, to rebuild the walls of our Jerusalem, are compelled to labor, like Nehemiah, with one hand and bear the sword with the other, and those within the walls are exciting discontent and distrust. But, Brother M., you and I may fail, but this work will go on. It is of God.

D. L.

Brother M., before we can consider any objections to one or another plan, on the ground of expediency, we must determine the question of authority. Has God authorized men to organize an institution in which he can serve his Maker? Will you give a little attention to this question? D. L.

A Common Yet Wicked Expression—"I Hate Such and Such Persons."

We are occasionally pained to hear the professed followers of our blessed Savior give utterance to such an expression. Paul tells us, "that if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." We learn from the Bible that when we were in a state of rebellion to God, the Savior so loved us as to divest himself of the glory that he had with the Father before the worlds were, and to stoop to earth, and die the shameful death of the cross that we might be redeemed. It is evident, that if he so loved his enemies, we, in order to possess his spirit, must love ours; and hence, we should abandon all such expressions. By reading verse 11th of the 8th chap. of Romans we learn that the Spirit of Christ means more than a good disposition. Here we learn that Christ was raised up from the dead by the Spirit, and that our being raised to the enjoyment of Heaven, depends upon our having the same spirit. Let us be careful in all our acts and words here below.

T. M. SWEENEY.

Augusta, Texas, Feb. 19, 1867.

Mar. 28, 1867

Discussion—Missionary Societies—No. 3.

Bro. Lipscomb:—All opponents to the societies assume that the work they do is not done by the church, but by an outside arrangement that takes all the honor to itself at the expense of the church, and seeks to gain ascendency over it. This is the pith of all the argument that has ever been offered. The Advocate, a few weeks ago, charged that the Kentucky Missionary Society gave the churches no credit *as such* in the work done by the Society. This is a marvelously strange assertion for one to make who had the Minutes of the Convention before him at the moment of writing such a charge. It seems to me, Brother Lipscomb, that you are too much incensed against the Society to do it justice, for, taking the minutes of 1865 and 1866, from which you quote, every church, *as a church and not as individuals*, is credited for every cent they contributed. In the minutes of 1865, for example, 165 different donations are reported, and 158 *of these are credited to churches, and only 7 to individuals.* Does this seem as if the churches were ignored in the Society? Is this making up an organization independent of the churches? And seeking to gain advantage of the churches? A church is credited with the contribution if not half of her members contribute. The church in Paris we consider helps the South whether all her members assist or not. We do not, as our opponents seem to, assume that every member must be a contributor before we can give the church the honor of the work. On your principle I doubt whether there are ten churches in Tennessee that could be credited *as churches* for any good thing that is done, for it is hard to find *one* where *all the members without exception* take part in it. This seems to be a new law of interpretation gotten up by the opposers of Missionary Societies, and made to order for this very purpose. This law, as often assumed in the Advocate and the Review, by different writers, if not formally stated, has been implied in every attempt to show that the Societies are composed of individuals taken out of the churches to form a new organization. You say, "Let the churches do the work." That is just what we are doing. Is this satisfactory? In the report referred to, you will find Winchester credited $100, Grassy Springs $100, Bear Grass $210, and so on. It is true, that some in each of these churches gave nothing, and yet so resolved have we been that the congregations should be represented in it that we have put it down invariably to the church. In your co-operations in Tennessee, "without organization," does every individual contribute before you credit the church with it? Or if only a part of your congregation should contribute to sustain the minister at Nashville, would you regard the individuals that do give as operating outside of the church in doing that good work? In short, do you boldly come out and say that if individuals in any given church fail to do their part with the rest, this would vitiate the enterprise *as an enteprise of the church?* This no sane man would affirm. Then suppose all the churches in a State unite their energies and liberality for any good end, would it fail to be a work of the churches, *as churches*, because some indifferent, cold, or poor members had no part in it? Let us face each other fairly just here, for our readers are looking for a fair, close, hand to hand contest, and if any misunderstanding has existed, let it be fairly made out and corrected. The charge then that our Society is made up of individuals taken out of the churches instead of the churches themselves, is altogether a mistake, for it is most strictly a simple co-operation of churches. I cannot see what more you want. It is composed of "all those who contribute

13

to its funds" and these contributors *we count by churches*. Will that do?

With this statement before us as to the real character of our missionary effort, we cannot see with what reason all the offensive epithets of "human invention," "human institution," "human organization," "treason," "back to Rome," and such like are used, as if no brother were loyal to the great King, but those who could deal in such language toward such men as Campbell, Johnston, and all who co-operated with them mightily in starting the missionary effort among us. Moreover, our brethren should remember, when speaking of "treason" in the mission cause, that it has friends and abettors who are considered by the whole brotherhood as faithful, as wise, as learned, and as safe in counsel as any that can be found among those who deal in the above ill-natured language. We feel that there is much less treason in the missionary men who give their money and time to save sinners and build up feeble saints, than those who refuse to take upon them this extra burden, and do nothing for the destitute portions of their own State nor for those of any other.

One of the Editors of the Advocate says, the Canada Hymn Book is a "human production" as near right as "human genius" can make it. I cannot see how a "human production" can be any more innocent or acceptable to God than a "human institution," especially when the former is brought into the meeting house, and held as the book next to the Bible in public worship. It is quoted here only to show that when the mind of any good man is working unbiased, and not under the influence of any chronic opposition to the missions, it can do justice to the human side of every good work. We have in Kentucky $50,000, the proceeds of which support, at this writing, about twenty poor young men who are preparing for the ministry. This money was raised by churches and individuals, who form what is called the "Education Society," the business of which is managed by an Executive Committee or Board of Managers. Will Brother Lipscomb say that the "Education Society" ought to be abolished? It surely is no more Scriptural than a Missionary Society, and if the one is permitted to live why not the other? But if both should die for want of a chapter and verse authority, what should be the fate of the "Gospel Advocate?" Is it any less a "*human invention*" than the Education or Missionary Society? We have no Scripture for it—it was never named by any Apostle or Prophet—no periodical was ever published in primitive times—the first ever issued was published in Italy, by the Catholics, after the rise of literature in Europe. This make it *human* enough. Now if every thing human must fall, then down with the Advocate, for it is about as human as any of its class and has no claims upon the tolerance of a chapter and verse people. Then there is the "Society" formed around the Advocate to support it, consisting of its editors, *its agents*—for Brother Creath was its travelling agent without any Scriptural authority for it—and its subscribers. The editor is the president to manage its interests, the subscribers are the contributors, and Brother Creath a financial agent—*a pretty well organized society this*—formed principally, if not entirely, by individuals taken out of the churches, the churches *as such* not being credited with any part of the work. This is a little more "human" than our other societies, for they are simply co-operations of church. Then there is the proposed University for Tennessee. It will have a Board of Managers under some name. Bro. Fanning is its financial agent, and the stockholders will be its contributers, among whom perhaps very few churches will be represented as such—a plain

14

"Education Society" this, with all the machinery of a Missionary Society, and a little more "human." Then there was that "Consultation Meeting" in Tennessee last year, that had a presiding officer, a secretary, and assumed the right to *appoint agents* to solicit supplies for the South. Some body assumed the right to call this "Consultation Meeting" without any authority. Tennessee is a highly privileged State. for they can have Boards of Curators, Universities, financial agents, presidents, editors, weekly periodicals, and their financial agents and contributors—*constituting a "publishing society"*—can have a "Consultation Meeting;" that is, conventions, and their agents for the South, besides a "human" Hymn Book, the product of "human genius"—all these without the least example for it in the Apostles days—and yet the Tennessee brethren never feel themselves to have gone outside of the record. But when Kentucky does the same thing in principle, *or does better*, as she has the churches represented as churches in the missionary work—lo! she is "going back to Rome," guilty of "treason!!" This logic is delightful. I think it high time for the opponents of societies to drop all these broad gauge charges so easily made, and so hard to sustain, and come to particulars and not be so unwilling to specify their own conception of the Bible plan for missions (in foreign countries especially) and show us how they will inaugurate large missions in Africa, in China and Madagascar without a little of the same organization we have in the Missionary Societies. And when they adopt our plan they will see how to effect a co-operation of churches, each one of which will appear as an integer in the work, in its honors and rewards.

THOMAS MUNNELL.

RESPONSE.

We protest that as yet not one word touching the right of human beings to form societies through which to do God's service—the real question at issue—has been written by our brother. We are not incensed against your Society. We have spoken plainly of it when we have spoken—but have spoken at all only when called out by the friends of the Society.

We have no where made the assumption or made an assumption that involved the idea that every member of the church must engage in a work in order to make it the work of the church. So all the argument on that subject is pointless. We do assume, that when individuals go off and work in an organization distinct from the church, they are not acting through the church. Is your Society a co-operation of churches? Even if it was composed of delegates appointed by churches as representatives of churches. who met together and organized a meeting unknown to the law of Christ, it would be—if a co-operation at all—an unscriptural one; even then it would present the anomaly of one body with two organizations. Your Society was such, whatever that may be, before your last meeting. Your constitution, under which it met at its last meeting, prescribed that it "shall be composed of such persons as shall be chosen messengers by individual churches or by district co-operation meetings." See October 1st, Constitution Kentucky Missionary Society, Minutes 1865. That had a show of church co-operation—unscriptural, we think. Under it, of course, contributions were attributed to the churches. But at your last meeting you made an organic change. The churches are entirely ignored, and your *Rules of Procedure* prescribe, Art. 1st. "Its membership shall consist of all brethren in the State of Kentucky who contribute to its funds." Now how can Bro. Munnell say, that churches as churches contribute through an organization thus formed?

15

The 1st question in meeting, if you are governed by your rules to allow you, will be, "Are you a brother?" 2d. Are you of Kentucky? 3d. Have you contributed to our funds?" Now, suppose a brother answers, No, to the latter question. Says I contributed to the Lord's treasury according to my ability on the first day of the week, but the church sent me here to represent her. Can you admit him as a member? Not without a violation of your rules. Suppose some brother, good and true, who has spent his all in the service of the Gospel, whose piety, fervor and zeal are esteemed by a congregation, comes to your meeting, can he have a voice in your proceedings? He may only by a violation of your rules. Christ, in the condition he was on earth, would have to work a miracle—find a gold or silver eating fish, to be able to get into your Society. Peter and John, as they were when they went to the temple at the hour of prayer, might heal the cripple, but must pass by without being able to sit in your councils. Christians have no business going where Christ and his apostles could not go. We speak of your Society as it now is, not as it was.

How Bro. Munnell, with the "Rules of Procedure" before him as laid down in your minutes, can call the Society a co-operation of churches, we cannot divine. We think our brother is so enamored of his Society that he cannot see her faults.

We have not proposed to discuss Educational Societies or Publication Societies, nor to defend our own consistency. We are frequently inconsistent, perfectly conscious of it, but that does not make an organized human society to do the work of the church right or Scriptural. We have never objected to humans working to human agency; they are necessary, ordained of God, but we only contend that that work should be in God's Church, through God's appointments, as God has directed. We are be co-workers with God—if we repu ate God's plan—invent a way of our o and do the work in our way, we are co-workers with God. While they entirely irrelevant questions, we s will respond, that general education not a work God has committed to t Church. If Bro. Munnell will exami the proposed operations of the sch at Franklin College, before the burni of the building, he will find that it w announced that *religious* instruction a training for those designing to prea and others would be furnished by t Church—not by the humanly organiz board of Curators. If Bro. Munnell, our Society brethren had have attend meetings instead of, as some of the did when kindly invited, reply insultin ly, they "did not take *stock* in *such co cerns*," they would have learned th those calls were simply invitations fro some individual congregation for t brethren to meet with it as a church, encourage and strengthen one anothe that the chairman of these meetings w the Elder of the Church with which t brethren met; that the secretary w the scribe of the Church or some one s lected by the Church; that every thin was done under the control of the co gregation; that no resolutions we passed, nor votes taken; that the me senger sent, was by the church, with th advice of the brethren present; that n rules of procedure but the Bible wa ever felt to be necessary; that ever member of Christ, without money an without price, could find a ready wel come to the meeting. The effort to plac the organized, self-perpetuating socie ties formed by man, to the work special ly committed by God to the Church o the same footing as these meeting whose only organization is the Church o God; or with those organizations tha do not propose to do a work God ha committed to the Church or to the pub

16

lication of a religious paper, shows the conscious weakness of the cause. We have never responded to these objections because we thought the fallacy was so transparent no one would be misled by them, save those who wished to be. So far as the publishing of a paper is concerned, it is nothing more than teaching, exhorting, reproving by the written word, instead of the spoken. The Apostles set us the example of doing this. Printing is nothing more than the multiplication of the copies of the *written* word. Who says we have not example for this? It has no organization about it, but is the work of an individual in the Church, and responsible to the Church. There is no more organization than there is in one individual writing a letter to a brother. Now the editors of the Advocate are each responsible to the church of which he is a member for what he writes and does. If he slanders a brother, or sues a brother, the church will readily take cognizance of it. But suppose we conclude it to be our duty to sell the Hymn Book gotten up by the brethren of Canada, and the Trustees of the Society Hymn Book sue us, as they threaten to do. It is evidently a violation of God's law, who will take cognizance of the fact? Suppose a church does. Do you suppose the Society will not sustain the Trustees in defiance of churches, which are but "outsiders" and "work under" the Society? This will show the discordant operation of these societies with the authority of churches.

But we call attention to the evident change of base Brother M. has made in his defence In his 1st article, page 206, he says, referring to the position of the anti-society men, "of course the cannibal had better die in sin than be redeemed through the instrumentality of an organization outside of the Church." Thus readily recognizing the Society as an organization outside of the Church, but now he stoutly maintains that it is a co-operation of churches and not a Society outside of the churches. In the face of the fact that at the very last meeting of the Society, by action taken after two years deliberation, (for the change was proposed two years before,) abolished the church representative plan, and adopted one of membership of individuals, who would contribute money. He says, "When they adopt our plan they will see how to effect a co-operation of churches, each one of which will appear as an integer in the work, its honors and rewards." Brother Munnell, are you ignorant of the action of your Society? Read your "Rules of Procedure," and certainly you will never again make such an affirmation till you meet and make another organic change.

We have but little inclination to reply to the inuendoes of our brother in reference to people in "some State" not supplying the destitute of their own or any other States with the Gospel. We dont know who is meant, and do not think inuendoes and insinuations comport with good natured or logical discussions. The brethren in Tennessee have not done what they should have done, they have done something toward supplying the wants of the communities in the limits of their own State, but *they* know no State lines, occasionally lap over and do work in the destitute portions of Kentucky, and some times exchange labors with our brethren in Kentucky. Do not feel hampered by State lines or human societies. Three-fourths, we would judge, of the congregations in the States South of Tennessee, were planted by Tennessee evangelists, most of them have been crippled and betrayed by human organization men from other sections after having planted, who hired to do their worship for them. The congregations in Tennessee which do the least for the spread of the Gospel according to their ability, so far as known to us,

are some planted and chiefly taught by our Society brethren from Kentucky. The brethren in Tennessee, though themselves impoverished and pressed for the necessaries of life, while your societies were waiting to get a start, lent a helping hand to our Southern brethren, especially the preachers, the last year. Come down and collect those statistics we appointed you a committee to collect, and no more such slurs as you indulged in the foregoing will exhibit your lack of good nature as well as good logic. Our Tennessee brethren have never been rich as the case with the upper Kentucky brethren. Especially are they not rich now.

While human society men have been devising ways and schemes for raising money to hire men to preach; while wise, learned men have been philosophising as to the impracticability of reaching men in the extreme South without a large amount of money, a poor shingle-maker from Tennessee, much under the same circumstances that Paul left Judea for the Gentiles, was guided by the hand of God to the extreme Southern coast of our land, where, to an honest simple hearted people, he spoke the word of life, and within a year or two built up, with the aid of a few companions, eight or ten healthy working congregations of the Lord, several of them numbering from 80 to 100 members. More genuine missionary work, we will venture, than your entire Society in Kentucky did in the same length of time. A human society would never have done this work. Your "sensible plans" would have sought the chief cities and influential centres, and have squandered money and time in seeking the influential, while God guided his servant to his chosen—the poor. Madison Love was a true evangelist of God, that did not wait for human associations to guarantee a support, but in the strength of his faith, he went to the work, trusting in God. When he had not bread, he, like Paul, made shingles (for that was his craft) that he might be enabled to preach the Gospel. He was not old when he died, he had baptized over five thousand persons with his own hands. It is useless, Bro. M., for you to attempt to substitute societies to raise money to hire men to preach the Gospel, in lieu of the self-sacrificing zeal of the true Christ-like spirit. Spiritual power alone can do the work of converting men at home or abroad—Spiritual power is the great want of the Church. All the gold of Opher, the mines of Golconda and the inexhaustible treasures of California, were they at the command of the church, can no more purchase spiritual power than Simon Magus' money could eighteen hundred years ago. The experiment was made then. It is useless to repeat it.

D. L.

Aliens Department.

We have found that the church of God was organized in the city of Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, and it is worthy of note that all the forms of speech used to indicate it are in the singular number, thus: Kingdom of Heaven, Kingdom of God, Church of God, The Body, etc., etc. Where the word "churches" occurs in the plural number it has reference to the congregations worshiping at particular places, and not to the Kingdom, Body or Church, which has been the object of our search. Paul tells his Ephesian brethren, that "there is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all." Eph. iv: 4–6. The connection in which we here have the phrase, "one body," as clearly shows that there is but one body, as does the language "one God" show that there is but one God. But, in Rom. xii: 4, 5, we are told, that "As we have

THE

GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

VOLUME IX. { T. FANNING, D. LIPSCOMB, } EDITORS. { NUMBER 14.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, APRIL 4, 1867.

Discussion—Missionary Societies—No. 4.

Bro. Lipscomb:—In defense of our Societies Bro. McGarvey and I have, each, several times, affirmed that in Kentucky so far have they been from preventing individual and congregational action they have directly promoted both these methods. No doubt brethren in other States can say the same. This our statement, however, seems to be discredited. If our affirmation be not reliable it must arise from one of two causes—either we are not in position to understand the action of the Society and of the churches, or else we are both willing to misrepresent the matter in the public prints. Now, as it cannot be supposed that any one would think the former, nor suspect the latter, it seems to me that it is rather discourteous to keep saying that 'the churches have taken up this work without the influence of the Society, and, that too, because the churches saw the Society was doing no good.' The truth is, the whole convention knows, the funds of the Society last year ran down to about fifty per cent of what it had been the year previous, because we *had no Corresponding Secretary in the field* rousing the churches to action. So much for our partial want of organization that year. Another year would have run us on down to the Scriptural plan, they have in some places, of doing nothing for the destitute. But the impetus the churches received was communicated in our "Consultation Meeting" by the stirring, heartfelt speeches of many brethren, by the reports of the wants of the State, and by a realization of how little we were all doing to meet those wants.

Now if the construction put upon the facts in the case by the Advocate and the Review be true, two distinct, well marked effects ought to follow. 1st. The waning influence of a society in any given State, as Kentucky, ought to be accompanied by the rising influence of the "individual and congregational plan," for you teach that our churches waked up because they saw the Society was doing so little—the failure of the Society being the inspiration of the churches. Why then did not the churches come to the rescue when the Society last year was partly disorganized, having no financial agent? Did they do so? On the contrary, being rather disheartened for want of a unity of action they did less than before. But as soon as we, last September, completed our arrangements for carrying on the work, the churches seeing that a united movement would amount to something, several of them undertook to sustain an evangelist alone *as a part of the State Missionary work*. 2d. If the decay of the Society is the rejuvenation of individual and

church missionary work, this latter ought surely to show itself in States where no Society is in the way. This *may be* the case in some States, but I have never heard of it. It may be that Tennessee has more missionaries in proportion to her number of churches, out in her destitute places, than Kentucky or Ohio. I shall not be sorry to find this all to be true, but I can see no use in keeping it a secret, for we all want to know how it is done without organized co-operation, without a convention, a treasurer, or a financial agent.

Since, then, it is not true that the churches grow more active in missionary labor where the Society staggers, nor that they do more in States where there is no Society than where there is one, it cannot be true that the Society "hinders all church operation and co-operation," *nor that the churches took up the work more earnestly because they saw the Society was failing.* This charge will, therefore, not look very well in print again till the facts, the well known facts I have stated, are fairly disposed of.

I will now venture an affirmative which, if not true, the facts of history are entirely competent to disprove:—*That for the last sixty years—the age of modern missions—no missionary work worth naming has been done except by organized Missionary Societies.* England and America alone have about forty organized Societies, and if any one can show what missionary work has been done by these countries outside of these societies and on the individual congregational plan, we would be glad to see it. If such has been the result of sixty years experience of business men, is it likely that the next sixty years will show that such organizations are unnecessary? But it may be said, that "Sectarians of course would get up unscriptural organizations but that Christians should do every thing in a Scriptural way." But I would remind any one who would, by such a position, disgrace all logic that in some things Christians must work just like other people, and that our being Christians does not invite us to ignore all business principles and all common sense. Moreover, as far as *we* have tried it *we have found it* impossible to carry on our missions even at home, not to mention those in Jerusalem and Jamaica, without similar co-operations. The experience of other people in all *business transactions*, connected with missions, are and ought to be made useful to us, notwithstanding the oft repeated maxim—"We have nothing to learn from sectarians." The fact that they cannot teach us theology does not prove their business experience to be useless to us. As far then as that experience goes it decides, for the present, till the "anti-society men" give us a little more light, that missions, especially foreign missions, are to be carried on only by church co-operation. The legion of fallacies lurking in the assumption, that we must have a chapter and verse express command, or example, for every *method or plan* of doing good shall be uncovered in my next.

The impression seems to have got abroad, that the churches co-operating in the mission cause have dropped every thing else, and do nothing except what they do through the Society. But it must be remembered this is but a small part of what the missionary churches are doing. Their contributions to the Society is just *so much extra*, so much more than others do. They support their own ministers, and their own poor, and pay as much for meeting houses, colleges, etc., as the anti-mission churches do. They have dropped nothing but have simply *taken on more* than others. And although they have done this in the fear of God, and in love for poor sinners, and have adopted the best method that "human genius" could devise, when aided by all the light that has ever been

thrown upon the subject, they are still complained of by those *who have taken up no extra burden*, because they do not work in a Scriptural way. It is always assumed, but never proved, that the New Testament has described, minutely, either by precept or example, all the modes and plans of carrying out every command, and has stereotyped them for all ages. If we help the destitute, we must adopt the same plan the churches of Greece did to help the poor saints in Jerusalem. Hence the unbusiness-like trifling of trying to raise all money for all purposes—for salaries, for sexton, fuel and light, for missions, for meeting houses, for the poor, for colleges—by Sunday contributions, simply because Paul suggested that way of accomplishing a specified object requiring but a short time for its completion. In one of our Kentucky churches a few months ago where this weekly contribution had been talked of considerably, a brother, one day, told the minister he would like to give him a fine cow as his share of the salary. "All right," said the minister, "just bring her to the church next Sunday and put her into the Lord's treasury." All Bible readers ought to know that it is a book of principles more than statute-like specifications about matters that belong wholly to the province of common sense. God says, "Feed the hungry"—a broad command to be carried out as our common sense and "human inventions" shall best enable us to do it. Feed the hungry, whether your corn-sacks and railroads are Scriptural ones or not; form county organizations, appoint your agents, your shippers, and places of consignment, and even if it should require you to call conventions and consultation meetings it wont offend the Lord if you only obey the broad command. Even so, "Go preach the Gospel to every creature," is another of the same class, but the modes of travel, of raising money, and such like business arrangements are to be governed by the circumstances of the times. As for the specified acts of worship and the forms of ordinances the Bible is very clear and decided, but who will affirm that the *plans* and *modes* of carrying into effect "every good work" are all laid down in the Bible? This would require volume after volume in every succeeding generation as new nations, new laws and new conditions of society should arise, until "the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." Evidently, then, some margin is left for the exercise of common sense, unless we conclude that, though it is very useful in worldly business, it has no place in carrying out our religious duties. Revelation comes on down from Heaven till it reaches common sense and there it ceases to specify. Common sense then takes it down till it reaches the instincts of our nature, and this latter will guide us down to the involuntary action of the body as such, circulation, digestion and assimilation. Now just as this involuntary, physical action is intended to proceed without taxing the instincts, and these latter are expected to discharge their functions without calling in the aid of common sense, so this latter is not expected to trouble revelation with every trifle for which God intended it to be quite sufficient of itself. Each of these several capacities is God's revelation to man within a certain sphere, while the Bible is intended to reveal what is out of the reach of them all. Now there is no need of misunderstanding my meaning here, I hope, as I have simply stated the province in which God seems to have designed each of these faculties to operate. The chief mistake of the anti-society men is their effort to sink the Bible down to the plan below where God designed it to operate, and to make it trouble itself with all the business arrangements that belong to the province of common sense, concern-

ing which revelation has about as little to do as the instincts have with the circulation of the blood. Therefore whenever "human inventions" take the place of any command of God they at once become wicked and treasonable, but when they are merely our best methods of carrying out that command—such as printing, book binding, missionary ships, missionary conventions, consultation meetings, financial agents, religious periodicals, Sunday schools, colleges, railroads, telegraphs and such like—they are all right, and doubtless well pleasing in His sight. Another article may close what I have to say until I see your replies to these.

THOMAS MUNNELL.

RESPONSE.

The question of the right of men to inaugurate an organization through which they will do work that God has committed to an organization of his own appointment has not been touched.

When we were younger than we are now, we sometimes would fall desperately in love with the girls, when in this state of enchantment the freckles, splotches and warts of our charmer were all bright beauty spots, her silly freaks of temper, her excentricities and foibles infallible marks of superior genius and worth, and for one to dare insinuate she was not a perfect paragon of excellence, only to my eyes intensified her charms. We fear Bro. Munnell, you and Bro. McGarvey are charmed with your Society, and its deformities and excressences all assume the appearance of excellencies to you. We can't trust your judgment standing in the re lation to it that you do, that's all. A contest, however, has been going on in Kentucky between the church appointments and the Society interest. It has been going on in the mind of Bro. McGarvey, as any man can readily see, who will read his articles on the subject, penned within the last thirty months, and we apprehend to a greater or less extent in every thoughtful and conscientious Christian man's mind, not even excepting Bro. Munnell's. Now this contest does not necessarily make open war upon the Society; it may seek to incorporate principles into the organization that give more power to the churches and diminish the importance of the Society. Such an influence is manifest in the report of your last Board. The adopting of the congregational plan in the Society, giving the congregation a more direct control of her money and men, your Board say, "would raise a much larger amount of money and the aggregate of good be greatly increased." If this be so, why not transfer the entire matter to the congregations. The admission of your Board is fatal to your Society. Again: "It would satisfy the scruples of some good brethren, who doubt the wisdom of our present method, it would make the Society promotive of congregational action in the missionary work instead of being, as some allege, antagonistic to it." See page 11 of last Report Kentucky Missionary Society. Now here is all that we have claimed. The transfer to the churches of their own affairs will increase their zeal and activity. It will promote congregational action. It will increase the amount of money and the aggregate of good. Whereas the exercise of control of these matters by the Society will and must hinder all these. We have said nothing more in reference to their influence as destructive of church operation and co-operation. And while this stands as the unbiased judgment of Bro. McGarvey and the Board, of the tendency of of your Societies, we must be excused for forming a judgment in accordance therewith. Just what you say ought to occur, if there is this antagonism, did occur. Your Society's operations ran down last year, not because they did not have

a Corresponding Secretary in the field, for they put one in and he failed, but because they did not have Bro. Munnell, who has a peculiar talent for the work of making men give their money to the Society. From the report last year one would be led to believe if Bro. Munnell were to die or leave the State the Society must die. The success of God's appointments do not depend upon such fortuities as these. The churches saw the failure of last year—"realized how little we were all doing to meet those wants," (your own language—they this year determined to manage their own affairs and do more. They did not care to make an open issue with the Society, so let the Society go through the ridiculous farce of reporting the operation of the churches as a part of its work. But the fact that the church preferred to manage its own affairs to let the Society do it, is its unmistakable judgment that its own operation is superior to that of the Society. So as bad as the statement appears, your own Board put it there as the result of its judgment after fifteen years experience. Still more satisfactory is Bro Munnell's own emphasised, italicised statement, "that for the last sixty years no missionary work worth naming has been done except by organized Missionary Societies." Churches and individuals have done nothing. How does that statement talley with the foregoing, that societies promoted church operation? Now while the statement is *not* true in full, it is to some extent. The true, devoted pioneers of missions went without societies. Carey had no society to send him. The Gospel went to Australia, and is there doing a great work. What society sent it there? But it is true, undeniably true, that in ancient days the churches did spread the Gospel. Why do they not do it now in this age of missions? No other reason can be assigned than that *the human societies have usurped this work, and to this extent destroyed the efficiency and vitality of the churches.* To the extent that your statement is true it is an incontrovertible argument against societies as destroyers of church operation and co-operation. When you destroy man's dependence upon them in one particular you do it in every one; lower them in the esteem of the world, and render them not only indifferent for spreading the Gospel, but for every work that God has assigned his church.

Bro. Munnell says they find it impossible to carry out their missions even at home without societies, and the general complaint is, the churches wont give money without some human machinery to force it out of them. The churches of Christ in primitive days did give it, why not now? Is it not because they have never been fully taught their duty, and made to realize their obligations. Instead, then, of forming human machinery to raise money, which, leaves the churches and Christians in the same unchristian condition, why not boldly meet the case, and teach the churches that they are not converted to Christianity, and that their members are on the road to hell until the last dollar they have is subject to the demands of the Christian religion. Why try to spread such an empty, hypocritical profession of the religion of our Savior? It will never save a single soul from death; will deceive thousands to their everlasting undoing. The churches that are made never surpass in devotion those who make them. Go to work then to teach churches devotion to God instead of forming institutions that will enable them to spread without that devotion. If you will do this, the failure to have one good money raiser in a State will not depress and destroy the work of 70,000 Christians. The whole idea of the spread of our holy religion, as presented by the Savior, is antipodal to that presented by the Society. The Savior said his relig-

ion would work as a leaven—spread abroad only as it possessed a controlling and sanctifying power at home. According to this rule, no church could spread abroad a lukewarm religion; it must kindle the fires of devotion at home, then, by the power of its own internal spiritual heat, spread itself abroad. The Society proposes to spread it by organic power. The cold, lifeless churches, of which Brother McGarvey speaks, by the mere force of organization will spread their cold, lifeless, hypocritical professions abroad, and deceive others with the idea that such is Christianity. Christ or his apostles never made provision for the spread of such a religion. Christ in all his parables and illustrations never once intimated that his religion would spread otherwise than by pure spiritual power as a leaven. The whole society organization is founded upon a false conception of the nature of the aggressive power of the Christian religion. Your comparing, living self-perpetuating societies, that control men and churches, and that embrace within them men and churches, with the inanimate objects of man's use—such as corn sacks, railroads—is only trifling with the subject, and must serve to expose its weakness to every thoughtful man or woman.

Your gradation of the works God has taken cognizance of, and those he has left to man, whether true or false, fails to fit the place you have assigned the Society. The simple church is beyond dispute an organization of which God has taken cognizance—nothing bigger, larger, more extensive than the church, then could man dare reach up to with his judgment as he must make provision only for that that is beneath the notice and too trifling for the attention of God. But you state in the foregoing that the churches "undertook to sustain an evangelist as a *part* of the State Missionary work." Meaning a part of the State Society work. Now if the church and the church work is only a part of the Society and Society work—the whole must be more important than a part. So too the churches are spoken of as auxilliaries of the *societies*. So our Brother has man's works, above and embracing that of God; so man's province comes down in the Society plan until it meets God's poor, imperfect, inefficient appointments, and leaves a little circumscribed work for them to do, fitted to their weakness. Bro. M., you may raise money to sustain them, but you never can assign the Societies a position that does not degrade the churches of the living God. God did say the hungry should be fed *in his name*, the Gospel should be preached *in his name*. Find his name attached to or written upon your human societies, county organizations, fairs, lotteries or balls, and we have not another word to say. The looseness of your views of Christian work is seen in your allusions to railroads, ships, colleges, etc. I suppose by that association you are willing to see the churches engage in ship and railroad building, etc. Now the Scriptural teaching says to the church, do all the work God has committed to you, if you fail you lose your spiritual power. Do nothing but what God has committed to your care, lest you become self-sufficient, rely on your own works, become secularized and corrupt. Of the inanimate instrumentalities used, they teach us by the example given to us to use just such as are at hand, whether it be an ass or horse, a railroad or steamship. The dragging these things in, and putting your societies upon a footing with them shows a weak cause. The societies have assumed the place and work of the church, therefore, in your own language are "become wicked and treasonable." D. L.

The poor useth entreaties; but the rich answereth roughly.

Discussion—Missionary Societies—No. 5.

Brother Lispscomb:—I have received three numbers of our discussion, in all of which you assume that I had stated a definite proposition to be proved, and so far had not touched it—that I undertake to prove that we have a right to substitute "human inventions" in place of the commands of God. Of course, all our readers know that I stated no definite proposition at all, much less the absurd one you have extemporized for my acceptance. I chose at the start, as I still choose, to take the course that will best show our right and duty to labor on, and at the same time to reveal the inconsistencies of all opposers of missionary labor as it is carried on by our Society. In this it seems I have succeeded finely, for you yield at once, and do not pretend "to defend your consistency," being "perfectly conscious" of inconsistency, only claiming that this does not make a "human society right." Now this inference is true—your inconsistency does not make us right. I never thought of building on such a foundation; but it is acknowledged on all hands that, as a thief has no right to teach honesty, and that as an adulterer has no right to preach against adultery; so no man has a right to oppose a work which he, under another name perhaps, is doing himself. You oppose all "human organizations," and yet establish them yourself. You oppose a missionary "society," and yet establish a publishing "society," only you have not called it a "society."

You oppose conventions, and yet get up "Consultation Meetings." You oppose our having a Corresponding Secretary or financial "agent," and yet you will start Brother Creath out all over the country as an "agent" for the Advocate. You oppose our passing resolutions in convention, and say that you did nothing of the kind in your "Consultation Meeting," but some how or other you agreed to send out agents through Kentucky to raise money and provisions for the South; that is you "*resolved*" to do this, whether it was put to "vote" or not. Now if there is any difference between *resolving* and *passing a resolution*, it must be about equal to the difference "*betwixt the south and southwest side of a hair.*" What did you consult for, if it was not to come to some "resolution?" It must have been rather a funny "Consultation Meeting" that could come to no conclusion, determination or "resolution." I could think it creditable neither to the heads nor hearts of such a convention of Tennessee brethren who could come to no "resolution" about the poor sufferers in the South. I am happy to know, however, that *you did* "*pass resolutions,*" in some way or other, as the presence of your agents in our State with their testimonials most clearly testified. These agents we received and helped in their mission of mercy, and thought a great deal more of the Tennessee brethren for moving in the matter, even if they did commit the enormity of calling a convention, of passing resolutions, of appointing agents, a house of assignment for provision, and getting up about the same machinery we have in the Missionary Society for carrying the bread of life to the dying. Now all this was just as *human* as a Missionary Society, and has no more chapter and verse for it than the Society. I believe both of these efforts has Scripture authority. "Feed the hungry," is the authority for the one; and "Preach the Gospel to every creature," for the other—the *particular methods* of doing these things not being defined in the Bible.

But I am wandering a little. "Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?" You are horrified at our work, and are doing the same things

yourself, under different names or a little modified.

"Strange that such a difference there should be
'Twixt tweedledum and tweedledee."

In Paul's day a man had no right to preach against a sin he was committing every day himself; and allow me to say that, in my judgment, *you have no more right* to preach against "human institutions" when you are encouraging the same things, under different names, yourself, than a regular dancer has to preach against dancing. However wrong to go to balls, no one is expected to receive the reproofs of a dancer. The truth is, the dancer has *no moral right* to be obeyed in such a case, and if Missionary Societies are wrong, we must be corrected by brethren that are not daily compromising the principle involved, in their own work; and until you can clear yourself of this charge, it will be hard for you to convince our society men. Bro. J. Franklin is trying to pursue a "*consistent*" course in keeping very near shore. You will never catch him calling Consultation Meeting, for no man can unite the churches in any general enterprise for good without involving all the elements in our Society. Let a man just *begin to work* in any co-operation of churches and down goes his arguments against us.

You ask, "How can Bro. Munnell say that churches as churches contribute through an organization consisting of all brethren who contribute to its funds?" This is a change made, you say, last convention, which destroys whatever claims the Society had before of being a co-operation of churches. Let us see. In my number 3 I showed that for the year 1865 we had 165 donations to the Society, not counting the $4.379 contributed to evangelists on the field, and that out of these only seven are accredited to individuals, and 158 to churches. These facts you can meet only by supposing that we have made such organic changes as to preclude our working as churches any longer—that now we must make it all individual. Now look at the missionary report made since the supposed change, and you will find for the year 1866, we had altogether 285 different donations, and of these 273 are credited to the churches *as churches*, and only 12 to individuals. This vital organic change, then, you see has been misunderstood by you. Besides, as I wrote before, *and italicised it*, that while our Society consists of all who contribute to its funds *we count the contributions by churches*. Will that do? And yet every visitor from any State is, as a brother, invited to participate in our deliberations, though not to vote. It is altogether proper that those who contribute money for a given purpose shall control that money, whether they be stockholders in a University, or contributors to the South or to the Missionary Society. My opinion is, that if Paul should alight down in this country again he would find our missionary conventions very happy places, and if he had no money he would make a tent or two and give the proceeds to the cause, for he used to say: "What then notwithstanding *every way*, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice, yea, and I will rejoice." "*Every way*." Ah, that's the idea. Feed the South in "every way"—by agents, by county co-operations, by associations, by missionary societies, by individual enterprise, by "consultation meetings," by preaching, by publishing, by legislation, by raising money, meat and bread, by wagons, by cars, by railroads, by turnpikes, by collections on Sunday, by court house speeches on Monday, *by* "*every way*" FEED THE SOUTH. "Hold on there with your human inventions," shouts Brother Lipscomb. "You are not doing that in a Scriptural way. You must take the Lord's plan for it." "I want at least two columns in the Christian Standard," cries

Bro. J. Franklin, "before you go any farther departing from the Lord's plan." "Treason," shouts another. "Back to Rome," says a fourth, with many other pious admonitions, while the people starve on, waiting till they can be helped in a *Scriptural way*. The application is easy. You think "Christians have no business (in Missionary Societies. T. M.) where Christ and the Apostles could not go." But they would all be sure to come to our conventions and contribute too, if they had to get the money out of a fish's mouth. Indeed the Savior does meet with us every time, and Paul tells us to preach Christ "*every way*"—by individuals, by congregations, by county co-operations, by State societies, by publishing, by Sunday schools, and by every other successful means; for he was no cast iron sort of a man, adhering to no ironclad forms of doing good, and was as far removed, as is possible for a man to be, from all the hardshell, hidebound systems of modern times.

I must close by assuring you that instead of showing any "lack of good nature" by "inuendoes and slurs," I never felt in a better humor in my life than while writing these articles and supposed you were in the same mood. I assure you also that I never thought of *hinting* at Tennessee when I said some opponents of the mission cause did "nothing for the destitute portions of their own State nor for those of any other," for I supposed you would readily understand that I plainly alluded to Tennessee. I had several times in the Review and the Advocate mentioned your State as doing nothing in this line that I knew of, and you never denied the charge. I was throwing no hints Brother Lipscomb. I do not say you are not laboring in other ways, but in the way of *missions to the destitute sustained by your churches* you are doing, I understand, *absolutely nothing*. You allowed Madison Love, a poor shingle maker, to go and do a good work, but that was *his* work not *yours*. It cost your rich brethren not a cent it seems. Kentucky and every other State has had men of the same kind, but is that a missionary work of the church? Who sent him? Who sustained him? It is very *easy* and very *cheap* to issue *permits* of that kind to good men to go and labor, and impoverish himself and family, while the rich churches never contribute a dime for his support, of which they ought to be ashamed. Your regular preachers, also, no doubt do much good at home. So do ours in Kentucky, but the question is about *missionary* work in places where the minister ought to be sustained by the rich church at home. The missionary men do as much, to say no more, in every other way as the anti-men do; but they do all they do for the destitute *besides*. Whoever keeps his own family and helps the South besides, does more than he who merely keeps his own. But you will never, in Tennessee, co-operate in a missionary work to the destitute—you dare not—for it will involve a simple organization something like ours. The work would be right, but you dare not adopt the only means that would be successful.

THOMAS MUNNELL.

RESPONSE.

The foregoing we regard as a distinct declaration that Bro. Munnell, after all his promises to have a close, logical discussion of the Society question, and an expressed anxiety to see "the very centre of my thoughts"—objections to the societies—of his intention to evade no fair issue, now does not intend to discuss the only objection that any consistent opponent of human societies in religion ever made to them. To-wit: "The organization of such societies by man is unauthorized by the word of God, is a sinful assumption upon the part of man." Now if this question is settled, the whole controversy is settled. If

man has a warrant to form such organizations, we feel that we would be sinning in the sight of God, and trifling with sacred interests in chaffering about any specific form or manner of such societies. It is certainly a logical, a legitimate issue in discussing the merits of a religious organization, to inquire by what authority it exists? Brother Munnell plainly refuses to meet this logical and fundamental issue we make with him. But now tells us he promised to discuss no definite question. We hope Brother Munnell will never again speak of logic in connexion with such a discussion. The first principles of logic require a definite enunciation of your proposition, the major and minor premises, and then to draw your conclusions from these. From what work on Logic did you learn to discuss indefinite (undefined) propositions? That we should say was a new and unique work under the sun. If our readers will reread the articles that brought about this "so-called" discussion, but which turns out to be no discussion, they will see Bro. Munnell proposed a discussion of the Society question, which is nothing more nor less than, "Are humanly organized societies legitimate, for carrying forward the work of spreading the Gospel." He then proposed to leave it to the results of the present year's labor, that the degree of success in making converts and raising money might decide the question. To this we objected, and stated we were willing to discuss it only on the ground of authority. Is man authorized to form societies to do a work God has committed to his church? To this Bro. Munnell consented, by agreeing to proceed with the discussion without a word of objection to our condition. He either accepted that proposition for the discussion, or he did not act frankly in the matter. Discuss an indefinite proposition? Why, Bro. Munnell, we have not got sense enough to state an "indefinite" proposition, much less to discuss it. Again: is there any logic in showing your opponent inconsistent? Logicians tell us this is a "specious sophism," by which we may turn attention from the weakness of our cause and excite prejudice against an opponent. Is that what Bro. Munnell is attempting?" We did not say that we were inconsistent on the subject of human organizations in religion. The insinuation that we did, is untrue, on the other hand we showed that what Bro. Munnell tried to make appear was as bad as his societies were not human organizations for religious purposes. Bro. Munnell may attempt to ridicule and carricature them as he wishes, but ridicule is not a *logical* weapon, but an illogical sophism, to excite prejudice, when argument fails. A logical discussion was what you promised us, Brother Munnell. We said we were conscious of inconsistencies a hundred times a day to remove all room for quibbling about what we were doing in Tennessee, for that had not one thing to do with the question under discussion. Bro. Munnell thinks he has gained a wonderful triumph by this statement. We state to him, that only the *perfect one is* consistent. We have never been so presumptuous as to believe that we had attained to that state, and we pray our Father "keep us back from presumptuous sin." Your statements about our organizations, sending our Bro. Creath, etc., are as devoid of truth as of a proper use of words. We never sent him or asked him to go at all—were glad of the aid he voluntarily gave us.

We made a resolution to obey God before we submitted to him, so have never had to "resolve," we would or would not do any thing God commanded us. Our only inquiry at our meetings, has been, what is God's will on any given subject, our meetings are for this purpose—to learn God's will and elicit facts, when this is done, the "resolution" un-

der which we act was passed when we swore allegiance to our King. Come down, Bro. Munnell, at the next meeting and you will learn something. We state, once for all, that your Society has never met or transacted business under the new "Rules of Procedure." You contributed last year and met under your old constitution. Under that you counted by churches. I was present when your present rules were introduced and know the intention was to do away with the church representation plan. After doing away with it, and adopting Rules of Procedure, which constitute the Society, of those brethren who contribute to its funds, to act by or as churches will be to commit an act of self-stultification. The assumption that Paul or Peter would meet with you, or that Christ does, has just as much evidence in its support as the assumption that they would or do meet with those at a Methodist mourning bench or in a Presbyterian Synod. When here on earth they *did* not meet with such organizations. This is a significant truth.

Your statement, that our churches in Tennessee, as such, are doing nothing for preaching to the destitute places, like your other statements concerning our operations, is without foundation. We thought we plainly contradicted this in a preceding number. Our churches in Tennessee before the war were poor, compared with yours, we apprehend, taking the amount of property into consideration, fifty dollars would have been then a more liberal contribution from an average one of our congregations than five hundred dollars from an average one of yours. During and since the war they have many of them been scarcely a remove from a state of absolute want, bordering on starvation. We have been to some of our wealthiest congregations, and found the wealthiest members of them with all their corn to last through a season, to feed their families and a horse, hid under the bed, "hid from the missionaries that some of your Christian (?) human societies sent to our destitute." Others of them were without a mouthful of meat for three or four months at a time. Were your churches in this condition, how much would they give, Brother Munnell? Yet in the years sixty three and four, four or five of these impoverished congregations raised about four thousand five hundred dollars to purchase homes for two of our tried and proved evangelists, to-wit: E. G. Sewell and R. B. Trimble, and have since had those farms cultivated for them, to make provision for their families that they might preach, *wherever* they found an opening. The church at Murfreesboro last year we have understood sustained Brother W. H. Goodloe, with the express understanding that he should give a goodly portion of his time to the destitute places. Under his labors a church was planted in Shelbyville, Tenn., that promises to do well. Other churches were planted, and foundations laid for still others in places that were destitute. We have not known a congregation in Tennessee for years to demand as a condition of its support, that the evangelist should devote his time to that congregation or its vicinity. We have never felt that a preacher was necessary to the life of a church. But the preference has always been that he should labor where he could find openings in destitute places. We mention those three cases as coming directly under my knowledge in the three adjoining counties. We doubt not but that a similar spirit prevails in the other counties. We know work is done among the destitute in other sections of the State. We doubt not but that two-fold more of labor to the destitute has been done in Tennessee, according to the number and wealth of the brethren, within the last ten years than has been done in Kentucky or Ohio. The only

thing is, the brethren do not make great swelling reports of their good works, to be seen of men. Come down and collect the statistics, and make a report for us, you understand that business, we do not.

Bro. Munnell, with his usual looseness of application of Scriptures and principles, quotes Paul—Philippians i: 18,—"What then! notwithstanding every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice." As evidence that Paul would aid in building up human societies for spreading the Gospel. Now Paul has been speaking of some who preach the Gospel of envy, to torture and afflict him, he rejoices that the Gospel is preached, not that they envy him and wish to torture him. To have any applicability to the present case, it must be proved that Paul was in favor of exciting envy, and building up an organization to prosecute him, before it can have any bearing on this subject. As much as I oppose human organizations to do God's work, I know they preach the Gospel sometimes. I know Methodists do the same, I know Roman Catholics do the same, and I rejoice when any of them do this. But must Paul be anxious to excite and cultivate envy and hatred against himself; must I labor to build up Methodism or Romanism, or any other human organization that is unscriptural, because I rejoice that amid much evil, they sometimes preach the Gospel. An association of gamblers, in Nashville, contributed largely to the relief of the destitute. I rejoiced at this work of theirs, but must I, therefore, encourage and build up this association of gamblers. I know that by breaking down Romanism or any other human organization, and substituting the Church of God in its place, the Gospel will not be preached less—but the other evils will be avoided. Then I can rejoice at what good your Society has done, and at the same time protest against its degradation of the appointments of God, and on the same principle that Paul rejoiced at the preaching of the Gospel from envy, yet endeavored to destroy the envious spirit, and substitute for it a spirit of love, just as I would destroy the association of gamblers and substitute instead a Church of God. It is irrelevant, yet as I am hopeless of a discussion of the only issue I make, I will protest against so anti-Christian an idea as is presented in the proposition. In Christianity those who contribute money shall control that money. The same idea is presented by President Pendleton in his address at Cincinnati. This at once builds up a moneyed aristocracy in the church. The poor man who contributes nothing save his earnest prayers, can have no voice in the church or its operations. If these societies are merely worldly institutions, professing no submission to God's law, the principle may be right. We have not a word to say in reference to the government of such. But if they are any part or parcel of the Church of Christ, or profess to be governed by the law of God as his institution, it is subversive of every principle of Divine order in reference to such matters. If this be true, the few moneyed men control the Church of God, and the poor—God's elect—have no part nor lot in its operations. The apostles could have had no voice in the operations of the church at Jerusalem on this principle. They gave nothing. The true principle laid down in the Scriptures is, that all should contribute of the Lord's money in their possession to the Lord's treasury, and then the body, as a whole, every member in its legitimate sphere, the head, hands and feet, uses that means as belonging to the Lord, not to any member. The Elders and Deacons especially are the organs of the church, controlling and dispens-

ing this means, and if they are Scriptural ones, they will not often be of the wealthier moneyed class. We enter then our solemn protest against so deadly an influence as this idea will carry to all Christian equality and brotherly love in the church. It will exalt the rich and cast down the poor and drive them from the church. It will honor men, give place and influence in the Kingdom of Him who was poor and had not where to lay his head, solely on the ground of being unlike their King—they are rich. A moneyed influence controlling God's church! Oh, shame on such an idea.

We must say in conclusion, we commenced this discussion with the hope that the issues we make would be fairly met. If we cannot discuss the question, by what authority these Societies exist, it will be profitless. We have never seen that question discussed. Bro. Munnell says our proposition is absurd, yet as absurd as he pronounces it, we are willing to undertake to prove that this proposition is the foundation of the Society which he is laboring to uphold.

Will you meet the question? Let us be definite. We will undertake to prove,

1st. All assumption upon the part of man or men to form organizations or to amend, modify, or form new combinations of the appointments of God to spread the Gospel, or do any other work that God has committed to the Church is anti-scriptural, and embodies a rebellion against God.

2d. The organizations known as the Christian Missionary Societies are such organizations, and as such constitute a rejection of God's appointment and a rebellion against God.

Will you meet these issues? We will affirm both, and promise a Scriptural and logical support of them. The discussion of the question is of your seeking, and I feel that a mere quibbling about my or your inconsistencies is trifling with the sacred principles at issue and unworthy of men seeking truth. If you prove me inconsistent, what principle will that establish? What benefit to the world? If we cannot discuss questions of more profit we had better cease. Your articles heretofore have been more of attacks upon the efficiency of the church and its ordinances than any thing else. We do not say that you intended to depreciate them, but no man can defend the human organizations save by depreciating the church. We never recollect to have read a series of articles by a professor of Christianity, even in defence of Creeds, that more constantly depreciated the efficiency and power of God's appointments, or that more persistently ignored the power and providence of God than your articles have done. The sin of the last age was, to deny or ignore the agency of man in the work of conversion. The sin of the present is the opposite extreme, to ignore the work and agency of God in the conversion of the world. Hence when you and your Society *confreres* say that such and such a work cannot be accomplished by such an agency, when God bas appointed that agency through which he will accomplish the work, you simply ignore God's presence and providence in his appointment, or you deny his power.

D. L.

Affliction.

We regret much to learn that our Bro., Dr. S. Bowling, is detained at home by the continued affliction of his wife, so that he is unable to spend the time in preaching as he wished. We learn from him that his wife is nigh unto death, with consumption. He has our hearty sympathies and earnest prayers in his affliction and harrassment. May he be able to look to Him who is able to comfort and succor his distressed and downcast children.

D. L.

For I give you good doctrine, forsake ye not my law.

THE

GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

VOLUME IX. { T. FANNING, D. LIPSCOMB, } EDITORS. { NUMBER 19.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, MAY 9. 1867.

Discussion—Missionary Societies—No. 6.

Brother Lipscomb:—On page 248 you observe, "We have not proposed to discuss Education Societies or Publication Societies, nor to defend our own consistency." This remark grew out of my having charged you with getting up "human inventions," the same in principle as the Missionary Society. I showed that, therefore, all your opposition to this cause is inconsistent, and that a large portion of all the good you will do in life necessitates arrangements similar to ours; that you do "invent a way of your own," and do God's work in "your own way." You say your Consultation Meeting was a simple "invitation from an individual congregation for the brethren to meet with it, as a church, to encourage and strengthen one another." Well, where is your chapter and verse for that? That meeting had a "Chairman," you say; it had a "Secretary." Then you sent your agents abroad. What authority had that church to call in others for consultation? What authority had that "chairman" for presiding over members of another church, or members of a dozen other churches? This is a perfectly human arrangement. Now remember, I believe this was all right, and that the Bible duty of feeding the hungry justifies and *demands* your adopting the means adequate to that end. So I believe we are to use all means in our reach in order to carry out the command, "preach the gospel to every creature."

Now let me ask if, in your "Consultation Meeting," and your subsequent work for the South, you all had to get out of the church and build up an outside institution to do that good work? Did Brother Metcalfe get out of the church in order to make his rooms a house of consignment? Did you all get out of the church before you could send out agents to gather food? What a beautiful ideal you must have of the church! No good work can be carried on by the co-operation of a number of churches *inside* the church, for if all the Christians in the State were assembled to devise means for doing good, and should find it necessary to have a "Chairman" and a "Secretary," they at once become a "human organization." The only escape you have from this predicament is in the consoling fact that your chairman was "an Elder of the church with which the brethren met," and that your Secretary was the regular "Scribe of the church." The Elder had a right to preside over his own members, but what scripture authority he had to preside over the other brethren present, you do not condescend to inform us. Or what right that "Secretary" or "Scribe

of the church" had to act for other brethren, is equally left in the dark. The truth is, in a general convention like that, the brethren from a distance have just as good a right to elect a President and Secretary as the church with which they meet, for they often outnumber the church members present.

Again: What right, according to your views, had those brethren from a distance to act at all away from home, from their churches? Were they in an organized condition when in that convention *as individuals?* Their church organization was left at home. At the convention they were not in their respective organizations. Was their action an action of their churches? You may say *yes* or *no*, as you choose. If you say *no*, then you were inducing them to work *outside* of their churches. If you say their action as delegates was the action of their churches, then these churches had just as good a right to have the Chairman and Secretary from their number as had the church with which they met. So then there was no great merit in having the "Chairman" and "Secretary" from the members of one church more than another. It seems that one church assumed the right to control all the rest. Rome like, if you correctly represent them. So you see you cannot escape from the charge of getting up a human invention in no respect more innocent than a Missionary Society. We meet with one church also. We invite the other churches all to come as many as can. The President of our "Consultation Meeting" is a member of that church. So is the Secretary. Our agents are not. Neither were yours. Our agents go out to furnish the bread of eternal life; yours to furnish the bread of this life; both good, both work on the same principle. They both are human and are both divine.

So much has been said about "*human* institutions," "*human* inventions," "*human* organizations," and so on, that I will now pay a little attention to these threadbare expressions. These phrases are not objectionable in themselves, only they are often used by our opponents in an offensive way. To this, however, I pay no attention, for I like all human inventions that work out the good of man and the glory of God—such as Sunday schools, printing presses, missionary ships, Consultation Meetings, Missionary Societies. Let us now see how much of the missionary effort is human, and how much of it is divine. We'll give the divine elements in it, and all the rest you may have for human; for every good work on earth must be *partly* human; even the Gospel Advocate is *a little* human.

First then: The gospel we are trying to have preached is *divine;* the salvation offered is *divine;* the men who preach it are "partakers of the *divine* nature;" the churches that give the money are *divine* organizations; the individual members are all born again, are *divine;* the work of saving sinners is divine; the building up of weak churches is *divine;* the comfort, strength and courage inspired in our conventions are all divine. The Society itself cannot all be a human invention.

Secondly: Our flesh and blood assembled in convention are human; so are yours in your Consultation Meetings. The judgment we form about the best means of doing good is human; so is yours. The month, the week, the day and the hour we appoint for our conventions are the result of our best "human" judgment; and just so with you. The rules for conducting the business of a public meeting are human; you also are governed by Jefferson's Manual or similar rules, or do worse. In short, all the work that God has left to our common sense may be called human in one sense of the term, and yet even this may be called divine when done to the glory of

God. Now my impression is, that there is no more of the "human" in our effort than in yours, and perhaps no more in either than is necessary to carry out the work assigned us. Please to observe once for all—*that wherever God has given the form of doing any given work or of obeying any ordinance we have in election, we must obey that form, as in baptism;* but the manner, or method, or form of doing our good works is very seldom mentioned in the Bible. Feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and preach the gospel to the poor, are generic commands that do not specify the plan of doing them; nor have we any example in the scriptures that binds us to any one form of obeying these commands. This we have often affirmed, and you have never attempted to prove us wrong, except by repeating the same threadbare platitudes about our "repudiating God's plan," "inventing a way of our own," and such like. We fail altogether to draw you out into any specifications as to the Bible plan. Why dont you teach us a little? We are waiting, anxious, impatient to learn.

To show how loosely you all reason about this matter, you say in your "Consultation Meeting" you had "no rules of procedure but the Bible." Now this I deny most positively, and if you do not now show your Bible authority for your action, your readers will have a right to hold you utterly defeated on this point. It will be necessary then for you to show *chapter and verse* for having a "President" *over such a meeting;* for having a "Secretary" for such a meeting, and for having such a "Consultation Meeting" at all. It will never do to say that an elder has a right to preside over all meetings of the church, for this was not an ordinary meeting of the church, but *of a convention* of churches. I'll argue this no farther just now, but will wait, and will ask the reader to wait to see what chapter and verse you will quote. Please dont give us some platitude for an answer, for these are all worn out. Brother Oliphant, of Canada, wore them all out ten years ago, and they no longer satisfy the mind that is reasoning close to a point. You say you had "no rules of procedure but the Bible." Now we'll hear from you what the Bible says about the *time* of your meeting, your *President*, your *Secretary*, your *agents* your *depot* for provisions, your "*resolutions*," (for you did pass resolutions as I showed in my last,) and all the human parts of your action. Please dont put us off with any thing less than chapter and verse, as the Bible has all your "rules of procedure" in it.

You will please allow me to say, that I was told by one that attended your "Consultation Meeting," that you all were greatly perplexed in your business meeting in trying to avoid any thing like a missionary convention. Hence the name *Consultation Meeting* instead of *convention.* You could pass no *resolution in the ordinary way*, lest that should resemble the Missionary Society, and so as respects other phases of your meeting. But changing the name does not alter the thing itself. You came very near a human organization you must admit. It reminds me of the remark of a little boy, whose mother had told him it was very wrong to whistle on the holy Sabbath. So one Sunday the thoughtless little fellow, before he knew it, had his lips fixed to whistle. His pious mother seeing his danger cried out, "Oh my little son, have you broken the commandment?" "No mother, said he "I didn't break it, but I—I *cracked* it." If your convention did not actually break the commandment, it at least cracked it.

Yours most truly,

THOMAS MUNNELL.

RESPONSE.

RUSSELLVILLE, KY., April 19, 1867.

Dear Brother Munnell:—Your Article, No. 6, is to hand. It and the others you

have written so utterly fail to touch the only issue that I would or could make in reference to the societies, that I feel it to be a trespass upon our readers to continue a merely evasive logomachy. I have no ambition to prove you inconsistent, nor the least pride to be hurt should you prove me to be inconsistent in the application of those principles that I hold sacred. Were you to show my inconsistency in any point I should be glad of it, that I might free myself from the inconsistency and more fully practice my principles. But our discussion was for the public good—to develop a principle of action, clear, satisfactory and scriptural for our brethren, that thereby we might produce harmony and cause strife to cease. You proving that we had something in Tennessee as bad as you have in Kentucky, would not at all bring about that result. If we were all working through human institutions in Tennessee, that would not change my faith with reference to the truth of the principle in the least. I certainly understood you to agree to discuss the question: "Has man the authority to form institutions (missionary societies) for the spread of the gospel or for serving God in any way." You may state the proposition in your own language, I only ask that it may embody the true idea. If you are willing to discuss a definite proposition, embodying the right of Bro. Fanning, Bro. Lipscomb, Bro. Munnell, or any body else to form societies to spread the gospel or do any other service to the Lord that he has delegated to the church, I am willing to discuss it. I had just as soon correct Bro. Fanning or Lipscomb's faulty practice as Bro. Munnell's. Just as soon prove our Tennessee brethren wrong and put them right as our Kentucky brethren.

The true principle for our direction, as presented in the sacred scriptures, is what I want. That you and I, and all our brethren in Kentucky and Tennessee, North and South, may act upon it in union and harmony. I might admit every thing we have done in Tennessee is wrong, and yet it would not effect the question before us at all, no more would it become a satisfactory rule to any one were I to prove all that we have done to be in harmony with the position I have assumed as true. It is the principles, that should control us, not you nor yours, me or mine, that I wish to discuss. I hardly think it worth the time to show wherein our meetings are not human organizations, but simply meetings of the brethren in and with a church of God. The organization of that church ordained of God is the only organization connected with our meetings. Neither you nor any Bible reader needs a reference to instances in the New Testament, where members from different congregations met with one to confer together and learn the will of the Lord. While with a church, worshiping with it, all Christians are subject to that one church, are for the time being—if you please—members of it. The utter dissimilarity between the meetings in Tennessee and yours is seen, in the fact that the former are not self-perpetuating as distinct from the church. Have no existence separate from that church. There is in existence in Tennessee at this time not the shadow of such an organization. The meeting did not adjourn to meet again, had no officers, no body authorized to call the meeting together again, no executive board, nor any thing corresponding to one, indeed no work to do, for the consultation meeting as such did not propose to do any work. It did not even appoint Brother Metcalfe and myself to aid in the work of relieving the destitute. We were doing this before any meeting of the kind took place during the past year. I attended the first of these meetings at Murfreesboro, solely to disburse several hundred dollars that had been entrusted to me for disburse-

35

Add to Gift List

ment, and to inquire concerning the state of destitution in different sections. The brethren there did approve of us, in connection with Bro. Fall, as suitable individuals for the work, but we were doing just as much before the approval, for the time we were engaged and the necessities presented, as we have been doing since. Your informant, I presume, drew largely upon his imagination in reference to the difficulties in avoiding the likeness of your missionary meetings. I heard nothing of such difficulties, and just such meetings as we had, we have had, names, styles of procedure and all, frequently in former years. We make these suggestions not because they have the least bearing upon the questions at issue, but merely as a matter of justice to our brethren in Tennessee. I, however, did not aid in calling these meetings; barely did get to each of them—am by no means committed to their defence, nor to the defence of what the brethren in Tennessee do. I see many things among them that I cannot approve. Even at the risk of forfeiting my right to discuss questions of Christian law with my Kentucky brethren, and especially my Bro. Munnell, I will repeat that so much of Adam's frailty clings to your unworthy brother, that he often does things that he would dislike to defend, and that on mature judgment he regrets. So did not agree to defend my own consistency, nor any indefinite (undefined) propositions, but have agreed and held myself ready to defend the proposition, that man has not the right to form organizations of his own, through which to spread the gospel, or to do other service to his Maker. Will you discuss that question? If not I think we had better end our logomachies about something neither of us can tell what.

Truly your brother in Christ,

DAVID LIPSCOMB.

I have made the preceding remarks not to express a doubt of the propriety of such meetings as we held in Tennessee, but with a view, if possible, of having nothing for Bro. Munnell to cavil over, but to induce him to come directly to the question at issue. But if he will satisfy us that our meetings were human organizations for doing God's work, we will promise never to be caught in another such. When we settle the principle, we will be thankful to have our failures to live up to the principle point out.

D. L.

Destitution.

TRENTON, Ga., April 23, 1867.

Bro. Lipscomb:—A few days ago I was in Jackson county, Ala., near Bridgeport, where there is a congregation of brethren worshiping at Rocky Springs, and their condition is truly distressing. There are ten widows with thirty-five children, that are needing bread and meat, and also old Bro. William Price and his sister wife, who heretofore were the pillow and stay of Rocky Spring Congregation, are now in a state of entire dependence. He, himself, is afflicted with paralysis, and entirely helpless, and has to be waited on day and night by Bro. William Hughes, or some of his family. If aid can be had, extend it to them. I will write you again in a few days.

Your brother in the Lord,

WASHINGTON BACON.

Fellowship.

We have received from Concord Church, Ky., $42; the Beech Grove Church, Maury county, Tenn., donated one car load of corn; the church at Thompson's Station, Tenn., one car load of corn and meat for the destitute; from a sister in Edgefield, Tenn., for sister Love, $2, and from J. N. O., Hartsville, Tenn., for sister Love, $5.

Good understanding giveth favor; but the way of transgressors is hard.

THE

GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

VOLUME IX. { T. FANNING, D. LIPSCOMB, } EDITORS. { NUMBER 20.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, MAY 16, 1867.

Discussion—Missionary Societies—No. 7.

Brother Lipscomb:—The "Hypothetical Discussion of Missionary Societies," in the Review, I see, has closed, after a two month's continuance and has arrived, at last, at the conclusion that a single church, say Sixth Street Church in Cincinnati, has a scriptural right to invite all the other churches to entrust their whole missionary contributions to her hands alone; and as this seems to be your idea also, in your reply to my third article, I will examine it a little and see how much less objectionable it is than the Society plan.

1st. There is no chapter and verse for any such thing, and consequently, yourselves being judges, it is wholy unscriptural. One church has the right to send a missionary, but who gave that church the right to ask all the other churches in reach to "send all the money they can to the deacons" of said church? Such a course would soon make the Sixth Street Church a sort of Rome over all the rest. That is just the way Rome began her supremacy—by being made a sort of head and centre of money and influence in various ways. It seems she is to "secure the co-operation of neighboring county churches." A pretty bold move this, inasmuch as no other church would have a right to say a word about the management of said fund. If they have such a right to be expressed by delegates in convention, then is it a "human organization," and a "human invention." You must either give up the entire control of the funds of many churches into the hands of one irresponsible church, and so avoid the name of a Society, or you must give the others a voice in it, to be expressed in convention assembled, and so have of necessity all the elements of a Missionary Society. I say one *irresponsible church*, for no man, or set of men, has a right to interfere with the business of a church; and all these means collected from "all the rest of the disciples in the United States," change not the individual character of that same Sixth Street Church. The money becomes all her own, and of course she is irresponsible. If not, to whom is she responsible? If to all the other contributing churches they together are a Society. This no man of the least acumen will deny. But as there can be no organization, you say, beyond a single church, what sort of an irresponsible moneyed monster do the Advocate and Review wish to build up? And this is the substitute for the Society plan, where *no church* can control more than her own funds! determining whether it shall be sent to this or that particular field. If we were to unite all the churches in Kentucky to send all their

money to the church at Lexington, to be handled by her treasurer and other officers alone, at the same time claiming to be perfectly irresponsible to any convention, my ink would scarcely be dry till the Advocate and Review would both cry "Rome, Rome, usurpation, consolidation." And no wonder, for any set of men, if unscrupulous enough, could soon grow rich by embezzlement, for a single church is supreme in the matter, and there is none to give account to. But if they are to make any "Report" (a thing you allow to be "human") there is no more reason for making it to one of the contributing churches than to another, and therefore it must be all alike—say one thousand churches, each of which give $100. making $100,000, a handsome little sum to commit to one irresponsible church. But as said in my last, there is no scripture for the elder of a single church presiding over such a mammoth concern, unless you want to make a Pope of him, nor any scripture for the Treasurer or "Scribe" of a single church, either handling the money or keeping irresponsible books for one thousand churches, unless the President, Treasurer and Scribe of said meeting are elected by the churches represented by their messengers who express the will of the churches; and this would make it in all respects like our missionary conventions. If such a convention should meet, they would find it necessary to set down the regular time of meeting that it be not forgotten; also the place of meeting; some one in the assembly must be chosen to preside, another to make a minute of what is done; if they should resolve to do any good work they would necessarily "pass a resolution" to that effect, either by vote, or as you did it in your "Consultation Meeting," and so on, till they would have something like our "Rules of Procedure." Now you may have either this horn of the dilemma or take the one involving the irresponsibility of the Sixth Street, or any other church that might set up such hideous pretensions to metropolitanism.

2d. Nearly two years ago I took the trouble to appoint a committee of four, consisting of Joseph Franklin, J. K. Speer, D. Oliphant and Wm. Pinkerton, of Ohio, to report a plan for carrying on missionary work, especially in foreign countries, without a co-operation something like our societies. I thought they never intended to report, but this it seems is the discovery made out after two years' hard tug. I refer to this because your plan, whether made out independently of, or conjointly with, them, appearing about the same time, is fully met by meeting theirs. And now taking the joint labors of all, what sort of a substitute have we offered us instead of the Societies? You offer us a substitute which, taken one way, as I have shown, is essentially the same thing as the Societies, which of course you reject; but taken the other way is perfectly horrible; for you would erect a church in our midst commanding all the missionary money of the brotherhood in such an irresponsible way, as would either establish a metropolitan church, or keep every dollar of missionary funds in the hands of the owners for fear of such monopoly. Nor does it relieve you from the dilemma to say, as the Review does, that "other churches as well as that of Cincinnati would have missionaries to send forth," for if there were a score of such irresponsible centres of influence and consolidation, the stronger, in a century or two, would absorb the weaker and reduce the contest to two or three. Did not Constantinople, Alexandria, Jerusalem and Rome form such centres in the early centuries? So would it be with us. Now really, I have just been leaning back in my chair wondering at your suicidal "invention." No wonder all anti-society men have hesitated so long to show their hands. We have been

asking, begging, and sometimes, with two speers and a whip, urging our opponents to try their hand in starting the work on the Lord's plan, and here is what we have. This plan, I suppose, we are to receive as perfectly scriptural; chapter and verse for every part of it; nothing "human" in it; no horns a sprouting; no "treason" seed threatening the liberty of the churches. A "*ridiculous mus*" appears.

The pendulum drawn up high on the arc will oscillate far to the other side. Robert Dale Owen once denied all spirituality in religion, then fled clear across to spiritualism. The Review fled from the consolidated "Evangelical Committee" plan to what amounts to no plan at all; and you, if I understand you, take fright at the organized co-operation of many churches in which no one can monopolize the money and work, and recommend that we make one or several metropolitan churches to control the money of all the rest.

This may be an improvement upon the societies, but I think few will see it so. The reason I have pressed you all to give us some business-like view of the work as going on "in a scriptural way" is that I felt confident that the moment you would undertake it you would either get up something like a society or some *Gorgon Head* like metropolitanism, and *here it is*. Had I been on your side I never would have allowed myself to be drawn out, on any specifications. As it is you must support the society principle or the *Gorgon* principle, or draw back all antennæ and remain in stubborn noncommittal. I can work on any plan, can pull wherever I'm hitched. a could have worked on the evangelical committee plan, can work on the society plan, or the individual plan, and could work on your plan if you had any, or on the scriptural plan if you could tell me what it is, or give me the book and chapter where it is described.

The truth, as it seems to me, is this—the Bible has given us no more direction about *how* we shall send the gospel abroad than about *how* we shall send bread to the hungry, and it is in vain that you *tease* the Bible about every trifle that common sense is quite sufficient for. I am glad, however, that the Advocate and Review have both ventured to light their lamps in a dark place, to show us all how to co-operate as churches without any organization beyond that of a single congregation. If this, upon mutual examination, shall be found sensible, practicable and scriptural, both for home and foreign missions, I, for one, will adopt it, and give it my earnest support.

THOMAS MUNNELL.

RESPONSE.

We apprehend that the author of "Hypothetical Discussions of Missionary Societies" has as great a detestation of what Brother Munnell extemporizes for his advocacy as Brother Munnell has, if he has not he ought to have. We suggest that Brother Munnell will never convince men of their wrong when, to make what they advocate appear wrong, he distorts and misrepresents their action and teaching. So he has done the operations of the brotherhood in Tennessee, and so, we suppose, he has done the above writings. Now the result of this is, that every man, woman and child, that attended our meetings in Tennessee, knows there was not the shadow of an organization outside of that formed by God; that the church of God, at the point we met, had all the "organs" necessary to our meeting, and no new ones were created. They know too that the Kentucky brethren have an organization that is not known to the church of God. When Brother Munnell represents differently, he destroys his influence with them for whatever of good he might have in correcting their wrongs. A bad argument injures even a good cause. So as we nor any one else we know of pro-

poses such a Gorgon as he conjures up, we will not take up a line in reference to it. We never believed that any one church or individual could delegate its work or responsibility to any other body. It is the duty of the church (not its rich members) to expend the Lord's money in building up the cause of God. Any delegation of this work to any board or to any other church is an injury to itself, in depriving it of that exercise which is necessary to its spiritual life. Whenever Brother Munnell will come to the discussion of the question at issue: "Has God authorized man to form organizations through which he will do God's work," we will respond. Till then, we must allow him to ramble on in his own loose, illogical and indefinite way of proving an "indefinite proposition." His utter inability to teach one scripture that gives the least shadow of authority for such organizations must, either in precept or example, be apparent to the weakest mind. We must remind him, however, that while we are anxious to allow him full scope to develop the weakness of his cause, already more space has been occupied than would have been required to investigate the matter fully and scripturally, and we are becoming restive, lest our readers begin to think *their* rights are neglected. But Bro. Munnell promises to come to the question in his next, and we wish him, for the sake of our space, to confine himself to the question, for we have already occupied more space than we anticipated would be necessary. D. L.

It sometimes seems to us a poor thing to walk in these common paths, where all are walking; yet these common paths are the paths in which blessings travel. They are the ways in which God is met Welcoming and fulfilling the lowest duties which meet us there, we shall often be surprised to find that we have been unawares welcoming and entertaining angels.

Christian Labor.—No. 2.

The work or labor of Christians has been sadly neglected and most fearfully lost sight of by the church. The energies of the church have been destroyed, and her zeal has been cooled by the transfer of her labor from her members to certain agencies. It was an asseveration of Alexander Campbell (we quote not the exact words) spoken in reference to the subject of "spiritual influences," as so continually preached and harped upon by the sects, that the much more frequent use of a term in our current religious teaching than was found in the teaching of Christ and the Holy Spirit through the Apostles, indicated an unscriptural and dangerous prominence given to the idea embodied in the term. If this is so in reference to the theory of Christianity, it is doubly so of the appointments connected with the church. The greater importance given to, and reliance upon public preachers and preaching, indicates an unscriptural and dangerous departure from the primitive work and order of the church. All the work of the church has been swallowed up in and engrossed by public preaching. All other ministers, servants, agents of the church have been overshadowed by the public preacher. The church has come to recognize public preaching as the only work she has to engage in. She relies upon it exclusively to perfect her internal parts, and to extend her bounds. The aim of the church in her efforts to raise means is that she may purchase and control speaking talent. One writer not long since, in one of our most ably conducted weeklies, insisted if money enough was given, so as to pay salaries high enough, the best of speaking talent, any number of preachers might be put in the field, and the world might be brought into the church of Christ. The editor of the Quarterly, in the 1st No. of the 4th vol., says: "The greatest temporal need of the church is money; give

THE

GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

VOLUME IX. { T. FANNING, D. LIPSCOMB, } EDITORS. { NUMBER 21.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, MAY 23, 1867.

Discussion—Missionary Societies—No. 8.

Bro. Lipscomb:—As you think my letters not pertinent to the main issue before us, and desire me to affirm a certain proposition you name, I will, for the sake of meeting your views of propriety, affirm the very thesis you have, in your note to me, submitted for my acceptance: "*That man has authority to form institutions for the spread of the gospel, or (institutions) through which he will serve God.*" In accepting this, I do not admit that my articles have been anything but close and pertinent, as I will show by applying all the points I have made directly to our proposition.

1st. I must first premise what all good thinkers will no doubt admit: *That the Bible often gives us authority in general precepts, rather than by specifying the particular plans of doing good.* Here is an example: "As we have opportunity let us do good unto all men." Gal. vi: 10. It is plainly intimated here that we are to watch opportunities for doing good in various ways. To have the Bible describe all these ways would truly make a book the "world could not contain." Not long ago I had an opportunity of helping Bro. Neely to raise some money and corn for the South by getting him a meeting to address in the court-house, on court day, and this passage was my *scripture authority* for it. You are publishing the Advocate to do good unto all men as far as you can. This passage is abundant authority for that also. You rescue a drowning man by the use of a skiff, I by a plank, and another by a rope, each one "as he has opportunity." "Do good," is the general command. It is obeyed in a thousand ways not *specified* in the Bible. In ancient times they fed the poor by carrying them to each other's gates as Lazarus was. Now we take care of them by taxation and poor-houses. This passage is authority for both plans. It is certainly scriptural, in one sense, to lay a beggar at a rich man's gate, but our present system I regard as much superior to that. The apostles did good as they had opportunity. They wrote the scriptures with the hand. We print them. Ours is, no doubt, the better plan. They wrote on sheep skins; we on paper. Here again our opportunities are superior to theirs, and consequently our plans are better in these respects than theirs. When contributions were made by the Grecian churches for the saints in Judea, they were compelled to send men all the way there to carry their liberality; now we ship it by rail to houses appointed to distribute it without sending agents with every package—a better plan than theirs. In short, I think we are left at liberty, by the word of the Lord, to do good *as we have op-*

portunity; and as no two centuries, or two nations, or even two individuals, have precisely the same opportunities for it, the plans must be ever various, a large margin being left for our common sense, the improvements of the age, and the circumstances of life to operate in. The Bible shows its divine origin in not attempting to point out, like a statute book and court decisions, every *mode* of action for every year to the end of time.

2d. You will now ask how this proves that we have a right to "form *institutions* for the spread of the gospel." I answer, that if an institution like the missionary society presents an "opportunity of doing good," this passage is full authority for it. I know the common way of answering this is by saying that the same plea has been set up for infant baptism, auricular confession, and the mourners bench. I reply, that if *these are* opportunities of doing good, then this passage fully authorizes them; but if not, it is no reply to my argument, for I am only speaking of "doing good." The question is, not whether the society is the best method of doing good, but does it afford an "opportunity of doing good." In the year 1865, our Kentucky Society was instrumental in adding 2,300 to the church, in raising up a number of fallen down churches, and in doing much good in various ways that never has been chronicled. And this was done, too, with money that would not have been raised without this missionary effort, for the churches did just as much in every other direction, if not more, than if they had not done this work. Therefore the Society affords an opportunity of doing good, and *therefore* has scripture authority for its existence and operations.

3d. Do you respond that the Society is in the way of better opportunities of doing good on the individual church plan? This idea is refuted by the fact that no man, not even anti-society men, have ever been able to start or carry on any co-operation of churches without some system similar to our societies. I proved your inconsistency in Tennessee in getting up "human inventions" to do good with, and yet objecting to our society. You are not wrong in starting a sort of *publishing society*, a sort of *education society*, and a sort of *southern aid society*—you could not do otherwise without neglecting your opportunities for doing good. And the fact that even you in Tennessee could not *keep out* of such things, shows that they are not in the way of better plans or better opportunities. My object in proving your inconsistency, was simply to show that in justifying yourselves you are bound to abandon your opposition to societies or give up your own "human inventions." You cannot give up your publishing educational and philanthropic movements —before God you dare not do it; therefore you must cease opposition to things you are practicing yourselves. My third argument then is briefly this: We should always embrace the best opportunities we can for doing good; your human inventions and ours, already devised are, as far as we know, the best that can be devised, therefore we have scripture authority in Gal. vi: 10, for these plans. So you see all I said about "organized co-operation" proves our present thesis, for *even you cannot keep out of them.*

4th. To show still further that missionary societies afford opportunities of doing good, and the best we know of, I refer again to *foreign missions.* Missions to Asia, to Africa and the South Sea Islands cannot be either inaugurated or sustained without organized co-operation among churches. This we have repeated a dozen times, but, as usual, we still fail to elicit any response to it, either from the Advocate or Review. True we have been asked how the Gospel got to Australia without a society? We answer, it was not done on the "individual or congregational

plan." It was done first simply by *immigration* to that country, without costing any of our churches a dime. Is this your plan for *missionary* work? It will suit all the stingy members precisely—it costs them nothing. No body sent the Christians there at first, nor even yet, for they offer to sustain evangelists themselves if they can get the men to come. Australia is not one of our *missionary* fields at all. I doubt not the gospel will find its own way to other fields sometime, even if our rich churches live and die in inglorious ease. But the question is: Shall we do any *missionary* work? Shall we *send* the gospel to them, or shall we wait on the slow process of immigration? When will enough of our brethren emigrate from the United States and England to evangelize Asia and Africa? And shall we meanly impose this whole burden upon a few such heroic souls and lend no helping hand? No, you will say, by no means. Then I say that "organized co-operation" presents the only means or opportunity for doing this work that has ever been before us. If we have any better opportunity of sending the gospel to the Feejee Islands, it is your duty to let us know it, for I tell you candidly I am just in the mood, and have been for a long time, to accept any better way that will do the work. This, my 4th argument, I consider unanswerable. We should neglect no "opportunity of doing good," and therefore we have a right to "form institutions for the spread of the gospel" *when they afford such "opportunity."*

Now, let there be no misunderstanding here that your response may be no mere jingle of words. Observe, then, we agree that we have no right to substitute any institution where God has himself appointed one. This is agreed to all round. We next agree that the church is the living power to do all missionary work. I never had a doubt of this. The only question left, then, is how shall the church combine her means to do a work that no one or two can accomplish alone? I regard the church itself as the only missionary society on earth authorized of heaven. All I want to do is to get the church all to work. Don't you want to do the same thing? I see no other way of doing it than by the co-operative effort we are now making. I say here, before heaven, that I am anxious to have the best way of doing good, and would, to-day, give up our present method in a moment for a better one that would interest more of the churches in the work. I am not wedded to the society, nor to any other plan, only as I recognize in it the best method of combining the means and the efforts of the whole church in preaching the gospel to the destitute. Indeed I am not only willing, but anxious, to stop all discussion and take counsel together, not that I am either out of ink, or out of paper, or out of breath, or out of humor, or out of arguments, for I have a larger stock of all these on hand than ever before; but our churches are idle as to foreign fields and doing but little *missionary* work at home, while Sectarians, Catholics and Infidels are giving their millions of money with ten thousand missionaries this day in the field. If you have any light let us all see it, and Kentucky will not be slow to recognize it.

THOMAS MUNNELL.

P. S.—I hope you will not respond to my last sentence by the too common platitude that "you have no light but Bible light," for it is Bible light I want. If you have Bible light, put down chapter and verse, but if the question of the best method is not settled in your Bible, give us your best judgment in the spirit of a counsellor.

T. M.

RESPONSE.

We, at last, have an agreement in the foregoing to investigate the question: "Has man authority to form institutions

for the spread of the gospel, or institutions through which he will serve God?" Bro. Munnell affirms that he has. It is his duty to show this authority. If he fails, then the presumption is, no authority exists, and all assumption of such work, on the part of man, is an unauthorized assumption of power on his part.

But before we examine this, let us see what common ground we have. 1st. The admission is readily made, "we have no right to substitute any institution where God has himself appointed one." "We next agree that the church is the living power to do all missionary work." "The church itself is the only missionary society on earth authorized of heaven." This is coming much nearer together than we had dared to hope we would be able to do. We certainly have an anxious longing to see the church, body and soul, through every member earnestly at work. To attain this, we most ardently desire to see the church and the membership withdrawn in feeling, affection and association from every organization of earth, that the entire means, talents, affections and strength of every child of God may, with an undivided fealty and true singleness of purpose, be directed to the upbuilding and spread of the kingdom of God on earth. Yet we recognize that "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it: except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh in vain." Ps. cxxvii: 1. That is, unless our work, service, devotion and zeal be in accordance with the will of God, and in harmony with his works, so that he works in, through and with us, they result in confusion and disaster rather than good to the cause of God. In one word, when we work with the true spirit, in exact accordance with God's will, for a heaven-approved end, it is no longer our work, but it is God working through, in and with us after his own good pleasure. The true Christian frame is, I will have no wish, way or preference of my own, but I will humbly, trustingly hold myself a willing instrument in God's hand to do his will. I will ignore my own will, way and wisdom, be directed by God, and leave with him the results. This is the whole of Christianity. With this idea, whatever is accomplished by or through us is accomplished by God, whatever is proposed to be accomplished by such agencies so acting is proposed to be accomplished by the power of God, and not in the wisdom of man. God has especially preferred to work through means which, according to human wisdom, are unfitted for the accomplishment of the proposed end, that it might be manifestly of God and not from man.

We do not say, then, that man can accomplish the conversion of the world through the agency of the churches without some humanly organized effort, but we say God can and will, and that he will do it in no other way—that is the way he has proposed to do it, and the only way. When man proposes another way, then if it is done, it is man's work, and not God's.

We must dissent from Bro. Munnell's proposition, although he thinks all good thinkers will admit it, to-wit: The Bible *often gives us authority in general precepts, rather than by specifying the particular plans of doing good.* Had he have said without specifying the particular instrument with which to do good, we might have admitted it true, within certain limits. But a "plan" is a comprehensive system involving the rules for our guidance. He does not tell us we should give of money or meat, clothing or bread, letting the circumstances of the needy and the possessions of the donor determine this question. But he does tell us how we are to give, to do it in his name, and for his honor. If given individually, we must do it as a servant or agent of Christ. If done

through an organization, this must have the authority of Christ, his name stamped upon it. What is given through institutions not stamped with his name, reflects no credit on him. Brethren have given largely for the destitute South, through worldly organizations, but Christians have never received a dime of it, so far as we have been able to learn, and the Christian religion has never received the credit of it. I doubt much whether God has given them credit for it. We know one instance of Christian brethren giving, and the Baptist Church was credited with it. This was right, because brethren entrust it to the care of the Baptist rather than to the church which Christ died to establish. We know a brother who became chairman of a worldly organization for supplying the destitute, it became necessary to get this brother's recommendation, in order to enable us to ship the offerings of the brotherhood free over a railroad. This he refused on account of his position, in what he felt to be a rival society. And really in the interest of a worldly organization threw obstacles in the way of the church supplying the wants of his starving brethren. If he had been acting on the Lord's plan, he could not have felt it necessary to assume this position of hostility to the church of God. We are satisfied he did not wish to oppose our effort, his being in an institution not formed of God, placed him in a position of hostility to his brethren. There is a plan given—scriptures that thoroughly furnish the men of God to all good works. God's church is the only organization through which Christians can work. Brother M. uses words and terms quite indefinitely, as "opportunity" and "institution," or "plan" and "means." See the preceding article. A society may be a facility or means, but cannot in any sense be an "opportunity." "Opportunity" is a fitting occasion. A society can in no sense be called an occasion, fitting or unfitting. The utter inapplicability of the only scripture Bro. M. could possibly find from which even to "infer" a right to frame such organizations, is at once seen. The admonition to the Galatians is, "As favorable occasions present themselves for doing good to all men, let us do it. When we see a widow in distress, an orphan hungry or naked, or a sinner in a condition to hear the gospel, at once do the good needed, do not neglect such opportunities. This is very different from forming a human organization" to do God's service. It is an admonition not to neglect doing the good in God's organization. You must certainly admit that such a conclusion from such a premise is exceedingly far-fetched, and to say the least, uncertain.

We confess to a surprise, too, at Bro. M.'s reference to the "poor house," &c., as Christian work. Christians never carried their poor to the gates of the wicked rich, nor will a Christian church ever permit its poor to go to a poor house. Nor will it raise its means to relieve its poor by taxation other than voluntary. Bro. M. these are the devices of the wicked to ease their consciences, make a show and escape the work of providing for the poor. You do not mean by '*we*,' the society men or Christians, have a *poor house* for suffering Christians, worn out and destitute preachers. You do not mean that the distressed and afflicted widows are shifted off your shoulders to be sent to the devil's poor house, there to suffer neglect and dire want. Bro. M. this would doubtless much relieve Christians, but your Christian brother has a right to your bounties, to your comforts. Your sister's children have a right to the guardianship and shelter of your house, your protection. The idea that our duties are performed by providing poor houses, or even orphan's schools, into which they are placed as a separate off-cast and

down-cast class, unworthy the association of the world, is a miserable, but a fearful deception Christians are practicing upon themselves. The gray-headed and worn-out servant of God in a poor house, to be neglected by one who oversees and feeds for hire. The homeless brother, and the orphan of your brother are entitled to the comfort, the cheer, the love and nurture of your own fireside. Brotherhood and fellowship among Christians is a miserable sham until it furnishes this. This is the fatal tendency of substitutes in religion for the church of God. Not so much money to hire some one else to care for the poor and afflicted, as the personal service of Christians themselves, in this work, is the great need. Personal service here alone can benefit the Christian. We may give money to hire this service done, and relieve ourselves from the work, just as we may hire a preacher to preach, pray and exhort for us, and relieve ourselves from worship, but we are not blessed in so doing, we deprive ourselves of true spiritual labor, grow cold, formal and lifeless.

So, too, in reference to sending the word of God to foreign lands. It requires devotion, zeal, self-sacrifice; these are more wanting than money; these will bring money—money cannot purchase these. Now we state to you that the difficulty is not in appropriating and directing money after it is collected, but in collecting it. The lack is not in the co-operation, but in the operation of the churches. If you would spend your time in setting in order the things that are wanting in the church, exciting the lively active operation of the churches, you would find more money, more spirituality, more devotion as the result of your labor than you will ever find to result from any new organization. But instead of this, your position to the society requires you to depreciate the power of God to save through his own appointments, causes you to bring into disrespect the order of God. God with a wisdom that commands the mute admiration of the world, ordains, "When you are celebrating the sacrifice and fellowship of Christ for yourselves, do you make your sacrifice and bestow your fellowship for God and your poor brethren." Bro. M., with a sneer, says it is a mere temporary expedient, and not authoritative and binding, notwithstanding Paul is careful to ordain the same order in the different churches. God says, the scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable, &c., that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Bro. M. says the scriptures do not give a perfect plan for the most important work of God, the conversion of the world. God says, "Whatsoever I command you, observe to do it; thou shalt not add thereto nor diminish from it." God visited condign punishment upon all who dared add to his appointments, or varied from the strict letter of the law, under the Jewish dispensation, witness, the giving of the law by Moses, the asking of a king by the Jews, 1 Samuel viii: Saul destroying the Amalekites, 1 Samuel xv; David fighting Goliath, 1 Samuel xvii: Uzza with the ark of God—God closes his word by the fearful denunciation, "If any man shall add unto these things, (the things ordained in the book,) God will add to him the plagues written in this book." He says the terms of the new covenant are as much more sacred in his sight than those of the old as the blood of his son is more sacred than the blood of bulls and goats. Yet Brother M. ridicules those who insist on a full and exact compliance with this law, adding nought thereto and diminishing nought from them as extreme sticklers for the word. Now you say, "the church is the only missionary society on earth authorized of heaven." Your society is not *a* church, nor *the*

46

church, but an outside human organization, you have frequently admitted, hence it is unauthorized by God, and is added to the things ordained in God's book. God has commanded individuals and the church to preach the gospel, to sound out the gospel. 1 Thes. i: 1. Under the guidance of the Spirit "men and women" preached everywhere. Acts viii: 4. Philip preached as he travelled by the way-side, to the citizens of Samaria. Paul and Barnabas—Paul and Silas, under a burning zeal for the salvation of the world, went every where preaching the word—preached in prison, in chains, at the judgment seat of their rulers. Paul so preached and repeatedly told his brethren they must follow him—"follow me as I follow Christ." Then here is divine authority for a preacher's going to preach, while preaching—the churches sent once and again to his necessities, never formed a society to do this. Now, Brother Munnell, the point we make is this: the man that will not preach until he has assurance first of being compensated, is not fit to preach at all. He will corrupt and demoralize the church. He will pander to the caprices of the rich, and accommodate the Christian religion to the fashions of the worldly. Bro. Beardslee is now in Jamaica—building houses, that will attract the wealthy—the church at Covington, Ky., spends $35,000 in a fine house, frescoed walls and rep-covered seats, while their brethren and sisters are starving, and then with complacency say, *we have the finest church house in the State of Kentucky*,—the cause of Christ is permanently established here. We would have said permanently corrupted. One of your ablest writers says, in a very demoralizing article, No man can give a sensible reason, why a rich man should refuse to preach until he can get as large a salary as a lawyer or doctor. Now we submit, brethren, in no fault-finding spirit, if this is Christianity or any part or parcel of it the Bible is a falsehood from Genesis to Revelation. We say, then, that God's plan for the spread of his religion is to inspire his children with that degree of zeal, devotion and fidelity to his laws, that every one, whether a doctor, merchantman, trader or slave, male or female, becomes a missionary of the cross wherever providence casts his lot. The presence of a Christian in England or China is a leaven that will work. Persons, when the church is properly at work—when the fires of devotion are burning brightly at home—will be inspired with the wish to spend and be spent in the cause of Christ—like Paul, with a desire of preaching where the gospel is unknown, and others who themselves cannot go, will desire to aid in this work, that they may have fruit that will abound to their credit. Phil. iv: 17. The one will not wait for a promise of so many thousand dollars before he starts, the other will not need to be begged, and pressed and dogged to give a stingy pittance, from a covetous hell-bound soul. Where there is a will, there is a way. Excite and arouse the will—the way will present itself. Now we charge that the societies are substitutes for the true missionary spirit, and, like all substitutes, calculated to destroy and do away with that for which they are substituted. The churches should not be spread abroad while in a corrupt and lukewarm state—they ought not to sustain men who are not determined to live and die for the cause. If they do, fine houses, as in Jamaica, organs and quoirs, fairs and lotteries, fashion and lust will be substituted for purity, holiness, zeal, simplicity of worship, self-sacrifice, and self-denial as agencies for the spread of the gospel.

The above is not a very business-like way of spreading the gospel—I admit. It *is* a very divine way. You have then commenced work at the wrong point. A home sanctifying influence, a life con-

secrating influence is what is needed. This can be gained only by a more faithful operation of God's appointments. Look at home, kindle the flame high there. Drink deeply of the spirit of Christ—cast out every other spirit. This can be done only by separating ourselves from the human organizations in which other spirits dwell, and clinging closely to the institutions of God in which Christ's spirit dwells.

So far as foreign missions are concerned, we again state that God, by individuals and through the simple churches, sent the gospel from Jerusalm through out Judea, Samaria, Asia Minor, to Europe, Africa, to the islands of the ocean, and finally to America without the aid of a single human organization. The fact that he did it once, is the best evidenc that he can do it again. The work God gives the church to do is to prepare the proper material for doing this work, and he in his Providence will send it abroad. Whether he will do it through his servants as merchantmen, or as prisoners, by driving them upon the prepared shore by a tempest, by scattering them through war or persecution, or by putting it into the hearts of his children to go and labor among a certain race, we know not. He has on divers occasions used all these agencies in sending abroad his word—he is still exercising the same supervising care of his church if it is faithful to his appointments. *God has sent the pure gospel to the nations of the earth through these, his approved agencies. We challenge Bro. Munnell, to present a single instance in which the pure gospel has been sent abroad by human societies.* Present this, or cease your talk about them as agencies for spreading the gospel. We repeat again, that the fact that the faithful use and operation of God's institutions fail to carry the gospel to a certain people, is the clearest testimony in the world, that God does not yet intend it should reach them. The efforts to force Providence by human inventions will prove a failure. Bro. Munnell rightly says, "We have no right to substitute any institution where God has himself appointed one." Stick to this, and we will be one people Bro. M. God has appointed his church for the conversion of the world; see Bro. M's statement in the foregoing. Then *we* can ordain no institution to do this work. To do it, in your own language, would be wicked and treasonable." Again, Ephs. iv: 11, God gave (to the church) apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the Ministry, (the relief of the poor—*ergon diakonos*,) for the edifying or building up of the body of Christ. The apostle explains, this is to be done by every member in its proper place in the body working under the true spirit. Now to ordain societies or agencies "for perfecting the saints, for relieving the poor (the work of the ministry) or building up and spreading the body of Christ, which is committed by God to the church, is, according to your rule, "wicked and treasonable." God has never ordained how we should travel, transport provisions, write our letters of love and exhortation, reproof and instruction, whether with pen and ink, or whether with a printing press; has never ordained institutions for the spread of education and intelligence—has never committed the providing of these to the church, but has left us the example of using just such instrumentalities as we find available. Had he have told his children to walk on all fours, we would have stoutly maintained they must not go erect; but according to your rule these latter are all left to the devices of human wisdom, but not the societies that have a living, controlling spirit, for the spread of the gospel—these inanimate instruments have no spirit, good or bad; have never been the subjects of God's appointment, so cannot be legitimately compared to the societies for making

Christians perfect in character, for feeding the poor or for spreading the gospel. These are subjects of God's appointment. Men must here in meek adoration receive God's institutions as the perfection of divine wisdom, and humbly and in trusting faith work through them. D. L.

Ye are the Salt of the Earth.

Our very highly esteemed brother, Joseph Ash, of Oshawa, Canada, writes in the following strain:

"*Brother Fanning:*—The times in which we live are fearful. Almost everything we witness in the politico-religious world, is well calculated to entrance the heart of Christians, and prejudice it against the pure gospel of the Savior. Though we may deserve but little credit before God for what we have done and are doing, suppose our influence, small as it is, were taken from the world. Even in our own America, in the worldly wise, denominational religions, we see but little except pride, love of form, love of money, love of politics, love of war and strife, of wranglings, bickerings and hatred. But for the little salt amongst such as declare themselves not "of the world," where are a people who enthrone the words of life and allow them to speak with power and authority? Amongst the parties, men do not preach the word, but "*their views*" of the word. If we do not buckle on the whole armor of God, and contend violently for the truth, we, too, will soon be shaken from our steadfastness, and will be found trying expedients in religion. But it greatly rejoices my heart to see many of the beloved disciples of the Savior standing out boldly for the truth of the Lord, and asking nothing more, and that will be satisfied with nothing less."

Remarks.—We are pleased to hear from Brother Ash, and hope he will write for the Advocate. T. F.

Spiritual and Worldly Powers.

The interest recently manifested by Christians, in regard to the spiritual character of the Christian institution, is almost, if not quite, marvelous. We have received from Brother C. S. Town, of McMinnville, Tenn., and Brother T. F. Tukesberry, of Brentwood, New Hampshire, some good papers upon the differences between the kingdoms of this world and the kingdom of God's dear Son, which we hope to let our readers see in future numbers of our paper. There is something in this of deep interest with brethren widely separated, and without communication with each other, and far deeper than the shallow philosophy of any age. Men in different quarters of the earth are turning their attention to the study of the scriptures of truth. When we wrote upon these matters over twenty years ago, nobody seemed to hear them, or care for them, but now the best intellects in the land are engaged in their examination, and thousands are turning from the active service of Satan's empire to the labors of love in the Messiah's dominions. A little more humility and devotion to truth will soon work greater wonders amongst us. Brethren, let us not fall out by the way. We have but one cause to plead, one work to perform on earth, and one heaven to attain. Let us cease from man, whose breath is in his nostrils, and turn our whole hearts to God, and to the word of his grace. T. F.

Envy, like a cold poison, benumbs and stupefies; and thus, as if conscious of its own impotence, it fold its arms in despair, and sits cursing in a corner. When it conquers it is commonly in the dark; by treachery and undermining, by calumny and detraction. Envy is no less foolish than detestable; it is a vice which they say keeps no holiday, but is always in the wheel, and working upon its own disquiet.—*Jeremy Collier.*

49

THE

GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

VOLUME IX. { T. FANNING, D. LIPSCOMB, } EDITORS. { NUMBER 23.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, JUNE 6, 1867.

Discussion—Missionary Societies—No. 9.

Brother Lipscomb:—The material accumulated in my former article is so easily applied as argument to prove our present proposition, that it will require but little more to justify the Mission Cause in the mind of every logical thinker. Had you proposed these now before us at the start, it would have shortened the work, but instead of this you proposed the absurd proposition, "That we have a right to substitute human inventions for the commands of God." The one now for discussion is in your own language, "That we have a right to form institutions for the spread of the gospel." This I affirmed, and have already, in my last article, proved. Your constant complaint that I am not close to the discussion, can have but little force with good thinkers, since every one can see that while I have not seen proper to state a definite proposition, I have been perfectly eviscerating the anti-missionary spirit. It is always legitimate to carry the war into Carthage. The inconsistency and weakness of your cause (if you have any) have been shown up in the fact that you are practicing the very principles you repudiate in us. Nor can you dodge this charge by refusing to defend your consistency; for your *practice* in publishing a paper, holding "consultation meetings," getting up colleges and Sunday schools, and appointing agents is right, but your theory in opposing the same principle in missionary societies is wrong. Now your practice and theory cannot both be right; one or the other must be wrong. Everybody knows *such practice is not wrong*, and therefore *the theory must be*. It is your theory I oppose. I know it is a very easy, and a very cheap way of dodging an overmastering argument to say, "I don't defend my consistency," but it must be observed that your consistency must be defended, for my argument grows out of the fact that you cannot keep off society principles whenever you attempt to co-operate in any good work, and of course these principles are right, *yourselves being judges*. You have in every article tried to fling this argument aside; and no wonder, for it is not easy met. I don't blame you for feeling its weight. That is what I intended. You have done the best you could with it. Still it remains true, that as a dancing master has no right to lecture against his own practice, so neither have you.

There are two ways of proving a proposition—either by substantiating it by direct proofs, or by showing its opposite to be untrue. The latter I have accomplished in my former articles, and now I can afford to double the argument by direct evidences. As I volunteered to

take the lead, I thought I had a right to go through with it on this line. And before entering upon another argument allow me to say, that instead of my letters being irrelevant to the questions now currently discussed on this subject, I think they fit a little too "close" for the comfort of our anti-society brethren. They discuss the very issues raised, whether in the form of a definite thesis or not. True, you are unable to see the light they shed, but inability to see arises from two very different causes—from insufficient light, and *from too much light*, as is the case with nocturnal birds at high noon. My letters, I think, have poured a little too much light upon the inconsistencies and bad logic of some to be appreciated all at once.

But now, have we "*a right to form institutions to spread the gospel?*" I still think so for the following additional reasons.

1st. The command, "Do good as you have opportunity," *authorizes our Bible College at Lexington, and all similar movements for instructing men for the work of the ministry.* It is not specifically commanded in the New Testament, but is fairly embraced in the scope of this command. This you will not deny, unless you can show, not only that the Bible College, but the Lecture System at Bethany, at Hiram and elsewhere, fail to promote the gospel. If teaching young men, not other books concerning the Bible, but the Bible itself—in its divisions, its dispensations, its facts, its precepts and its promises is promotive of the gospel then, is this a means of "doing good as we have opportunity?"

2d. The "Midway Female Orphan School" is a "human institution," designed both to "spread the gospel" and as an institution "through which to serve God." The young ladies are carefully taught the word of God, that they may go forth as school teachers into society to "spread" its doctrines all divine among mankind. Had the brethren of Kentucky "a right to form this institution?" It was not done by any single church, nor did all the members of any one single church contribute to its funds. The work was done as you say "outside the church." Was it right? Say yes or no, for there is no need of circumlocution here. This "institution" has its board, its president, its treasurer and its resolutions. Its object is to "serve God." It was not gotten up "in any one church." Is it right? If so, my thesis is sustained. If not right, show it.

3d. We ought to *seek for opportunities of doing good.* It will not be denied that sending the gospel to the heathen is doing good. This work I have frequently shown cannot be done without what you call a "human institution," or an organized co-operation of churches. None of your class of thinkers have ever shown how the gospel could be sustained on the Feejee Islands without this organized co-operation. You are all as still as the grave on this question, and no wonder, for the work cannot be done on what you call the "Lord's plan." Now if it can be done by an "institution," and cannot be done without it, as you tacitly acknowledge, it is right to have the institution, and thus again my thesis is proved.

You say your churches are doing missionary work in Tennessee, for no preacher is confined to the church that supports him, but goes frequently to destitute places in the community. This is all very well. We have all done this for years, but the missionary work we speak of is a very different thing. There are regions far beyond the limited circle of a brother who preaches part of the time for the church that supports him. There are destitute places one and two hundred miles from the point of support. Then the foreign missions—what about these? The truth is, *you cannot do for-*

eign missionary work on your plan. Therefore the plan that will do it is the right one, as it alone affords "opportunity to do good" in this holy work.

I now close this article by saying, that all my arguments are emphasized by the fact that those churches whom you influence against the society, both in Kentucky and Tennessee, and elsewhere, instead of going to work as you suggest, simply *do nothing* in this enterprise in any way. Whenever one of our churches objects to the society, as they occasionally do, I always propose to them to go to work in their own way, but I have yet to see the first one do any thing of the kind in any way. Your tree bears bad fruit. It ought to be cut down.

You have several times invited me to come down to Tennessee and examine into the work of your churches—to get the "facts and figures," and I now announce my intention to do so, and I hope I will be more favorably impressed with the condition of the churches under "Advocate" influences in Tennessee, than some others have been who have returned from your State. You say you were present in our Convention when our Rules of Procedure were adopted. I am sorry you did not make yourself known, for this is the first I had heard of it. Whether these rules of procedure will revolutionize our Society, by denying *church* representation, will all be revealed after we publish our next minutes. I may write another article, or more depending upon your replies. I have, I consider, already proved more than enough to justify our way of working, and could never think of exchanging it for a theory that practically operates against the spread of the gospel of Christ.

THOMAS MUNNELL.

RESPONSE.

Will Brother Munnell tell us why it is that our society brethren are so loose in their quotation and application o what they read—both from divine and human writings? Is it the natural looseness of their observation, and the constitutional proclivity to deal and speak indefinitely on indefinite propositions that lead them into the societies, or do the associations and practices of the human societies beget the recklessness of their quotations and applications? Brother Elley, in a recent article in the Review, professes to quote Brother Campbell, from the 74th page of the "Christian System," he gives a quarter of a column purporting to be from this page, not a sentence of which can be found there, and we doubt whether A. Campbell ever penned a sentence of the quotation. In the foregoing Brother Munnell quotes us as saying we were at the meeting that adopted the present Rules of Procedure of the Kentucky Missionary Society, and rather intimated that we had falsified or were clandestine in our visit, when we have neither said nor intimated any such thing. We did say we were present when they were introduced by Brother P. B. Wiles, two years before they were adopted. The same meeting that changed your whole plan of operations—abolished your board, and made the officers of your Society the executive board, to get clear of certain persons whose politics did not suit the majority of your body.

Again you say, had you proposed the present thesis before us at the start it would have shortened the work. Now the third sentence that I penned in my first response as the proposition for discussion was, "are human societies admissible for doing the work of God." See No. 11, page 206. How much does that differ from the proposition: "Have we a right to form institutions for the spread of the gospel?" If we form them,

they are human. The spread of the gospel is God's work. The very first proposition I made is identical with the present, save more general in terms. You were cruel, Brother Munnell, to shed forth so bright an effulgence of light all at once as to blind us poor benighted heathens down this way. Possibly the shock was so severe that our blindness is made incurable. You ought to have just let out one little glimmering, flickering ray of grey twilight and then brightened it as we were able to bear. As it is, we have not seen or heard from a single individual that has been able to perceive a single ray.

It is strange that such an effect should be produced when all the light has been derived from our own actions.

Eight articles have been written; two —only two—passages of scriptures have been referred to, in order to prove the right of man to form institutions for the service of God. One of these scriptures, Phil. i: 15, to have any applicability, necessarily places the Society upon a par with the pretended preaching of the gospel, through envy to Paul. The other was the command of Paul to the individual members of the churches in Galatia, to do good every time they met with a case in need. xvii: 10. These two passages constitute all the light on the right of men to frame societies for doing God's service that the most successful advocate of them in the United States can find. Not another passage from the scripture is produced. But what care they for scripture, when the idea that every *method or plan* of doing good must have scripture authority for it contains a legion of fallacies. (See T. Munnell, page 282, G. A.) And when, notwithstanding the declaration of the Holy Spirit, that the scriptures "thoroughly furnish the man of God to all good works," our society brethren stoutly maintain, the scriptures do not furnish direction for spreading abroad the gospel of the Son of God, or for the salvation of dying sinners in foreign lands. Either the Apostle Paul was egregiously mistaken, or saving sinners in a foreign land is not a good work, or Bro. Munnell and our society brethren are greatly in error.

These two passages of scripture, and then the balance of the light is sought where? Wholly from our brethren in Tennessee. If we can only find they are doing the same thing we are, we are safe!! We thank you for the compliment, Bro. Munnell, but we are not infallible, we may err. You had better not depend on us as infallible guides. What other argument is presented? From what other source is light derived? The light that comes from our own actions blinds us by its brilliancy! Strange indeed. But Brother Munnell has perpetually refused to see that light as it is in truth. To the jaundiced eye all things are green. Brother Munnell, who is committed to human institutions, will see nothing but human institutions in what we do.

So he perverts all of our actions to prove us like him. He even perverts our statement as to what we are doing. When we tell him that churches sustain individuals to preach to the destitute he will see nothing but preaching to those in their vicinity. While we believe there is a great amount of foolish waste of strength and means, and devotion in going off a hundred miles or two hundred, or to China or the Feejee Islands, when thousands are dying around our very doors for lack of gospel teaching, our Tennessee brethren are not confining themselves to their communities. Bro. Trimble, one referred to as being sustained by the brethren, is at this writing in an entirely destitute county, nearer, by two thirds, a head centre of one of your society districts than he is the churches that sustain him. Bro. E. G. Sewell has done more service, we will venture, in

some destitute points in Kentucky the present year, than in the county in which he lives. Both of these points a hundred miles from these brethren. Our own labors have twice reached to Kentucky, and the most pressing appeals we now have are from sections of Kentucky, where there are brethren in abundance, with wealth far surpassing any thing we know in Tennessee to sustain the gospel, but who are doing absolutely nothing under the demoralizing effects of your society operations, not even meeting on Lord's day to worship, but waiting for somebody to come and do their work for them.

These two passages of scripture, and the misrepresentation of what we are doing with the oft repeated assertion that the scriptural plan of spreading the gospel by individual and church operation and co-operation without human societies cannot carry the gospel to foreign lands, constitute the entire argument in behalf of the right of man to form institutions of his own for the service of God. Not another point is made. The scriptures you quote require no response. As one puts your society upon a par with the envious persecutors of Paul who preached the gospel only in pretence. This is a worse position than we ever assigned it. We always gave credit for honesty of purpose. The other is so manifest a teaching to individuals as members of churches and not to human associations, that he who would be misled by it is in no danger. To whom little is given, of him little will be required. Of the second, our operations, we have said sufficient. Your own rule condemns you—justifies us. God has ordained the church as his agent for good; He has not ordained any plan of transport, travel, communication or generaleducation.

To the third we have presented the fact, which Brother Munnell dare not call in question, that the gospel has been spread over the known world, from Jerusalem, Judea, Samaria, over Europe, Asia, Africa, thence to America and the Isles of the Ocean, through churches and individuals, without the aid of human societies. That these churches have the same power now that they had then, if they but keep themselves pure and free from human societies as they were then. We present the further truth, that the pure gospel has never been carried to a single foreign land by human societies; but these societies have followed the openings of individuals and churches, and corrupted and destroyed the purity of their faith and practice, their self-sacrificing devotion, their confidence and trust in the sufficiency of God's word and appointments, in doing this they destroy men's confidence in God himself; have thus separated them, in faith and feeling, from the only instrumentalities and influences that can keep alive their zeal, devotion and spirituality; have substituted the missionary societies in place of the true self-sacrificing evangelizing spirit of the gospel; have continually violated God's law, in inducing men to give by publishing to the world the good deeds of those who contribute, when God says we must do, not letting one hand know what the other does. You pervert not only the spirit but the mode. God says lay by in store on the first day of the week as the Lord has prospered you. You say a mere temporary order; give quarterly. God says, say not we will do this or that on the morrow. You say pledge what you will give for the future, whether God prospers or not. We have presented, that in destroying man's confidence in the ability of the church of God, to send the gospel abroad, without human societies, you destroy his confidence in its ability to accomplish any other work that God has established it to perform; hence invite men to make additions and amendments to the church at every

point. If it cannot send the gospel abroad, it cannot feed the poor; so you form human societies to feed the poor or send to the world's poor houses. No more can it make men temperate, so you form a temperance society. No more can it make men truthful, so you form a truth-telling society. If it cannot send the gospel abroad, it cannot make men refrain from stealing, killing, whoring, cannot make them love God, nor observe the ordinances of the Lord's house, cannot make them visit the widows or care for the orphans, so we must have a separate and distinct society for each of these ends. Not one of these is more sacredly committed to the church as a work which God will accomplish through it than the preaching of the gospel. When the church is thus divested of its power for good, the man is a miserable dotard that would respect either it or its maker.

You have admitted that it is "wicked and treasonable in man" to make institutions where God has provided. You have admitted that the churches are God's only appointments for spreading the Gospel. You have admitted that your societies are but human inventions for spreading the gospel. You have human inventions working where God made provision. How can you put these three admissions together and fail to see your society self-condemned as "wicked and treasonable." You may say, that this society is not a substitute for, but an addition to the church. God says most emphatically whosoever adds to the things written in his book, (or to his appointments) to him shall be added the plagues written in that book. God has taught that his church is the pillar and support of the truth. That it is to be perfected, built up and spread by every member in its proper place in the body, (not in some other body,) doing its duty. Eph. iv: 11–16. The churches sounded out the gospel under divine guidance. Paul was sent by the church. Paul and Barnabas, Paul and Silas, and the disciples went every where preaching the gospel under divine guidance. The churches sent to their necessities once and again. The churches sent by their own chosen messengers to supply the wants of the suffering brethren in Judea—they did not unequally yoke themselves together with the world, and give human societies the credit of what they did, ignoring God's appointment. This was God's approved order, done under the guidance of his Holy Spirit, and he who properly respects God will still act in the way that he knows is approved.

Human societies spread by organic force—the religion of the Savior spreads as a leaven. Human societies are based on the right of man to form organizations through which he will worship his Maker. This is the fundamental error of Romanism. The great battle now in the religious world is: Shall human expedients prevail in the church or divine authority. Rome is the giant Goliath, among the denominations; leads in the conflict, with the most complete human expedients the world ever saw. The denominations have quailed and trembled before her. The only power that can prevail against her will be the church of Christ as a youthful David, strong in faith and devotion, meeting her only in Heaven's armor, with God's approved weapons. To arm her with human expedients, is to clothe David with Saul's armor.

The principle is the same that authorizes auricular confession, the order of Jesuits, the mourning bench, or any other human society for the service of God. The difference is in the degree to which the assumed right is carried, not in the character of the assumption. That Rome will swallow up every organization that continues to maintain this principle we have not a doubt. Every individual then that maintains the right of men to frame institutions for doing God's service, wittingly or unwittingly, strengthens the bonds of Rome. It will not do to say that this is an organization for good, Rome's are not. The mourning bench doubtless amidst much evil accomplishes some good. Rome does some good; auricular confession restrains crime, and the order of the Jesuits had some excellent features about it. But that cannot be said to be a means, or as you will have it, an "opportunity" of doing good, which stands in the way of other better agencies, and brings more of evil than of good as its result. Scarcely an act of life, however criminal, but that is the occasion of developing some good. The mourning bench, the confessional, and the missionary societies all do this, but they all bring more of evil, and stand in the way of better agencies for good. They all destroy man's confidence in, and sense of dependence upon, God and his appointments, teach him to rely upon his own wisdom and guidance. For this, the great evil, no good can compensate. D. L.

Fellowship.

We have received from a sister at Columbia, Mo., $5; from a brother at Austin, Texas, $50; from a sister at Franklin, $1; from a brother at Williamsport, Maury county, Tenn., for the church at Frankfort, Ala., $22 50; from a sister at Ashley, Ill., $2; from congregation at Cross Roads, Upsher county, Texas, $20; one box of bacon from a sister at Tate's Station, Ky.; from church at McMinnville, Tenn., $30; from a brother a Wellonia, Ky,, for sister Love, $5; from a sister at Cadiz, Ky., for sister Love, $1; from a brother at Cadiz, Ky., $5; from the church at Bagdad, Smith county, Tenn., $12; from Cathey's Creek congregation, Maury county, Tenn. $88.

55

THE

GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

VOLUME IX. { T. FANNING, D. LIPSCOMB, } EDITORS. { NUMBER 28.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, JULY 11. 1867.

Discussion—Missionary Societies—10.

Brother Lipscomb:—I have concluded to close up our discussion with this brief note, as other matters of great importance are pressing upon me now toward the close of our missionary year. Besides, if what I have said already is wholly "irrelevant" to the subject, as you always say, I can have but little hope of ever saying any thing that will seem relevant to you. Every thing I have said in every article seems to me entirely relevant, and I judge a little too much so for *somebody's* comfort. The proposition before us now in three different articles is just the one before my mind all the while whether definitely stated or not. I first showed, in two articles, that no co-operation of churches, a thing allowed to be right, could be effected without some organization or arrangement larger than a single congregation—there must be conventions, reports, resolutions, presidents, agents, etc., or no general co-operation could exist. To this you ventured no reply, except that it was "not relevant." I showed that if a work was to be done that required such organization, that the argument was entirely complete. But still it was "not relevant"—a very cheap, convenient way of switching off to escape the force of an unanswerable argument.

2d. Again, I showed that our work was a *work of the churches and of no body else.* That the very thing you had been demanding was being done for years before the Advocate began to enlighten us on the subject. If the society was not coextensive with the whole body of Christ, it was largely the fault of the opponents of the work. There must always be a society until all the churches engage in the work; then the society will be lost, will die; but it will die like the morning star dies in the brightness of a greater light. This is what we are working for, as Brother McGarvey told you several months ago. The co-operation of a few churches, and only a few individuals in each church, is truly but the star light to what it would be if every church and every member were at work. To this end we are laboring, and until that day the societies must still work on; they can neither be written down nor talked down, especially by those who are offering nothing better in their stead. You can't say you are offering the church plan, for that is what we have. We can't learn anything from you on that subject. Nor do the oft repeated threadbare platitudes about the "Lord's appointments," etc., shed any light at all. My proposition then stands fair by the fact that our work is the work of the churches and not of sinners—the very

thing that you and others have been so clamerous about. We are right, yourselves being judges.

3d. We kept calling for three years for the "scriptural plan of co-operation," and not one of you *dared* to give an answer. We have always been answered by vague generalities about "human societies doing the Lord's work," etc. At last you and the Review tried your hand at a plan, if carried out, might make the 6th Street Church, Cincinnati, a monster of iniquity in a few years. I exposed that, but still I "was not relevant." Now I have had discussions, both written and oral, and have never been thought "irrelevant" before. My discussions in the Quarterly, the Harbinger, and Review, I think will show any thing else rather than "irrelevancy." No one ever discovered that peculiarity in my writing until the Advocate found itself unable to meet me in any other way.

4th. I next proved my proposition, not at that time formally stated, by demonstrating your own inconsistency in denying to us what you were *compelled* to have yourselves in undertaking any good work: for *if even you could not keep out of "human institutions" just while opposing them in us it is a pretty good proof that they are necessary.* I showed that the Advocate *wasn't quite* a divine institution, nor your projected university, nor your Sunday schools, nor your "Consultation meetings," nor your agents, nor your presidents, nor your "human" Hymn Books, which Bro. Fanning said was as good a "human production" as "human genius" could make. Tennessee has a right to be quite "human," but Kentucky. Now let Tennessee "pull out the beam out of her own eye and"—you know the rest. To all this you simply applied your stereotyped answer of "irrelevancy." One would think you had a patent or that response for the most pungent, killing thrusts were all turned aside by the new patent. Your inconsistency alone is no proof, but the *necessity* of your being *slightly* "human" in your work *is a proof.* Refusing to defend your own consistency is no answer to my proofs, but is rather an acknowledgment of your error.

5th. Again and finally: the only response you could make to my argument from the passage, "Do good as you have opportunity," was that the passage was "*irrelevant.*" Of course; and so is every one I might quote that could not be answered. You say I had no other passage but this. No doubt I have *forty* of them, but I hoped you would lock horns on this one if I would emphasize it. But *irrelevancy* is the "open sesame" for making a way to escape from every difficulty. When I said we had a better way of keeping the poor now by "taxation and county houses" than they had in Lazarus' days, you gave us a lecture about how the church ought to keep her own poor and not allow them to go to the poor house. It was very kind in you to enlighten us all on this subject, but I never thought the church ought to be burdened with the world's poor too, but supposed in my ignorance that poor houses, sustained by taxation for such persons, were very good things. Our Bible Colleges, Bible Lectures, Orphan Schools, Education Society for poor young men preparing for the ministry, all furnish opportunities, or as you say, "fitting occasions" for doing good. Shall we go on with these or shall we stop? Say. We would like to know your opinion up here. Shall we go on with these institutions for the spread of the gospel," or shall we drop them? Say yes or no. If you say *no*, then the missionary society will stand the test, for it has as much authority as any of them, and more than you have for the *Advocate.* If you say *yes;* drop them all, then I would desire to write no more, for it would be in vain. Now if the point I have just made is "irrelevant," like all the rest, then,

57

also, I think it would be useless to argue any longer.

Before closing allow me to express my gratification at the uniformly good temper in which this discussion has been carried on; and whether we ever agree on the missionary question or not, I shall always admire the kindness of heart you have manifested in the debate. If I can in the future do any thing that will remove your objections and still *preserve our efficiency in the missionary work*, I will not be slow to make the adjustment, I am not particular about *plans* but about *the work*, and must stand by the society plan till a better one is proposed.

THOMAS MUNNELL.

RESPONSE.

Our response to the above will be brief. As to what was proved or disproved, our readers of course must judge. None can fail to see from the above that Bro. Munnell has fully substituted human reason as the test and rule of authority for the Bible. "I showed in two articles," he says, "that no church co-operation could be effected without some organization larger than a single congregation." How did he show it? From what passage of Scripture? Not one did he point us to on this subject, but simply by his reasoning, which, however good, is human and liable to be mistaken. The same work of church co-operation was done in primitive times without any organization but the church of God. He says in the second place that their work was a work of the churches as such; so far as this is true I must certainly make no objection to it. But if a work of the church it is done by improper, unscriptural, unnecessary agencies. That society at Lexington that is composed of individuals that purchase membership by the payment of money, is not *a* church, *the* church or any part of the church of Christ. The right to enter the church of Christ, without money and without price, was purchased for the suffering poor by the blood of our great Redeemer. The hapless waif of mortality that has not money can never enter your society or any human society for religious purposes known to me. Our brother certainly forgets when he says the Gospel Advocate ever approved of any plan of co-operation that would make one church the agent for others. We gave six distinct forms of scriptural and efficient church co-operation, which he dared not question as both scriptural and efficient; but instead of responding to these, he conjures up something from a writer in the Review, which the writer nor any one else but a society man ever believed in, to belabor. In our first response we lay these developments of the divine plan down. How can you say then, Brother Munnell, that your call for the divine plan was never answered, or answered with vague generalities. See No. 11, page 206 of Gospel Advocate.

Bro. Munnell seems still to lay stress on what he terms our inconsistencies, and seems to think we were pledged to defend Tennessee against Kentucky. This has somewhat the appearance of being done for effect; we hope no such feeling has entered into the discussion. We trust we esteem Christians in Kentucky as highly as we do Christians in Tennessee. Our aim was and is not to show any thing in Kentucky wrong or in Tennessee right, but to learn what principles and practices were consistent with the Bible teaching. But we ask again, Suppose he prove we are guilty of adopting human institutions in religion, what then; is that proof of any thing but that we are frail human beings and liable to fail to live up to our prinples? This to us needs no proof, nor will we put others to the trouble of proving it. But Brother Munnell says that is proof the work cannot get along without these human organizations. Luther started out from Romanism with

the proposition, that the Bible and Bible alone contained the rule of faith and practice of Christians. Yet he adopted a Roman creed. Now suppose all men had argued, as Brother Munnell does, because an opponent of human creeds, especially such a master spirit as Luther, himself adopted a human creed; therefore the Christian religion cannot exist without a human creed. Suppose Mr. Campbell had argued thus, how chilled and cramped would have been his labor. But he had less faith in human reasoning, and more in the wisdom and efficiency of God's word and God's work than our Brother Munnell has. So he says, though all the world have found the word of God insufficient, yet I know that the true, trusting faith in God can find ample sufficiency in his work and appointments. To do all that his children ought to do, and with this earnest faith in God and his appointments, he worked mightily for the Lord. So, Bro. Munnell, as you learn to distrust your reasoning and human experience and trust God's word and God's wisdom you will depart from human institutions and rely on divine appointments. But did Mr. Campbell live in all things in exact accordance with his principles. We think to say he did would be to say he he was more than human. Hence his faith in God vindicated the principle, that possibly his human weakness, especially in his latter years, failed to fully live up to. Brother Munnell referred to one scripture (he gives up the other in the summing up)—only one after much pressing for divine authority, to make this applicable to his case. He makes opportunity and means interchangeable terms. He applies a scripture addressed to individuals in a church to an organization embracing churches and individuals. Such an application of necessity is in direct contradiction to many of other passages of scripture. So it *cannot* be the proper application. So a little human reasoning constitutes the basis of these society operations, and this not only without scripture authority, but directly in the face of contrary teaching that cannot be set aside. Bro. Munnell for some time asked, "How the Bible can be sent to the Fejee Islands without human organizations?" Our response was, that the church of Christ, without human organizations, had carried the religion of the Savior to the ends of the world. We asked but in vain for one single instance, *only one*, brethren, where the pure gospel had been carried to a heathen land by human societies. Bro. Munnell, if his life depended upon it, could not give a single instance. Bro. Munnell asks, has done it repeatedly, what I thought of their Bible College, Bible Lectures, Orphan School, Education Societies, etc. We have not failed to respond to this question because we had any fears of assuming responsibility in the matter, but because we wished to settle a principle by the word of God and not by what we thought was right and good, and when this principle was settled we would then be prepared to apply it to the institutions of our land. We wished to judge of the human institutions by the word of God, and not the word of God by our institutions. We are not sufficiently posted in reference to these institutions to say whether they are in conflict with the principles we have laid down in these responses or not. So far as they are subversive of that principle or truth, they are, in the language of our brother "wicked and treasonable." In other words, so far as your Bible College, your Orphan School, your Bible Lectures, the Hymn Book or Gospel Advocate, take work out of the hand of the church, that God has appointed the churches to perform, and give that work to an institution not of God but formed by man, they one and all are sinful and treasonable. So far as your Bible Lectures take the training

59

and instruction of preachers out of the hands of the church, deprive the church of the benefit accruing from this work, destroy its importance in the eyes of its members and the world, they do harm and not good. So far as your Orphan School takes the place of caring for and doing good to the orphans from the church, relieves it of its sense of responsibility in this work, by transferring it to a human organization, it does a work of immeasurable injury to the church and dishonor God. The same thing is true of a Hymn Book or the Gospel Advocate. If either take the work, or any part of it, from the church and give it to human organizations, they ought to be disowned and suppressed immediately. We shrink from no application of the principle to ourselves, when that principle is established by divine authority. Then I am not prepared fully to speak of these institutions to which you refer, owing to my ignorance of them. I will state, that I regard the system of qualifying preachers to make fine, pretty talks, while they are disqualified for earnest and true sympathy with and labor among the poor; subversive of the Christian religion. The tendency of all colleges is in that direction. Again, with Brother Franklin I will unite in saying, I think the Bible lectures in colleges on the theories of religion, to qualify men to preach the gospel, will be very liable to substitute human reasoning and human philosophy for Bible truth. But as Bro. Munnell now thinks the societies only a temporary expedient to give way and die before the operation of the churches, and their work, but as the star light (flickering candle light would have been better) to the bright sun light of the work of God's churches, and while we prefer infinitely the day light of even a beclouded sun to the candle or even star light, yet if he will labor with us to bring in the radiance of an unclouded sun in the perfect operation of God's churches, free from human additions, we will rejoice. Still insisting that seeking the life-giving warmth and light of the sun, as shed forth through the divine institutions, in the cold, dark, flickering starlight of human inventions, is neither in accordance with sound human reason or the teaching of the Bible. The more closely we cling to and rely upon God's appointments free from human appendages, the more fully we come into unison and harmony with God himself, and the more deeply we drink of his Holy Spirit. We most heartily reciprocate the kindly feelings and spirit of our brother, and assure him we shall at all times gladly sacrifice every feeling, thought or objection, preference of our own, that does not involve a sacrifice of the integrity, purity, sanctity, efficacy, and honor of the appointments of God and of God himself, for the sake of union and peace among the people of God, but these we dare not sacrifice. D. L.

Alien's Department.

Partly by our negligence, and partly by attention to other matters, we have been delayed in our present visit to you, Friendly Alien, for some time, during which we hope you have carefully studied the five lessons we have already given, and that you have not forgotten the marks on the guide-post along the road to the Tree of Life. But as we started far back in the brush, bogs, muck and mire of Calvinism, our journey from thence to citizenship in the kingdom of God was necessarily a long one, and made rapidly; it may not be amiss for us to go back and familiarize ourselves a little with the scenery along the road.

We have seen that the destiny of each individual was not unalterably fixed in Heaven or Hell before time began, but that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and