The Voice of the Pioneers on Instrumental Music and Societies

By
JOHN T. LEWIS

PRICE, $2.00

NASHVILLE TENN.
GOSPEL AVOCATE COMPANY 1932

COPYRIGHT, 1932

GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY

NASHVILLE, TENN.

To all lovers of truth,
and especially to gospel preachers who are
contending earnestly for the faith which
was once for all delivered unto
the saints," this book is
hopefully dedicated,

JOHN T. LEWIS
Ensey, Alabama
July, 25, 1931

PREFACE

THE FOLLOWING PAGES contaln an answer to the challenge made by the secretary of the Tennessee Christian Missionary Society, sent forth to "our conservative brethren." The issue is clearly stated and the matter plainly put.

With absolute accuracy, Brother John T. Lewis has gleaned the writings of the pioneers of the Reformation and has presented what they had to say on the questions of missionary work and instrumental music in the worship. That he bas proved the statement of the above secretary false and showed him to be unreliable and unfamiliar with the "literature of that period" will appear to the most casual reader. The editor of this book has rendered a great service in behalf of primitive Christianity. Such a collection of reliable authority on these questions does not exist in any other volume.

1 most earnestly hope that every Christian, and especially every preacher of the gospel of Christ, may carefully read and thorough]y digest the matter herein found. Those who are now styled the "Christian Church" have made false claims for quite a while and have deceived many good peop]e. The truth demands that they be silenced along that line. The reading of this book will convince any honest soul that for a number of years after the great Reformation was begun the pioneers were a unit in opposing missionary societies and mechanical music in the worship of God.

N. B. HARDEMAN

INTRODUCTION

I OFFER NO APOLOGY for adding another book to the millions I already published some good and some otherwise--but following an age-old custom I will give my reason for so doing.

Job said: "Oh that mine adversary had written a book." Being, therefore, an avowed adversary of all who have departed from God's will and way, I have written this book, if not for their pleasure, I hope, at least, for their good.

M. D. CIubb, whose bold challenge occasioned this research, is secretary of the Tennessee Christian Missionary Society, and also editor of the T*ennessee Christian--instltutions or* organizations of the Christian Church. Therefore he must be considered as one of authority, a representative of his people. Wherefore this review is not direeted at an individual, but the organizations represented by him. His challenge involves innovations both in the work and worship of the church. The first part of this book will deal with the work of the church.

The constant and universal claim of the digressive churches is that they are standing with the pioneers of the nineteenth-century Reformation on "organized missionary agencies." The secretary of the Tennessee Christian Missionary Society says: "It is worse than folly to deny this."

Solomon says: "The words of the wise are as goads; and as nails well fastened are the words of the masters of assemblies, which are given from one shepherd. And furthermore, my son, be admonished: of making many books there is no end; and much study is a weariness of the flesh." (Ecclesiastes 12:11, 12.) I consider the pioneers of the nineteenth-century Reformation "masters of assemblies"--the "Milky Way"--in the galaxy of the ecclesiastical heavens--unequaled by any uninspired group.

In this book I have used the words of the pioneers "as nails well fastened" upon which to hang the challenge and baseless assertions of M. D. Clubb, there to dangle before a reading public, as a monument to his "learning and study" long years after our bodies are molding amid the dust of the dead.

Therefore this book is a compendium of what the pioneers taught taken from their own statements, and put within reach of all who are disposed to know the facts, but do not have access to the sources of information. This investigation has involved much research

and study; but it has not been "a weariness of the flesh," because Paul said: "For there are many unruly men, vain talkers and deceiver, specially they of the circumcision, whose mouths must be stopped; men who overthrow whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake." (Titus 1:10, 11.) Therefore, instead of being "a weariness of the flesh," it has been a pleasure to me to put these facts before you for the sake of truth and accuracy, and out of a sense of duty to sainted heroes of the faith, whose teaching had been flagrantly misrepresented.

Finally, these articles were first written with no thought of being put in book form; but when they began to appear in the *Gospel Advocate,* brethren from different parts of the United States and from the Philippine Islands began to write, urging me to have them put in permanent form, saying the articles contained facts and information which they did not have at their command.

Being a gospel preacher whose labors have been mostly of the pioneer kind, I had no money to pay for publishing a book. So there the matter rested for more than a year. But the request for the book became so urgent that the management of the *Gospel Advocate* decided to publish the book at a possible financial loss to themselves.

JOHN T. LEWIS.

INDEX--PART ONE

CHAPTER ONE

Clubb's challenge and Allen's commendation of Clubb's fairness and scholarship.

CHAPTER TWO

Lewis' acceptance of Clubb's challenge. The *Watchman and Reflector.*
Dr. Channing. Jacob Creath, Jr.

CHAPTER THREE

Errett Gates. Jacob Creath, Jr. Isaac Errett. Benjamin Franklin.

CHAPTER FOUR

James Inglis, a Baptist preacher's letter, and Mr. Campbell's reply. Jeremiah B. Jeter. John
Naylor's letter and Mr. Campbell's reply. "Not conscious of any change in any Christian doctrine since I wrote the first volume of the C*hristian Baptist"* (Campbell.)

CHAPTER FIVE

W. K. Pendleton. David Lipscomb. Robert Richardson. Moses E. Lard. Dr. Armitage's and ex-President Madison's opinion of Mr. Campbell.

CHAPTER SIX

Benjamin Lyon Smith's and F. M. Green's opinion of David S. Burnet. Resolutions of the
church of Christ at Connellsville, Pa., and David S. Burner's reply. Tolbert Fanning comments on "A Ministers' Meeting," and David S. Burnet replies.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Tolbert Fanning repliestoDavid S. Burnet's reply. Tolbert Fanning visits the convention and makes a speech. "The new editor of the Texas Department of T*he Guide"* misrepresents Fanning's position, and David Lipscomb replies.

CHAPTER EIGHT

F. M. Green, David S. Burnet, and Errett Gates tell about the prejudice and the fight made
against "The American Christian Missionary Society." The war resolutions passed by the convention in 1863 and Moses E. Lard's comments thereon.

CHAPTER NINE

Carroll Kendrick replies to ProL Charles Louis Loos' tract. Gilbert A. Sipe's letter and F. D.
Srygley's reply.

CHAPTER TEN

"The Depositions of David Lipseomb and E. G. Sewell" in the Newbern, Tenn., church trial.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

"The Tennessee Evangelizing Association" organized at Franklin College, April 21, 1852. Tolbert Fanning states his position and his purpose of establishing the G*ospel Advocate.*

CHAPTER TWELVE

A consultation meeting held in Franklin, Tennessee, April 10-14, 1856 An article written by
David Lipscomb and signed by sixteen brethren.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

The New Testament way of carrying the gospel to the world.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

Paul's examples and teaching in spreading the gospel.

CHAPTER I

(M. D. Clubb, in T*ennessee Christian.)*

THE G*ospel Advocate of* October 31 contains a lengthy article by J. A. Allen, in which he attempts to justify himself in making the following statement, which we published with some comment in a recent issue of the T*ennessee Christian:*

No man who respects the word of God can remain with the trans-gressives. The organ and man-made socieries do not constitute this trouble, but are merely symptoms of it. Their trouble is in the heart. They do not have the right attitude toward the word of God. The organ is one of the first steps. Others are, women preaching, open membership or receiving people without baptism, running with sinful denominations and going into "union meetings" with them. Then come evolution, modernism, skepticism, agnosticism, atheism. Many of them are now as far as skepticism. The same spirit that will take the first step will land in atheism.

He closes his article, in which he reprints the above, with the request that we point out any untrue statements or misrepresentations he may have made therein. We appreciate this courtesy and gladly avail ourselves of it. Our reply is in no sense personal. For Brother Allen we have great respect and esteem as a Christian brother. We are dealing with a situarion--a situation which requires fairness and frankness and a strict regard for the plain, unvarnished truth. Brother Allen's article is full of inaccuracies and misrepresentations. Let us see.

Here is a blunder in the first paragraph, which shows Brother Allen's carelessness in writing. He says the Tennessee Christian Missionary Society "is a State branch or auxiliary of the United Christian Missionary Society, whose headquarters are at Indianapolis." That is not true. The Tennessee Christian Missionary Society is not now, nor has it ever been, a branch or auxiliary of anything. It is absolutely independent of any outside connections. It is merely the method or agency through which the churches of Tennessee cooperate in the common task of building up the cause of Christ in the State. It exercises no control over the churches. The churches control it.

The second paragraph of Brother Allen's article implies strongly a misstatement of facts. The present division among our people did not come at the time of the introduction of instrumental music

and organized missionary work, nor for a good long time afterwards. Brethren who differed on these questions and others of similar nature did not break fellowship, but continued to work side by side in patient forbearance and brotherly love. If this spirit had continued, as it should have done, there never would have been a division. It was not until the opposers of instrumental music and organized missionary work began to make these things *tests of fellowship that* the division came. There never was, nor is riaere now, any disposition on the part of those who favor instrumental music and organized mission work to disfellowshlp their brethren who are opposed to them. Brother Allen knows that this is true. Were our conservative brethren justified in withdrawing from us? I answer, "No," Not one word can be said in justification of such action.

Again, Brother Allen says: "No man who respects the word of God can remain with the transgressives .... The fact is, no man can respect the word of God who refuses to abide in it, but insists on 'going beyond the things that are written' by introducing things that the word of God does not require or command." In this statement he condemns himself as completely as he does me. For if it is true that "no man can respect the word of God" who insists on going beyond the things that are written by introducing things that the word of God does not require or command, then is he not guilty of transgressing the word of God by introducing the Sunday scbool, the publishing house, the Bible college, and many other things which he and his brethren use to advance the cause of Christ, for which there is no specific requirement or command in the word of God? To put it bluntly, because I do not accept Brother Allen's interpretations of the Bible, I am therefore disloyal to the BibIe. How absurd such an idea! He thinks the organ and the missionary society sinful; therefore, I have forfeited my respect for the word of God because I do not agree with him. Has he produced any Scripture to prove that the organ and missionary society aresinful? No, for there is none. But when he tells me that l am transgressing the word of God in going beyond what is written in using the organ and missionary society, then I reply, so is he transgressing the word of God in going beyond the things that are written in his use of the Sunday school, the publishing house, the Bible college, the radio, etc. Why single the organ and missionary society out as sinful, and let these other things go scot-free? No, no, "sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander."

Again, he says: "It is a fact that they [us] fraternize with the sinful denominations and go into union meetings with them." I can hardly see how any man who really wants unity among all the followers of Christ could give expression to such a statement as that. "Sinful denominations," Brother Allen says. Now, I do not believe in denominationalism any more than he does, for denominationalism is the wall which holds Christians apart and keeps alive the spirit of division, and thus prevents the unity for which our Savior prayed in the very shadow of his cross. But, if we admit, and I gladly do, that our religious neighbors are Christians, despite the fact that we do not see everything alike, why should we not practice all the fellowship we can with them, looking forward to the day when all our petty differences and bickerings shall fade away in the beauty and glory of complete unity? My orthodoxy can take care of itself while I am busy working hand in hand with my brother of another religious body trying to bring lost souls to Christ. I know, and he knows, that neither one of us is compromising a single honest conviction we cherish in thus working together.

Finally, Brother Allen tells us that he and his brethren are standing just where the apostles and the pioneers of the Restoration stood in their opposition to instrumental music and organized missionary work. 0ur conservative brethren are constantly making this claim. Their position does not agree either with the apostles or the pioneers. 1 will pass over for the present the claim that they stand with the apostles and look into the claim that they are standing with the pioneers in regard to organized missionary work. What was the position of the pioneers on methods of missionary work? Here are the facts:

The American Christian Missionary Society was organized by the pioneers in 1849, at a general convention of churches in Cincinnati, Ohio. This convention was the first ever held in our brotherhood. This convention was suggested by Alexander Campbell himself. He said: "I am of opinion that a convention, or general meeting of the churches of the Reformation, is a very great desideratum. Nay, I will say further that it is all important to the cause of reformation. I am also of opinion that Cincinnati is the proper place for holding such a convention." He said further: "The purposes of such a convention are aiready indicated by a general demand for a more efficient and Scriptural organization, for a more general and efficient

cooperation in the Bible cause, in the missionary cause, in the education cause." *(SeeMillennial Harbinger, Volumelg49, pages475,* 476.) The convention was held, and W. K. Pendleton, one of the pioneers associated with Mr. Campbell, reported its proceedings in the December issue of the M*illennial Harbinger of* 1849. The following resolution was adopted: "Resolved, That the Missionary Society, as a means to concentrate and dispense the wealth and benevolence of the brethren of the Reformation in an effort to convert the world, is both Scriptural and expedient."

The constitution provided for a delegate convention. Mr. Campbell was elected president of the American Christian Missionary Society, and remained in this position till his death, tie was at the zenith of his intellectual strength, being just sixty-one years old. There were twenty vice presidents. Among them we note D. S. Burnett, Walter Scott, W. K. Pendleton, John T. Johnson, Tolbert Fanning, and James Challen. These were all pioneers of the Restoration.

Following the report of Mr. Pendleton, Alexander Campbell writes an editorial (Volume 1849 of the H*arbinger) in* which he says : "Our expectations from the convention have been more than realized. We are much pleased with the result, and regard it as a very happy pledge of good things to come." He commends the American Bible Society, the Foreign Bible Society, and the Christian Missionary Society. Of the latter he says: "The Christian Missionary Society, too, on its own independent footing, will be a grand auxiliary to the churches in destitute regions at home as well as abroad. These societies we cannot but hail as greatly contributing to the advancement of the cause we have been so long pleading before God and the people .... We commend these instrumentalities to the prayers of all the holy brethren and to the blessing of the Lord." "We are therefore peculiarly gratified to see with what unanimity, liberality, and zeal the whole brotherhood assembled at the tate Cincinnati convention have entered into this great work of evangelizing--at least of contributing their aid to the conversion of the world. It is the glory of the first convention ever assembled of our brethren, that then and there they unanimously resolved, in the name of the Lord, to institute, to organize, and put into operation a society for spreading salvation and civilization. . . . We have an organized missionary soeiety, a committee of ways and means, and desire no more at present than to notice

the foundation laid, on which we may build a glorious superstructure." *(Millennial Harbinger,* 1850, pages 75, 76.)

The literature of that period shows very little opposition to organized missionary work. The church at Connellsville, Pa., in its opposition, said: '"That we consider the church of Jesus Christ, in virtue of the commission given her by our blessed Lord, the only Scriptural organization on earth for the conversion of sinners and sanctification of saints." Mr. Campbell comments thus on this: "Their second resolution is the basis of all their objections, and yet it is, in the main, such a one as we all approve. Tbe only question is whether Christ's church is one community, or all the communities, founded upon a belief of his divine person, office, and mission. A church at Connellsville, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, or New York is not the church of Christ. The church of Christ is a very large and widely extended community and possesses a large field, even the habitable earth. The church for which Christ died, and for which he lives and intercedes, is not the church at Connells-ville, Rome, Ephesus, or Jerusalem, but is composed of all who have been baptized into his gospel and continue to walk in him. Now it is competent to '*the church of Christ'* to consult and cooperate with all the individual communities called 'churches of Christ,' which enter into her own constituency, in whatever State, nation, or empire they may be found, in each and every matter beyond their individual duties to themselves and their localities. These are matters which we regard as conceded by all our brethren, and therefore we offer no argument in support of them." (See *Millennial Harbinger,* 1850, pages 285, 286.)

I am quoting only a tithe of what Mr. CampbelI said in support of organized work. He met with very little opposition from any source, so far as we can discover. Our brethren have always been committed to organized mission agencies. It is worse than folly to dispute this. The pioneers were almost unanimous in favor of organization. They may have been wrong in their position, but one thing is certain: *Brother Allen and his people are not standing with them. I* am, and about one million five hundred thousand others of my brethren are, today. I challenge any man to prove that this is not true. The pioneers stood for organized missionary work. Brother Allen does not. That is the whole truth about it.

If Brother Allen wants me to take up "open membership," "women preaching," "evolution," "modernism," "skepticism,"

"agnosticism," "atheism," I will be glad to answer his accusations here. Brother Allen has done us a grave injustice. The Disciples of Christ number about one million six hundred thousand members grouped into more than five thousand active churches. After careful examination, only about sixteen congregations admit into their working fellowship professed Christians who have not been immersed. This is less than one-third of onepercent. Of course, there are varying shades of opinion on questions of theology, from extreme fundamentalism to modernism, so called, but as adherents to the New Testament gospel we stand as one man. Extremists can be found everywhere. Doubtiess we have ours. But, Brother Allen, are ninety-nlne and three-fourths per cent of our membership to be judged by one-third of one per cent? On that basis the twelve apostles would fare badly, for eight and one-third per cent of their number turned out to be a traitor. In closing, "let us magnify the things that make for peace, and the things whereby we may edify one another."

EXCHANGE OF VIEWS WITH BROTHER CLUBB.

We kindly request readers of the G*ospel Advocate* to slowly and earefuny go over Brother Clubb's editorial and our reply. The division over this matter is the one real division among the disciples of Christ, and we earnestly hope and pray that we may get together. There is no reason why we cannot. Elevated discussion and exchange of views, which is so conducive to light and intelligence, can never descend into a low wrangle when we honestly search for truth.

Brother Clubb's candor and fairness excites our admiration. He proves himself to be an inherent gentleman, not less than one of the leading and outstanding writers on that side of the question. The *Advocate is* glad to present Brother Clubb's views and wants him to feel free and uncramped in plainly giving us the benefit of his learning and study. The Savior prayed for the union of all his people, "that the world may believe that thou didst send me" (John 17:21), and there is, therefore, such a thing as eliminating division and putting forth a united effort to convert the world. May such a glorious consummation be speedily attained.

J. A. A.

CHAPTER II

IN the G*ospel Advocate of* February 6, 1930, pages 132, 133, we I have three and a half columns from M. D. Clubb. After quoting some extracts from Alexander Campbell's writings, he says: "I am quoting only a tithe of what Mr. Campbell said in support of organized work. He met with very little opposition from any source, so far as we can discover. Our brethren have always been committed to organized mission agencies. It is worse than folly to dispute this. The pioneers were almost unanimous in favor of organization. They may have been wrong in their position, but one thirfg is certain: *Brother Allen and his people are not standing with them. I* am, and about one million five hundred thousand others of my brethren are, today. I challenge any man to prove that this is not true. The pioneers stood for organized missionary work. Brother Allen does not. That is the whole truth about it."

In the same issue of the G*ospel Advocate,* page 129, Brother Allen says: "Brother Clubb's candor and fairness excites our admiration. He proves himself to be an inherent gentleman, not less than one of the leading and outstanding writers on that side of the question. *The Advocate is* glad to present Brother Clubb's views and wants him to feel free and uncramped in plainly giving us the benefit of his learning and study."

When Brother Clubb says, "I challenge any man to prove that this is not true," that includes me, and I gladly accept his challenge for the following reasons: First, for truth's sake; second, for the benefit of young preachers who may look upon the G*ospel Advocate* as authority and have not access to the writings of the pioneers to disprove Brother Clubb's statements.

If Brother Clubb had said, "'The pioneerswere almost unanimous in f*avor of co-operation,"* he would have stated the facts; but he said, '°The pioneers were almost unanimous in favor of organization." The difference between cooperation and organization is the difference between God's wisdom and man's wisdom. "And ye yourselves also know, ye Philippians, that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no church had fellowship with me in the matter of giving and receiving but ye only; for even in Thessaloniea ye sent once and again unto my need." (Phil. 4:15, 16.) This was *co-operation, but not* or*ganization.* When Paul

traveled among the churches of Galatia, Achala, and Macedonia taking a collection for the saints in Jerusalem, he was *co-operating,* but not or*ganizing.*

Brother Clubb says: "The American Christian Missionary Society was organized by the pioneers in 1849, at a general convention of churches in Cincinnati, Ohlo. This convention was the first ever held in our brotherhood." How can you harmonize these facts with the following from Brother Clubb: "Our brethren have always been committed to organized mission agencies!" What were "our brethren" doing from the beginning of the reformation till 1849, when they had their "first convention" and organized "The American Christian Missionary Society?" The reformation had almost circled the globe as a golden belt in 1849. In the balmy days of the reformation the pioneers *co-operated.* Since 1849 "our brethren" have been or*ganizing, and* only discord, disruption, division, and alienation have followed in the wake of their or*ganizations.*

Brother Clubb says: "This convention was suggested by Alexander Campbell himself." We will now let Mr. Campbell speak for himself. In the M*illennial Harbinger,* 1849, page 90, under "Church Organization--No. 1," Mr. Campbell says: "There is now heard from the East and from the West, from the North and from the South, one general, if not universal, call for a more efficient organization of our churches." This article closes on page 93 as follows: "Have we, then, no Scriptural model, no divine precedent or authority, for any form of church organization and cooperation? And if so, what is it? We must appoint a committee to examine the subject, and to report in our next number." Mr. Campbell says the call came "from the East and from the West, from the North and from the South," and he suggested "appointing a committee to examine the subject."

In the M*illennial Harbinger,* 1849, page 221, under "Church Organization No. 2," Mr. Campbell says: "We must, then, abstain from . dogmatical spirit, while there remains a reasonable doubt on the premises before us. To assist myself and others in coming to Scriptural conclusions on the topic, we will classify the Scriptures, and deduce from them a few inferences bearing on a proper decision of the question concerning coiSperation." This shows that Mr. Campbell felt that "there remains a reasonable doubt on the premises before us," and he was advising caution. In the same article, page 223, he says: "There may, indeed, be

'churches of God,' 'churches of Christ,' 'churches of the saints,' in a city, as web as in a province or an empire. And there may also be but one church of Christ in a city or in a province. In both cases, however, a church of Christ is a single society of believing men and women, statedly meeting in one place to worship God through the one Mediator. But a church of churches, or a church collective of all the churches in a State or nation, is an institution of man, and not an ordinance of God. Nothing in the constitution of a church of Christ is more evidcnt than its individual responsibility to the Lord Jesus Christ for all its acts and deeds. No one can read, with proper discrimination, any one of the apostolic epistles, without recognizing this great and important fact." Mr. Campbell's mind was as clear as a bell on the New Testament church when he penned those lines.

In the M*illennial Harbinger,* 1849, page 269, under "Church Organization -No. 3," Mr. Campbell says:

From the classification of Scrlpturcs exhibited in our last, certain important doctrines are logically and rationally apparent to every sound mind--viz.: First, that a church of Jesus Christ is an organized body, or company of disciples of Christ, mceting statedly In some one place to worship God through Jesus Christ, and to edify and comfort one another; and in the second place, that the church of Christ, in the aggregate, is the same as the kingdom of Jesus Christ--or the whole Christian communitv on earth, composed of all them in every place that are baptized into Christ.

In the M*illennial Harbinger,* 1849, page 272, under "Church Organization No. 4," Mr. Campbell says:

I was present on the occasion of the dissolution of the "Mahon-ing Baptist Assoclation" in 1828 on the Western Reserve State of Ohio. With tile exception of o e obsolete preacher, the whole association, preachers and people, embraced the current Reformation. I confess I was alarmed at the impassioned and hasty manner in which the association was, in a few minutes, dissolved. I then, and since, contemplated that scene as a striking proof of the power of enthusiasm and excitement, and as dangerous, too: even in ecclesiastical as well as in political affairs. Counsel and caution, argument and remonstrance, were wholly in vain in such a crisis of affairs. It would have been an imprudent sacrifice of influence to have donc more than make a single remonstrance. But that remonstrance was quashed by the previous question, and the Regular Baptist Ma-honing Association died of a moral apoplexy in less than a quarter of an hour.

It seems that Mr. Campbell used this to show the danger of doing things under "the power of enthusiasm and of excitement."

Remember, he was writing on "church organization." This article closes, on page 273, as follows: "If our brethren will, in moderate size, forward their objections, approval, or emendations by letter. we will dispatch the matter with all speed and concur with them in the call of a general meeting in Cincinnati, Lexington, Louisville. or Pittsburgh." This shows that Mr. Campbell was expecting *objections* as well as *approvals, and* that he would "concur with them in the call of a general meeting" when these objections and approvals had been "dispatched."

In the *Millennial Harbinger,* 1849, page 462, under "Church Or-ganization--No. 5," Mr. Campbell said: "A church set in order may elect, commission, and ordain its own officers. And on any special emergency a number of churches may elect, commission, and ordain a speeial messenger or messenger% agents or officers, and send them on any given mlssion." This is from Mr. Campbell's last artlcle on "church organization," and no one could object to what he says a church may do. These five articles on "church organization" were written by Mr. Campbell before the quotations that Brother Clubb made from him.

In the August issue of the M*illennial Harbinger,* 1849, pages 475, 476, Mr. Campbell had an article, titled "Convention." He says:

I am of opinion that a convention, or general meeting, of the churches of the Reformation is a very great desideratum. Nay, I will say further, that it is all important to the cause of reformation. I am also of opinion that Cincinnati is the proper place for holding such convention. But the questions are: *How shall such convention be obtained, when shall it beheld, and for what purpose? T*hese I cannot more than moot, or propound. I must, however, to suggest considerations to our brethren, say that it should not he a convention of book makers or of editors to concoct a great book concern, but a convention of messengers of churches, se acted and constituted such by the churches--one from every church, if possible, or, if impossible, one from a district, or some definite number of churches. It is not to be composed of a few self-appolnted messengers, or of messengers from one two, or three districts, or States, but a *general* convention. I know that nelther w sdom nor piety is rated by numbers; still, in the muititude of counselors there is more general safety and more confidence than in a few.

While this shows that Mr. Campbell was "of opinion" that a convention would be a good thing, it also shows that he had some premonitions that harm might come from a convention.

Mr. Campbell closes this article as follows:

It is all important that the brethren act in this great affair advised]y, and that they may do so the interval should be devoted to the ascertainment of their views, and to the general enlightenment of the churches on what is yet wanting to the full attainment of the great objects contemplated and desired by us alh For this pur-pos% during the interim, a free and full exchange of our views on the whole premises should be attempted. All of which I submit with much deference to their judgment and decision. Meantime we shall be pleased to receive communications from them on all the premises.

Surely Mr. Campbell would not have made all these suggestions about something that he considered was taught or sanctioned in the New Testament. However, he was willing to "submit with much deference to the judgment and decision" of the brethren in the matter, and it seems that Mr. Campbell was controlled more by the "judgment and decision" of the brethren than he was either by his own judgment or the teaching of the New Testament.

The convention met in Cincinnati, Ohio, October 24, 1849, and organized the "American Christian Missionary Society." The proceedings of the convention were reported in the December issue of the M*illennial Harbinger,* 1849, pages 689-694.

Brother Clubb says: "The constitution provided for a delegate convention. Mr. Campbell was elected president of the American Christian Missionary Society, and remained in this position till his death. He was at the zenith of his intellectual strength, being just sixty-one years old. There were twenty vice presidents. Among them we note D. S. Burnett, Walter Scott, W. K. Pendleton, John T. Johnson, Tolbert Fanning, and James Challen. These were all pioneers of t he Restoration." Yes, "these were all pioneers of the Restoration," and it seems to me that Brother Clubb should have been just a little more liberal with his "learning and study" and told us that neither Alexander Campbell nor Tolbert Fanning attended the convention, and that, therefore, they were not present when they were "elected." Mr. Campbell said: "Denied the pleasure of having been present on this interesting occasion by an unusually severe indisposition, I am peculiarly gratified with the great issues of deliberation." *(Millennial Harbinger,* 1849, page 694.) This shows that what Mr. Campbell said about the convention was based on what he had *heard, and* not what he *knew.*

Mr. Campbell left home on December 6, 1849, and was away on a tour "in the Southwest" for fourteen weeks. (See M*illennial*

Harbinger, 1850, page 164 and page 224.) On January 5, 1850, Mr. Campbell wrote from Frankfort, Ky., as follows: "We have said that the 'Christian Missionary Society,' as now propounded and organized, is the first fruit of a general convention of the churches. At least, in the absence of the minutes of that convention, so we regard it." *(Millennial Harbinger,* 1850, page 88.) This shows that what Mr. Campbell had thus far said about the convention was based absolutely on hearsay. He had not even seen "the minutes of that convention." Brother Clubb should have told us that all he quoted from Mr. Campbell was written by Mr. Camp-bell before he had seen the minutes of the convention. That would have been perfectly fair.

Brother Clubb says: "The literature of that period shows very little opposition to organized missionary work." We will now look into "the literature of that period" and see what it shows, f mean no reflection on Brother Ciubb's "[earning and study."

It was intended and ordered that the glorious work of evangelizing the heathen should be committed to the church itself, not to separate societies within it and around it. If the facts whicb we have considered left any room for doubt on this point, that doubt might be removed by observing how illustriously the primitive church honored her own missionary character. *(Millennial Harbinger,* 1880, page 64.)

The difference between this mode of operation and that of early times may strike some minds more strongly, if we should ask the question, amidst all the light we have for answering it, What would Paul or Barnabas have thought, if, while far away among Greeks and Barbarians, they had received a letter signed by Simeon or Lutes, as secretary of the missionary society of the church at Antioch? We can easily imagine what astonishment--yea, what alarm--would have been depicted in the countenances of them both. What! they might have said, dld we not Ieave the church at Antioch a missionary society of Christ's own forming? Have a part of them apostatized from the work! Have any risen up to oppose it, that a society should need be orgaldzed within the church, to do that which was committed to the church as her specific business? Were we not by her commended to the grace of God and "sent away?" They did run well who hath hindered them! *(Millennial Harbinger,* 1850, pages 13I, 132.)

These quotations were from the *Watchman and Reflector. I* do not know who published that paper, but it was "literature of that period."

Brother Campbell, I thank you for your last two letters to me,

tendering the privilege of expressing my opinion of conventions through the H*arbinger. I* always feel humbled and subdued when I am treated with justice and kindness, and I am confident I shall never be convinced nor conquered by injustice and oppression. If I have advanced anything on this subject, heretofore, offensive, it was unintentional, and it was elicited by the treatment which I have received from others. I never saw Dr. Channing's opinion of associations until recentiy--since I wrote my last essay. He has so fully expressed my views that I have concluded to substitute his remarks in place of my first number. (Jacob Creath: Jr., M*illennial Harbinger,* 1850, pages 408, 409.)

As Brother Clubb would say, Jacob Creath, Jr., "was a pioneer."

This shows that Jacob Creath had opposed the convention and had been treated with "injustice and oppression" by the exponents of the convention. Mr. Campbell came to his rescue and opened *the columns of the Harbinger to him.* We will hear more from him in our next article.

CHAPTER III

I WILL LET Errett Gates, Ph.D., open this article and introduce Jacob Creath, Jr.:

The first serious internal controversy arose on account of the organization of this first missionary society. The society was opposed on the ground that there was neither precept nor example in the New Testament for the organization of societies for the spread of the gospel. Some of the bitterest satire in the columns of the *Christian Baptist* had been directed against the "mercenary schemes" of the missionary, tract, and Bible societies of the various denominations. Campbell's approval of the organization of the new society did not save it from the assaults of many of his brethren. The enemies of the society went back to the C*hristian Baptist* for their most effective epithets against the new scheme, and Alexander Campbell of 1823 was arrayed against Alexander Campbell of 1849. While he distinguished between the missionary purpose and the missionary plan in his early diatribes, and aimed them at the latter, the enemies of all missionary work applied them to both alike. His support of the new society was frank, open, and positive, and he did not hesitate to accept the office and honor of first president imposed upon him in his absence by his brethren in the convention at Cincinnati which created it.

The struggle for organized missionary work among the Disciples was begun, and progress was contested at every step by a bitter and relentiess opposition, which became a party within the ranks with its leaders and newspapers. The first leader of the antimissionary element was Jacob Creath, Jr. (Pages 240, 241, "The Story of the Churches -- the Disciples of Christ," by Errett Gates, Ph.D., Associate in Church History, University of Chicago. Published September, 1905, by the Baker & Taylor Company, New York.)

Dr. Gates was "not less than one of the leading and outstanding writers on that side of the question." However, it is evident that he and the editor of the T*ennessee Christian* bad read different literature, or one of them had read none.

As to the argument offered to sustain these associations--that they are acceptable to our brethren we would say that they have been un*acceptablt* to them until recently. What has produced this change in them? What new light is this that has sprung up so recently upon this subject? I confess I have no more light now, on the subject of associations, than I bad twenty-five years ago. Will these brethren, who have been so recently and suddenly converted from their former faith upon this subject, furnish us with a small portion of this new light, that we may be converted, too? I suppose the golden calf was acceptable to all the Jews, *except Moses.*

I believe the calves set up at Dan and Bethel were popular with Jeroboam and the ten tribes. The report of the spies was acceptable to all the Jews, *except Caleb and Joshua. T*he Pope is very acceptable to the Catholics; so are creeds and clerical conventions to all the Protestant parties. But does all this prove that they are acceptable to God? Did not God's Son say, that which is highly esteemed among men is an abomination in the sight of GOD? It is seldom that a thing is acceptable to God and man both. (Jacob Creath, Jr., in M*illennial Harbinger,* 1850, page 470, 471.)

You ask, "Are not the terms 'congregation' and 'convention' verbal equivalents?" I *answer no--they are not.* You ask, what is a single church but a convention? I might ask, what is a single family but a state, and what is a state but a single family? Are they the same thing? A single church is a select assembly of Christians located permanently in one place, meeting weekly to celebrate the ordinances of God. A convention is a collection of the clergy, elders, and laity, of some religious party or sect scattered over the United States and other countries, meeting occasionally, annually, or semiannually, in different places--for what? To pass resolutions to bind themselves or others to do what they were aiready bound to do. The crcation of a single congregation is the work of God; the creation of a eonveation is the work of man.

You say our Savior and the apostles did not denounce conventions, as such. Did they denounce popery or corrupt Protestantism, as such? Did they denounce infant baptism, or creed making, or auricular confession, as such? It is for you to show where they *authorized conventions. (Jacob Creath, Jr., in Millennial Harbin*ger, 1850, page 497.)

The T*ennessee Christian* editor says: "Our brethren have always been committed to organized mission agencies. It is worse than folly to dispute this." WeS, we will have to excuse Jacob Creath's *"folly"* on the ground that he did not know that a man of such outstanding character and ability would ever so express himself on the subject.

Since Jacob Creath, Jr., has aiready committed this folIy (?), we will hear him again:

Brother Campbell: The September number of the H*arbinger,* containing your strictures upon Dr. Channing and myself, is before me. In refuting what the Doctor sald about indlvldual human ae. tion and almsglving, I do not see any relevancy between his argument and the work of redemption being conjoint and representative. *He was not speaking of divine acts, but of human actions.* You allow me two pages in the September number, and you have nearly nine ages. On the first page of your reply to Dr. Channing you say, The church in Jerusalem was itself a convention; and then how many pages do you afterwards occupy in your answer to my third

number, to prove that I misunderstood you when you called a church and a convention verbal equivalents, in the July number? You bave twice expressed your sorrow that I have so freely indorsed what Dr. Channing said against conventions. Now, permit me, my dear brother, to say to you in all kindness and candor, that your brethren who now oppose conventions, and who have opposed them since they entered this Reformation, are equally sorry to find you and others opposing conventions in the great platform you laid down for us in the C*hristian Baptist, and* now to find you and them advocating conventions as zealously as you then opposed them. If you were right in the C*hristian Baptist,* you are wrong now. If you are rigbt now, you were wrong then. If*youwererightintheChris-tian Baptist,* we are tigbt now, in opposing conventions. We follow the first lessons you gave us on this subject. If we are wrong, Brother Campbell taught us the wrong. Instead of denying this fact, and endeavoring to conceal it, and to throw the blame upon us, we believe it would be more j*ust and* Christian to confess the charge, and to acknowledge that the arguments you offered in the *Christian Baptist,* agablst conventions, are much more unanswerable than any that have been offered for them since that tlme. Itis the de6ire of many brethren, who sincerely love and admire you, that you wilt reconcile the arguments in the C*hristian Baptist,* offered against conventions, with those you now offer for them. We are unable to do this, and, therefore, we ask it as a favor of you to do it. (Jacob Creath, Jr., in M*illennial Harbinger,* 1850, page 637.)

Remember, our challenger says: "He [Mr. Campbell] met with very little opposition, from any source, so far as we call discover." It is aiready apparent, evidently, to the readers of these articles, that the editor of the T*ennessee Christian* has never made very extensive excursions into "the literature of that period." If he had, he certainly would have *discovered the* opposition that Mr. Campbell met.

Professor Gates opened this article, and I will let him close it: Isaac Errett became the leader of the progressive party, and through the pages of the C*hristian Standard,* after its establishment in 1866, favored and promoted every helpful expedient in the work of the church. It was he who fought the batties of the missionary society, and reminded his brethren in 1867 that the *Standard was* the only weekly paper advocating missionary societies. Against him were the G*ospel Advocate and* the A*merican Christian Review,* and to them was added in 1869 the A*postolic Times, un*der the editorship of Moses E. Lard, L. B. Wilkes, Robert Graham, W. H. Hopson, and J. W. MeGarvey, establisiled with the avowed purpose of resisting the tide setting in, in favor of modern methods and organizations in church work. (Pages 252, 253, Gates' history, as given in the first part of this article.)

It is a pity that the learncd editor of the T*ennessee Christian* had not been with Isaac Errett in 1867, and told him "our brethren have always been committed to organized mission agencies," and the opposition was only a mental delusion of his.

The A*merican Christian Review was* given, in my last article, as one of the papers that opposed the "American Christian Missionary Society." Benjamin Franklin, editor of the C*hristian Review, for* a while worked with, and served as secretary of, the society, but turned and threw all of his influence and power against the society.

I quote again from Errett Gates' history, as given in my last article, pages 244, 245:

All the officers of the society served without salary until 1857, when Benjamin Franklin, as secretary, was the first to be paid a salary. In his report to the board he said: "There has been strong prejudice against the missionary society. This we have labored to counteract, and, I think, to a considerable extent it has abated." After holding the office one year, he was succeeded by Isaac Errett. From the time he severed his relations with the society be began to oppose it, and opposition in one point broadened to include every point, until he stood opposed to the very idea of organized missionary work. He became the leader of the antimissionary forces, and by voice and pen, as editor of the A*merican Christian Review,* he menaced and cramped the work of the society until 1870. His paper became the most influential next to the M*illennial Harbinger.*

We will now read something about Mr. Franklin's change:

We shall attempt no outline of the argument, as the points made m it, excepting the charge that the society had failed in the work for which it was organized, are before the reader. The main question involved was the pure congregationalism to which the Reformers had been educated by Alexander Campbell in the C*hristian Baptist,* and by Barton W. Stone in the C*hristian Messenger.*

A number of the periodicals of the Reformation refused their columns to the discussion. But the Rev*iew was* opened to it, and as it circulated everywhere, the people generally were awakened to a considerafion of the subject. Mr. Franklin himself for some three years took no part in the discussion. But it was noticed that he had ceased to plead for the society, and tilat his son was one of its most persistent opposers in the columns of the Rev*iew. M*any suspected that he was the instigator of the articles written by his son, and this increased the personal opposition to him. But the fact is that his mind was undergoing a change in regard to the denominationalism of the Reformation. He had been a fervent advocate of the societies, and his influence had contributed in no small degree to make them what they were. But he was disappointed n the results. He began to conclude that they had not done what they were expected

to do, and had assumed a prerogative as a representative assembly which did not belong to them. And it was not long until it became evident that his sympathies were with the opposition, atthough he said nothing. ("The Life and Times. of Benjamin Franklin," by Joseph Franklin and J. A. Headington, pages 343, 344.)

This change in Mr. Franklin exposed him to severe criticism from the exponents of the society. To this criticism Mr. Franklin replied in the following ironical strain:

In another column the reader will find an article from our worthy brother, John B. Corwine and we have two more from him equally as clear and conclusive as the one we published, in which he proves beyond a reasonable doubt that the editor of the Rev*iew is* not infallible, or certainly that he has not been in his past history; that he recommended the Louisville plan in 1869, but now opposes it! This he has shown up with much ability, and greatly to the disadvantage of the editor of the Rev*iew. T*rue, that matter has been explained in our columns again and again; but, then, it must be explained and discussed more and more. When other men commit a blunder, and afterwards confess it, they are generally forgiven, *but there appears to be no pardon for the editor of the Review! H*e has made a blunder, and the law is: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." (Ezek. 18:20.) If he swore the horse was six*teen feet high,* he must stick to it. if the editor of the *Review* once went for the society scheme, wrote and published many things in favor of it, and thought it was right, he must think so forever, in defiance of all his experience in the matter, the demonstrations he has had, a more mature study of the Scriptures and thorough knowledge of them, and the history of religious operations; and though fully convinced that the whole of these schemes are wrong, he must continue to write and publish as much as ever in favor of them. Is not a man to be allowed to learn anything in a public life of forty years? Or may all other men learn something, and when convinced of error turn from it, but the editor of the Rev*iew mus*t never learn anything, nor change his course from wrong to right? Must he carry the meal in one end of the sack, and a stone, to balance it, in the other end forever, though he has learned that, by dividing the meal and lear-ing the stone, he can carry twice as much?

As we have said, we have documents before us from our worthy Brother Corwine, in which he has labored the sub ect, brought it up from d fferent any es, and showed up the editor of the *Review* in a most masterly manner. He has anticipated the reluctance the editor would feel in publishing the exposition of his inconsistencies in his own sheet, and demanded a return of the documents, if not published, that he might publish them in some other paper. This of course, alarmed the editor of the Rev*iew and* brought him to terms. He must, therefore, succumb and publish these document% and let his readers see what those attentive had long known: that

he has said malay things favoring and even advocating the different society schemes we have had; probably as much and with as much force as any other man among us. We confess that the editor of the Rev*iew is* fairly and fully convicted by our able Brother Corwine of having been a society mart and saying many things favorable to the society schemes. This our columns abundantly show. We do not, therefor% propose to stand any trial, but come forward in open court and ple*ad guilty.* We are at the mercy of our judges, and can only beg their clemency. May it please their honors to hear us a few words?

We were not present when the first society among us was born. We never did anything toward originating any one of the societies we have had. Our name was put on the list, without our consent or knowledge, as one of the committee of twenty, appointed to devise a plan previous to the bringing out of the Louisville plan; but we were not present with the committee at any time during their work on it, did no part of the work, and had no idea of having anything to do with it. We shall have occasion to refer to this matter again further on.

We held all conventions at a discount for many years, in the early part of our operations, and stood pretty firmly on the position taken in the early articles in the C*hristian Baptist.* But we continued to attend the conventions generally, and found much enjoyment in meeting so many men all enlisted in the same work. Not only so, but explanations were constantly being made, that our conventions were only *advisory,* voluntary, and had no *authority--that the*y were limited strictly to *missionary work, and* had no right to interfere *with the independence of the churches.* We also had a clause in the constitution of some of our soeieties limiting the conventions to missionary work. With this view and trying all the time to be satisfied, we became reconc ed to them, and thought we had them safe. That great mart and master spirit, Jacob Creath, as he has recently mentioned, wrote us nearly thirty years ago, objecting to conventions as dangerous bodies, and entreating us to have nothing to do with them. We published some of his articles and probably declined some of them, mak ng the best defense we could.

We at one time took the position of Corresponding Secretary for the General Society for a short time--six months, if our memory is not at fault--agreeing to give it one-half our time, and to receive a compensation of six hundred dollars a year. Our recollection is, that *we received three hundred dollars for our services.* We never heard anything about our "exacting" the pay, or there being any necessity for it; but it was the understanding that we should have it, and we received it. We beg to be forgiven this wrong. We soon saw that, though we were doing work enough and more than enough to earn what was given us, we were not doing the cause of the Lord *good though to justify our continuing to receive it; and*, as the best thing we could see that we could do was *to stop it,* we *promptly resigned.*

This was the only *three hundred dollars* we ever received for labor in the cause that we are satisfied did not do any good. (Editorial *in the Review of January 11, 1876. Q*uoted in "The Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin," pages 346-349.)

I am permitting the pioneers to speak for themselves on "*or*ganized mission agencies," and am saying as little as I can myself, lest I should appear as "learned" and as "studious" as the editor under review appeared in his dissertation on the subject.

CHAPTER IV

BROTHER M. D. CLUBB says: "I am quoting only a tithe of what Mr. Campbell said in support of organized work. He met with very little opposition from any source, so far as we can discover." (*Gospel Advocate, February 6, 1930, page133.)* In this article I will give "opposition" from a Baptist "source." On Feb-uary 4, 1850, James Inglis, a noted Baptist preacber, of Detroit, Mich., wrote Mr. Campbell a long letter commending the Reformation, but criticizing the Cincinnati Convention. He also made some prophetic statements about the Reformation that have long since come true. This letter is found in the M*illennial Harbinger,* 1850, pages 201-205. I quote some extracts from this letter:

Accept my congratulations, in the commencement of the twenty-eighth year of your editorial labors, on all that the Lord has given you grace to accomplish in the reformation of a current and corrupt Christianity. Your venerable father's character, and your own, commanded my admiration, long before I was as well acquainted, as I now am, with the spirit and aim of your labors. And as a matter of satisfaction, that the veteran has been permitted to see, before he lies down to rest, how far the Lord can exceed all our thoughts and desires. The devotedness of your love of truth, and the intrepidity of your advocacy of it, have awakened the evident sympathy of truth seekers, even when they dissent from your conclusions as to what is truth. For myself, no reproach shall hinder me from owning my indebtedness to you in my humble endeavors to get past the traditions of men, to the plain faith and institutions of the gospeh I avow sympathy in the truths around whleh our hopes for eternity cluster. Perhaps I should say t fiat it goes h gher still--from sympathy in love of the truth to sympathy in love of the *True One; and* in heaven itself, there is no alliance higher, holier, or more endearing than this.

My congratulation is not a mere common courtesy, nor a mere friendly gratification, in view of your personal success, but a participation, with you, in the joy of truth promoted and the True One honored. I do not judge of the extent of your success by numbers who have joined the body known distinctively as "Disciples," but by what meets me everywhere, even where it would be most indignantly disclaimed--the modification of the teaching of almost every sect by the influence of the Reformation, in which it has been your mission to lead.

Mr. Inglis states the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth--"the modification of the teaching of almost every sect by

the influence of the Reformation." That would be absolutely true today, if the digressive brethren had not ceased to plead the principles of the "Reformation."

I quote again from Mr. Inglis' article:
But, amidst these antlcl ations, the movement excites apprehensions, too. The body of Disciples is now influential in point of numbers and resources. They have advanced, through a severe conflict to their present prosperity, and now is the time when a denominationa spirit will be apt to spring up. The selfish cant of "our denomination" may steal in under a mere change of phraseology. The critical period, in this respect, is in the outset of your associated efforts and organization.

My apprehensions on this score are quickened by some features of the constitutions of the several societies formed by the convention at Cincinnati and by some corresponding features in the proceedings of the convention itself.

This was a prophetic statement, and it has come true. His Satanic Majesty, evidently, saw what Mr. Inglis said met him everywhere--"the modification of the teaching of almost every sect by the influence of the Reformation." So he quit fighting the "Reformation" from the outside, got on the inside, "fashioned his ministers as ministers of righteousness," and began to preach a negative gospel, telling people that the Bible doesn't say you can't have this and you ean't have that. If Mr. Campbell and Mr. Inglis were living today, Mr. Inglis could at least say, "I told you so."

I quote again from Mr. Inglis:

The most ob ectionable form of this carnal policy in religious societies is the sale of fe memberships and life directorships.

Mr. Campbell replied to Mr. Ingfis in the M*illennial Harbinger,* 1850, pages 205-209. I will now quote two extracts from M*r.* Campbell's reply:

In my first essay in the first volume of the C*hristian Baptist, I* took the ground that the *church, in* her own capacity, was the only Scriptural missionary institution known to the primitive church and to Christianity, as propounded by "its Founder and his prime ministers " and that no separate or distinct associations, composed of other persons than its members, could be regarded as of divine authority, or in harmony with the genius and spirit of the gospel and the church. To this view I am as much devoted today as I then was; and whe consenting to a missionary society as a distinct object of eontemp ation and as a means of diffusing the gospel, I now regard it as I then regarded it, as the church of any given dis-

trict, in council assembled by her messengers, to devise ways and means for accomplishing this object with more concentrated power and efficiency.

If we believe the above from Mr. Campbell, we must believe that he never changed his views on missionary societies, and that he never understood the kind of society that he was "consenting" to. I doubt that any one can show from Mr. Campbell's writings that he ever claimed to have changed his views on the subject. If not, then we should be slow to accuse him of changing, because he *consented* to something in his old age that he-evidently did not understand.

I quote again from Mr. Campbell's reply to Mr. Inglis:

I am as fully with you in the sale of life memberships and life directorships. This way of giving to an individual frequently more influence and power than to a whole church is of the most questionable policy, and is wholly destitute of any New Testament authority.

But for these aberrations from evangelical propriety and principle, our apology is, that our infant society, when entering into life, took hold of Esau's heel, not so much for supplanting him as for ushering itself into life. It followed the example of other Baptist and pedobaptist institutions, and did not inquire into the bearing and tendency of such precedents. But for doing this, I confess my inability to offer a more satisfactory defense.

Anybody that ever read Mr. Campbell's early writings knows that this vacillating and apologetic manner of writing did not belong to him in his prime. I quote the following from "The Life and Times of Elder Benjamin Franklin": "Alexander Campbell approved, and was for years nominally president, although so advanced in years and feeble in strength that he never presided over its sessions. He was present a number of times, and read an address at the opening of its sessions." (Page 340.) This tells you the only part that Mr. Campbell ever took in the conventions and the American Christian Missionary Society. You can read his addresses made, or read, at the conventions, and they are all of a general nature, nothing specific about them. Instead of being that driving and dominating character he had once been, he was plastic in the hands of his friends.

I now quote from another Baptist preacher, one that was not as kindly disposed toward Mr Campbell, and his early writngs, as Mr. Inglis was:

The reader has aiready been informed, through the extracts trans-

ferred from the writings of Mr. Campbell to these pages, of his views on the subject of Christian missions, and will, doubtiess, be surprised to learn that the Reformers with Mr. Campbell at theb head, have engaged in the missionary enterprise. Soon after their separate organization, they sent out, not *missionaries, but evan-gelists--paid preachers--to proclaim the "ancient gospel." For* the appointment of *missionaries, not* endowed with miraculous power, there could, at that time, be found in the Scriptures neither precept, example, nor inferential authority; but the appointment and support of tian*gelifts* to irinerate and proclaim the "ancient gospel" was pialnly sanctioned by the "Living Oracles." But recently they have organized a For*eign Mission Board and* have sent forth, not a church, according to the original Bethany plan for evangelizing the world, but individual missionaries, "without the power of working miracles," of which, said Mr. Campbell, "the Bible gives us no idea." *(Christian Baptist,* page 15.)

The above facts win suffice to show the favorable changes which have taken place among the Reformers. The Reformation has been gradu ally and greatly reformed. T*he present Millennial Harbinger* is a far more respectable and dignified monthly than the old C*hristian Baptist,* though it must be conceded that its pages occasional]y furnish proof that its veteran editor has not forgotten the art of vituperation. The Disciples generally are less opinionated, less eager for battle, and far more courteous and conciliatory, in their intercourse with other Christians, than they formerly were. In short, they seem to have taken the road back to Babylon, and have nearly completed their journey. ("Campbellism Examined," by Jeremiah B. Jeter, pages 347, 348.)

It seems to me that if Baptist preachers knew that "organized missionary societies" were incompatible with, and contrary to, the original position and teaching of the pioneers, the editor of the *Tennessee Christian* should have been able to "discover" it.

I have quoted from two eminent Baptist preachers. Mr. Ingfis wrote to Mr. Campbell just five months after the Cincinnati Convention and the organization of the A*merican Christian Missionary Society, and* warned him that: "Now is the time when a denominational spirit will be apt to spring up. The selfish cant of 'our denomination' may steal in under a mere change of phraseology. The critical period, in this respect, is in the outset of your associated efforts and organization."

Five years after the Cincinnati Convention, Mr. Jeter wrote: "The reader has aiready been informed, through the extracts transferred from the writings of Mr. Campbell to these pages, of his views on the subject of Christian missions, and will doubtiess be

surprised to learn that the Reformers, with Mr. Campbell at their bead, have engaged in the missionary enterprise .... The above facts will suffice to show the favorable changes which have taken place among the Reformers. The Reformation has been gradually and greatly reformed." Yet the editor under review says: "Our brethren have always been committed to organized mission agencies. It is worse than folly to dispute this."

On March 28, 1855, John Naylor, of Halifax, N. S, wrote Mr. Campbell a letter in which he said:

Dr. Jeter charges you with materially modifying your views, or, rather, the expression of your views, and that you have altered your opinion of ministerial education, etc. Well, it seems to me, my dear sir, that he is somewhat correct in some of these matters. You formerly used some terms, and advanced some sentiments, which do notagreewithyourlatepublieations. I cannot refer to the C*hristian Baptist* at present; but if my recollection serves me, I think I could cull a few paragraphs, and not take them out of their connection, either which would not quite tally with your late efforts
forco eges. *(Millennial Harbinger,* 1855, page342.)

I quote from Mr. Campbell's reply:

Mr. John Naylor. My Dear Sir: Touching these changes of which some have spoken, and to which you allude, I have leisure, at present, only to state that I am not conscious of any change in any Christian doctrine since I wrote the first volume of the C*hristian Baptist. T*hat my horizon has been much enlarged during the last thirty years, I should be ashamed not to avow. But it has mainly been in deepening my impressions of the great departure in the exhibition and practice of the present Christian wor d, from prlml-rive Chrisrianity. *(Millennial Harbinger, 1855, page 343.)*

This shows that others besides Mr. Naylor had spoken of Mr. Campbell's changes; but when he says, "I am not conscious of any change in any Christian doctrine since I wrote the first volume of *"the Christian Baptist,"ought not that stop his accusers?* Since men of honor, and intellectual grasp, *thought M*r. Campbell had changed his views from the position he took in the C*hristian Baptist, and* since Mr. Campbell said, "I am not conscious of any change in any Christian doctrine since I wrote the first volume of the C*hristian Baptist,"* we must look for the reason for these conflicting views.

The Baptist system, we have always said and seen, is the most impotent of any of them. They have in theory, sawed the horns off the Beast, and the assoc ation is a hornless stag, with the same ferocious spirit which he had when the horns were on his head. If he is offended, he makes a tremendous push with his brains, and

bruises to death the obnoxious carcass which he would have gored clear through at a single push, if he had his horns. Herodian feels the want of horns, and would have the creature furnished with at least one artificial one, which he might occasionally use. My brother of the H*erald* would wish to feed the stag well, but would still be sawing off the horns. Perhaps I may wrong him in so saying, for, indeed, he is very modest about it. But for my part, I do not love even an image of the Beast. I have no objection to congregations meeting in hundreds, at stated times, to sing God's praise, and to unite their prayers and exhortations for the social good; but whenever they form a quorum and call for the business of the churches, they are a popish calf, or *muley, or* a hornless stag, or something akin to the old grand Beast with seven heads and ten horns. *(A. Campbell, in Christian Baptist, Volume 6, page 531.)*

This quotation is from the article, "*A R*estoration of the Ancient Order of Things," No. 30. Who can believe that Alexander Campbell would have countenanced, sanctioned, or tolerated in any sense the A*merican Christian Missionary Society* when he penned the above? But Mr. Campbell sald: "I am not conscious of any change in any Christian doctrine since I wrote the first volmne of the *Christian Baptist."* We are trying to find the reason for this apparent contradiction in Mr. Campbell's *positions. T*he position he, in such a masterly way, set forth, and defended, in the C*hristian Baptist:*

They knew nothing of the hobbies of modern thnes. In their church capacity alone they moved. They neither transformed themselves into any other kind of association, nor did they fracture and sever themselves into divers societies. They viewed the church of Jesus Christ as the scheme of Heaven to ameliorate the world; as members of it, they considered themselves bound to do all they could for the glory of God and the good of men. They dare not transfer to a missionary society, or Bible society, or education society, a cent or a prayer, lest in so doing they should rob the church of its glory, and exalt the inventions of men above the wisdom of God. In their church capacity alone they moved. *(Christian Baptist,* Volume I., pages 6, 7.)

Harmonize this position of Mr. Campbell, in 1832, with his posl-tion, as president of the American Christian Missionary Society, in 1849.

Jacob Creath, Jr., said: "*We* stand upon original ground. We desire these arguments in the C*hristian Baptist* answered or the work discarded. The C*hristian Baptist* stands good against all the *puny and feeble* arguments that have been offered for church organization and conventions since that time." *(Millennial Har-*

binger, 1850, page 641). Mr. Campbell's reply to Jacob Creath is oa the same page of the *Harbinger.* I quote from his reply: "While I always read the C*hristian Baptist* with pleasure, and wonder that written when it was, and amid such conflicting circumstances, it has so long withstood all opposition, and yet I do not now, nor have I ever, considered it as invulnerable in some points. One thing is, to me at least, clear--in no one important point has it, in my conception, been refuted." Mr. Campbell was not wiiling to "discard" the C*hristian Baptist,* but in his "conception" no one *important point in it* had ever been *refuted.* Yet he was president of the "American Christian Missionary Society." Why? Maybe the following from Mr. Campbell will he]p us understand the *why:*

As to the acceptability or un*acceptability of* conventional meetings to our brethren, there is some misunderstanding. We have always had great meetings, conventional meetings, many evangelists' meetings, and deliberating, and cooperating in the best ways and means to convert the people, and making appointments and adopting more systematic action when together and when apart, in furthering the great cause of redemption. I have never opposed any such meetings, called conventional, or general, or State, or big meetings of brethren, ministers, and churches.

I have, indeed, since I became a writer, always opposed, do now oppose, and I presume so far as to say that I am likely always to oppose, all ecclesiastic, associational, conventional, or synodic meetings, to legislate for the church, on any form of sound words or sound doctrine, enacting new formulas of church ethics, church politics, or church enactments, or anything called morality or church polity. *(Millennial Harbinger,* 1850, page 495.)

Mr. Campbell here tells us the kind of meetings "we have always had," and the kind he "always opposed, do now oppose, and I presume so far as to say that I am likely always to oppose."

All that is necessary for the reader to do is to decide whether the "Cincinnati Convention" and the American Christian Missionary Society belonged to the kind of meetings that Mr. Campbell said "we have always had," or to the kind he said he had "always opposed." We will let Brother Clubb decide this for us. Hesays: "The American Christian Missionary Society was organized by the pioneers in 1849, at a general convention of churches in Cin-

cinnati, Ohio. This convention was the first ever held in our brotherhood."

If "this convention was the first ever held in our brotherhood," it certainly could not have been the kind of meetings "we have always had." Therefore, it must have been the kind Mr. Campbell said he had "*always opposed.*"

CHAPTER V

REMEMBER, the editor of the *Tennessee Christian* said: "I am quoting only a tithe of what Mr. Campbell said in support of organized work. He met with very little opposition from any source, so far as we can discover. Our brethren have always been committed to organized mission agencies. It is worse than folly to dispute this." I am sure the editor is an "inherent gentleman"; and so was Saul of Tarsus, yet in his ignorance and unbelief he was a "blasphemer" and a "persecutor" of the church of the living God.

I feel sure that the editor of the *Tennessee Christian* can see that he was ignorant on what the pioneers stood for, when he wrote the article I am reviewing, and I hope also that he may not only "prove himself to be an inherent gentleman," but that he may "prove himself" to be as honest as Saul of Tarsus and turn away from these man-made societies to the church, God's only missionary society. Mr. Campbell was made president of the American Christian Missionary Society when it was organized in October, 1849, and kept president till his death on March 4, 1866. Thus he was president of the society for more than sixteen years; but he never presided over any of its sessions. Rather a unique record for a president. It is true that Mr. Campbell attended some of the conventions and read essays or speeches, and, as I have aiready said, these essays or speeches were of a general nature, nothing specific about them. Mr. Campbell's name appeared in the M*illennial Harbinger,* as editor, for the last time in 1864. Yet his friends kept him president of the American Christian Missionary Society till his death. Why?

It is a fact that Mr. Campbell was made president, in *his absence,* of the first missionary society organized by our brethren in Cincinnati, Ohio, October, 1849, and kept such till his death on March 4, 1866. Since our digressive preachers make much ado over this fact, I will quote from Mr. Campbell's will, written by his own hands. I win quote the first paragraph, and then only that which is germane to the arguments made in this book.

THE WILL OF A. CAMPBELL

I, Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, Virginia, being at this time in my usual health and vigor of body and of mind, and in possession

of my usual judgment and memory, in anticipation of my death as the common inheritance and lot of all mankind, do will and ordain the following disposal and distributions of the property, real and personal, which my Heavenly Father in his good will and pleasure has committed to my stewardship and disposal in the following manner, to wit: . . .

Item 13th. I will and ordain that to the sums previously specified in this my last will and testament, to be paid by my sons Alexander and William, to the Board of Trustees of Bethany College, there shall be added to them the sum of six thousand dollars paid out of my estate in Illinois and Ohlo, thereby making in al the sum of ten thousand dollars, the interest of which annually accruing, shall be paid to the endowment of Bethany College.

Item 14th. I will and ordain that my library consisting of many rare and useful works not frequently, if now at all in the market, shall be added to the College Library as a donation from me, to which my family and descendants shall always have free access. I except out of this donation only such modern and popular works as are of easy acquisition. These I wish my family to retain and to distribute amongst themselves according to their own taste and pleasure.

Item 15th. I will and ordain that the sum of six hundred and eighty-five dollars, left by my daughter Eliza Ann, in my hand for evangelizing purposes, shall be invested in the hands of the Trustees of Bethany College, the interest annually accruing thereupon shall be placed in the hands of the elders of the Church of Bethany, whose duty it shall be to employ and send out an evangelist to preach the gospel so many days or weeks as the said interest shall compensate .... ALEXANDER CAMPBELL. (L. S.)

The above instrument subscribed on the seven preceding pages, was signed, sealed, published, and declared by the testator, Alexander Campbell, as and for his last will and testament, in the presence of us, who in his presence at his request, and in the presence of each other, have hereunto subscribed our names as witnesses, March 11th, Anno Domini, 1862.

CHARLES LOUIS LOOS.
J. E. CURTIS.

I will now quote from the codicil of Mr. Campbell's will written March 31, 1864, also witnessed by Charles Louis Loos and J. E. Curtis: "And I hereby devise and bequeath the sum of five thousand dollars to be invested in land or stocks or such investment that my executors shall consider best, the rent or interest thereupon accruing shall be paid yearly to an evangelist who may be selected by the elders of the Church of Bethany to preach the gospel in Western Virginia or elsewhere."

The above quotations are from Mr. Campbell's will as published in "*The Wellsburg Times, M*arch 3, 1868," Wellsburg, Virginia. The copy of T*he Wellsburg Times* from which these quotations are made is now owned by Brother B. C. Goodpasture, of Atlanta.

Mr. Campbell, in his life time, was wonderfully blessed by his Heavenly Father with earthly possessions. In a good old age, when he saw the end of his earthly pilgrimage approaching, having well provided, in his will, for his wife, children, and grandchildren, he remembered Bethany College with ten thousand dollars and his wonderful library. His daughter, Eliza Ann, having preceded him into the unknown, had left the sum of six hundred and eighty-five dollars in the hands of her father for "evangelizing purposes." To this sum Mr. Campbell added five thousand dollars more, the interest annually accruing thereupon to be placed in the hands of the elders of the Church of Bethany, "whose duty it shall be to employ and send out an evangelist to preach the gospel." *But not one penny did he have for the American Christian Missionary Society,* the presidency with which his brethren had honored him for nearly seventeen years, and of which they boast today.

But why! O why! Mr. Campbell, did you thus ignore "*The American Christian Missionary Society" of* which you were president? Brother Clubb, you may answer.

W. K. Pendleton was twice son-in-law of Mr. Campbell, and was coedltor with him of the M*illennial Harbinger f*rom 1846 till 1864, when he succeeded Mr. Campbell as editor, and at Mr. Campbell's death he succeeded him as president of Bethany College.

I will now quote from an address that Mr. Pendleton delivered at the eighteenth anniversary of the American Christian Missionary Society:
There are some things in the present condition of our society which, I confess, are somewhat discouraging. It cannot be denied that we have not grown in power and means of good, as there was reason to expect. Our financial affairs have not been so prosperous as our numbers, wealth, and Christian intelligence warranted us in anticipating. Instead of a steadily swelling treasury, our contributions have been less and less liberal; instead of establishing new missions, we have allowed some that were started with enthusiastic zeal to perish in our hands; instead of anticipating the new and expanding fields that have been opening upon us, and providing the means promptly to enter them, we have slept upon our post, till the opportunity has offered, and we are not ready to improve the providence that calls us to rise up and possess the land. Advocates

that once were eloquent have withdrawn their plea; friends that were liberal have ceased to contribute; members that came up to counsel have strayed away to chide; enthusiasm has been chilled, generosity has been discouraged, and wisdom made despondent of her hopes. The blessing of our God does not rest upon work like this. *(Millennial Harbinger,* 1866, pages 494, 495.)

This speech of Mr. Pendleton's ought to floor the editor under review, if he was honestly ignorant of what the pioneers stood for, and he ought to get up with his face set toward Jerusalem.

I quote again from Mr. Pendleton's address:

We feel that it is due to the great name of Alexander Campbell to vindicate his memory from the charge that he was ever opposed to true missionary work, or true and Scripturally conducted missions. It must be remembered that in his early writings he was engaged almost incessantly in the fiercest and closest conflicts with the various forms of sectarianism, which surrounded him, and which, as organizations, both in their theory and their practice, he was deeply convinced, were injurious to the highest interests of the church, and incumbrances upon the primitive power of the gospel. As such he attacked them. "Their missionary pl*an" was but* one feature of many, and this, as a pl*an, not* as a legitimate *purpose,* he criticized, with a moderation and caution, however, which showed that he desired to touch it but gently. His arrows were directed against the "*scheme." "*Our objections to the missionary plan," says he, "originated from the conviction that it is unauthorized in the New Testament; and that, in many instances, it is a system of iniquitous peculation and speculation, I feel perfectly able to maintain . . . Not questioning the piety and philanthropy of many of the originators and present abettors of the missionary plan, we must say that the present *scheme is* not authorized by our King." This was written in the very beginning of his work as a Reformer, and lest some might stupidlyrmisunderstand his motives, he throws out the following caveat: "There is another difficulty," he says, "of which we are aware, that, as some objects are manifestly good, and the means adopted for their accomplishment manifestly evfl, speaking against the means employed, we may be sometimes understood as opposing the object abstractly especially by those who do not wish to understand, but rather to misrepresent. For instance, that the conversion of the heathen to the Christian religion is an object manifestly good, all Christians will acknowledge; yet every one acquainted with the means employed, and with the success attendant on the means, must know that the means have not been blessed; and every intelligent Christian must know that many of the means employed have been manifestly evil. Besides," says he, and this I take to be the key to all his opposition to these sectarian mission% "to convert the heathen to the popular Christianity of

these times would be an object of no great consequence, as the popular Christians themselves, for most part, require to be converted to the Christianity of the New Testament."

This is the author's own explanation of the motives of his opposition as expressed on the earliest pages of the C*hristian Baptist* itself, and I need not pause to show how utterly irrelevant it is, to the uses for which it is now sought to be employed. The fact is, his heart was too full of the benevolent and saving power of the gospel to allow him to impose any trammels upon any legitimate means which the liberality and the wisdom of the church might devise for its universal proclamation. (Pages 497, 498.)

This address of Mr. PendIeton's covers twenty-one pages of the *Millennial Harbinger.* It was made the same year Mr. Campbell died, and just two years before the death of the American Christian Missionary Society. It was rather strange that Mr. Pendleton felt called upon so soon after Alexander Campbell's death "to vindicate his memory from the charge that he was ever opposed to true missionary work, or true and Scripturally conducted mis[sions."]

The truth is, none of the pioneers ever "opposed true missionary work, or true and Scripurally conducted missions." They opposed the *schemes,* such as Mr. Campbell said were "unauthorized in the New Testament, and were in many instances systems of iniquitous peculation and speculation." What Mr. Pendleton should have explained was why he and his colaborers in the society system and business did not discriminate between the "true missionary work, or true and Scripturally conducted missions," and the "unauthorized, unscriptural, and iniquitous systems," which in "many instances were systems of peculation and speculation."

I will now quote from "The Deposition of David Lipseomb" in the Newbern, Tenn., church trial:

My own conviction is, that Alexander Campbell never consciously, changed his position at all; that he reached a period in his life, and had done so because this trip to Europe was two years before the formation of the first society--that while his mental grasp of things that had occurred years before seemed good and he could make a brilliant and strong oration, and everything of that kind, at the same time, his mind had failed to grasp events around him, and he never did realize what kind of a society of which he was president.

Now that is my conviction of it. Another thing is he was exceed ng y am able. He oved his fr ends, and his friends loved him. Such a man in old age and failing will power, I know from experi-

ence is always easily influenced by his friends and Mr. Campbell fell under the influence of t rose fr ends that were building up this society fight around him. W. K. Pendleton, his chief adviser at those periods, was the chief one in building up these societies, and Mr. Campbell, under his assurance that it was not opposed to what he had previously advocated, was led along. *(Examination in Chief,* pages *177,* 178.)

Again, on page 179 we read:

He was here and lectured on the subject of Ferguson's spiritualism. I remember Tolbert Fanning heard him during the time, repeatedly and I recollect his statement at that time to me. Said he: "He has delivered some excellent discourses, excellent ones, but he has never yet understood or touched the facts or phase of infidelity of Ferguson," Just a few years back John B. McFerrin, the head and front of the Methodist Church for years, said the same thing, that Campbell had come here to lecture against Jesse Fergu-son, and he delivered some excellent discourses and lectures, but he said: "He never did touch the phase of infidelity that Jesse Ferguson was advocating. He was at home in those old types of infidelity that he discussed years ago." I mention these to show this, that Mr. Campbell's mind was failing; he lived in the past and seemed to be brilliant in it, could deliver excellent discourses, and yet seemed incapable of taking cognizance of the things that were ilia-mediately surrounding him.

Mr. Campbell's replies to "Campbellism Examined" are found on the following pages of the M*illennial Harbinger,* 1855:61-75, 140-145,181-190, 257-265,305-311,366-372, 638-446, 448-457, 547554. Robert Richardson, in his "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," page 613, refers to Mr. Campbell's replies to Elder Jeter as follows :

The work was therefore regarded by Mr. Campbell, in a somewhat rambling review which he made of it in some pieces in the *Harbinger* as doing him great injustice, and he proposed to Elder Jeter a discussion of the points nvo red, to be publ shed in the *Religious Herald,* so that his defense might be given to the Baptist community. This, however, Mr. Jeter declined, and Mr. Campbell then thought of writing a volume in reply which he hoped would circulate where the *tIarbinger* did not; but owing to his pressing engagements in the revision of Acts and other unavoidable labors, this was from time to time postponed.

Mr. Campbell never made "*a* somewhat rambling review" of anything in his prime. The following from "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," pages 619, 620, will explain this "rambling review":

At the close of the spring (1855) Mr. Campbell succeeded in completing the task of revision assigned to him by the Bible Union, to which for many months he had devoted every moment which could

be spared from his college and other duties, with the exception of the time occupied in his trip to Nashville. Such was his earnest and his deep interest in the cause of revision that, giving up his agricultural affairs into the hands of his eldest son, he bad secluded himself in his little Gothic study, and given almost his whole attention to the work, greatly to the injury of both his mental and bodily vigor. To one of such active habits, the loss of his accustomed physical exercise alone was of itself a serious injury to his bodily health. Nor was the character of the labor required less hurtful to his mental powers. The close examination and comparison of minute verbal details demanded in the revision and in the preparation of extended critical notes was exceedingly harassing and irksome to a mind accustomed, like that of Mr. Campbell, to range at pleasure amidst the grandest subjects of human thought, and to find among these its natural and healthful sphere of action. His conscientious and persevering endeavors, therefore, to perform his work faithfully, were of no small detrhnent to his mental facuities, and the effects soon became visible in his public discourses. His mind seemed to have been cramped like the limbs of a prisoner long confined in heavy fetters. He appeared unable to take that extensive and powerful grasp of the subject for which he had been so conspicuous, and his pulpit efforts, though still interesting and occasionally brilliant, ceased for some thne to manifest their former unity and point. His friends noticed, too, occasionally, a singular confounding of things relating to the past, and odd mistakes in regard to articles furnished by his correspondents for the H*arbinger,* of which he still retained the chief management.

I think this will help us understand why Mr. Campbell said: "f am not conscious of any change in any Christian doctrine since I wrote the first volume of the C*hristian Baptist." His* "extensive and powerful grasp of the subject" was gone. Remember, "Mr. Campbell succeeded in completing the task of revision assigned to him by the Bible Union, at the close of spring, 1855," and his "somewhat rambling review" of Mr. Jeter's book was made throughout the year 1855. In March, 1856, Mr. Campbell said: "We think it expedient that our readers should know that we are preparing a formal review of Dr. Jeter's book; and not as a program, but as a general introduction, we submit to them a few preliminary thoughts on the premises. We estimate the work, not on its real merits, but on the factitious importance our opponents have given it. We will issue a prospectus of it in a few days, and will send them according to order." *(Millennial Harbinger,* 1856, page 163.) This "formal review" was never published. Why! Evidently, like

Nebuchadnezzar's dream, that "extensive and powerful grasp of the subject" had gone from Mr. Campbell.

In "Memoirs," pages 623, 624, Mr. Richardson says:

As he had been too much occupied with the revision of Acts and his other engagements to fulfill his intention of presenting in a distinct work a full reply to Dr. Jeter, who had by this time published a second volume, a young student from Missouri, who had recently graduated (M. E. Lard), concluded to attempt a reply and thus relieve Mr. Campbell from the labor. T*his "Review of 'Campbell*-ism Examined,'" forming a volume of two hundred and ninety-seven pages, appeared in 1857, with a short preface by Mr. Campbell, and was regarded generally by the Reformers as a triumphant refutation of Elder Jeter's arguments, which it dissected with unusual logical skill.

Moses E. Lard's "Review of 'Campbellism Examined' " is the most withering *review that* I ever read.

Possibly Mr. Lard's contempt for "Campbellism Examined" grew out of the fact that he felt that Mr. Jeter was taking the advantage of Mr. Campbell's physical and mental disabilities to challenge and garble his position and teaching. His "Review" was replete with logic, ridicule, and sarcasm, and closed as follows: "These are a few of the effects to be ascribed to Mr. Jeter's book, and with the simple statement of them we now take leave of both him and it, feeling that in one we part from a misguided man, in the other from a graceless thing."

I will now quote what Mr. Lard said about his own brethren who he thought were taking the advantage of Mr. Campbell's infirmities:

Again, Brother Campbell is now a venerable old man, with memory gone, and wholly unfit for any kind of business. From him in his declining years the right to the Hymn Book has been obtained. Could it have been obtained fifteen years ago! No more would that sagacious brain have done then what it has now done than would it have burnt the nails from the fingers which compiled those hymns. We are ashamed of the cunning which preys upon the infirmities of old age and induces it to do what that very cunning knows it could not have effected when memory was good and judgment clear *(Lard's Quarterly,* Volume 2, page 142.)

Certainly Mr. Lard implied here that Mr. Campbell had not been himself for fifteen years. The American Christian Missionary Society was just fifteen years old when Mr. Lard wrote the above.

That same "cunning" which made Mr. Campbell president of the American Christian Missionary Society in his absence was the same "cunning" that kept him president till his death, and evidently for the influence it would have over the Reformation.

I do not believe a greater injustice was ever done to the llfe and teaching of a man than that which Mr. Campbell's friends perpetrated upon him when they took him from the head of the "Reformation" and made him "head" of the "American Christian Missionary Society," *a faction in the Reformation,* a thing that every fiber of his being and every pulsation of his great heart would have rebelled against when that "sagacious brain" was the great luminary it once had been.

I will now quote what Dr. Armitage, a noted Baptist preacher and historian, said about Mr. Campbell when he was at the zenith of his intellectual powers:

Mr. Campbell possessed a powerful intel ect which largely predominated over the emotional in his nature. He was of French descent on his mother's side, of Irish and Highland Scotch on his father's. He was very ositive unyielding, fearless and capable of wonderful endurance. Without being overpolite or ceremonious, his manners were bland and conciliating. While his mind was entirely self-directing, there was no show of vanity about him; and while not an orator in a high sense, his manner of speaking was prepossessing from the utter absence of cant in expression or whine in tone. There was a warm play of benevolence in his face and a frank open-heartedness in his speech, which was clothed in the dress of logic and armed with pointed artful sarcasm which seldom failed to influence his hearers. ("History of the Baptists," page 736.)

In 1830, Virginia called for a convention to amend the State Constitution. Mr. Campbell had never taken any public part in polities; but the people called for his service and he was elected without opposition. I quote from W. K. Pendleton's address at Alexander Campbell's death:

We remember well an incident illustrative of the effect of his "course during this convention, which occurred in the spring of 1830. Ex-President Madison was returning from the convention, of which he had been a member, and spent the night at my father's house, .which was just one day's journey from Richmond. The next morn-mg Mr. Madison rose early, and he and my father were walking on the portico in the early sunlight, when the atter asked Mr. Madison his opinion of Alexander Campbell. After speaking in very high

terms of his abilities as displayed in the convention, he said: "But it is as a theologian that Mr. Campbell must be known. It was my pleasure to hear him very often, as a preacher of the gospel, and I regard him as the ablest and most original and powerful expounder of the Scriptures I have ever heard." *(Millennial Harbinger,* 1866, page 131.)

CHAPTER VI

I WILL SHOW in this article who was the real father and promoter of the American Christian Missionary Society." Benjamin Lyon Smith, corresponding secretary of the society, wrote a history of the society, which was published in "A Historical, Biographical, and Pictorial History of Churches of Christ," by John T. Brown, M.A. I quote from page 153:

David S. Burnet was the father of organized cooperative work among the disciples of Christ. He crystallized the sentiment for cooperarion. He was the leader of leaders, who, more than any other mail, advocated the adoption of the plan of cooperation which has grown to its present power and usefu ness among our people. Speaking of the cooperative work of the Bible, tract, and missionary socities, he said: "The several enterprises, brethren, are thrown into the bosom of the church of God, to be nursed as a nurse cherisheth her children. The hour of our associated strength has arrived, the hour which shall demonstrate our union to be more than uniformity of sentiment, a oneness of mind, and of effort arising from the nature, power, and exaltation of the holy truth believed. *This year is to prove us. I*t will be decisive of our character and destiny. The spirit we shall now exhibit will be the augury of our fate." Afterwards, in looking over his llfe work, he said: "I consider the inauguration of the society system, which I vowed to urge upon the brethren if God raised me from my protracted illness of 1845, was one of the most important acts of my career."

D. S. Burnet used the pages of the C*hristian Age* to freely urge and advocate all organization of our forces and their cooperation in all missionary enterprises. While others halted, he pressed on; and while they were fearful, he was strong and courageous. He was, indeed, the leader of the leaders in the work of organization and fcrmation of the American Christian Missionary Society.

We have it from Benjamin L. Smith, corresponding secretary, that "David S. Burnet was the father of organized cooperative work among the disciples of Christ." David S. Burnet himself said: "I consider the inauguration of the society system, which I vowed to urge upon the brethren if God raised me from my protracted illness of I845, was one of the most important acts of my career."

According to David S. Burnet, "the father of organized cooperative work among the disciples of Christ," the idea originated in the

sick room. You know sprinkling for baptism also came from a *sick*

In writing the history of the "American Christian Missionary Society," Brother Smith's "candor and fairness excites our admiration. He proves himself to be an inherent gentleman, not less than one of the leading and outstanding writers on that side of the question."

1 will quote from another "leading and outstanding writer on that side of t he question." F.M. Green, in his "Historical Sketches of Missionary Societies Among the Disciples of Christ," says of David S. Bnrnet:
He was a pulpit orator of no mean ability, by some called the "silver-tongued orator of the Reformation." He had fine executive talent. Perhaps to him more than any other one man are the Disciples indebted for their present system of missionary societies. (Pages 173, 174.)

"At the mouth of two witnesses or three every word may be established." I suppose the digressive brethren will accept the testimony of Brethren Smith and Green on this subject. This is evidently one of the things the editor of the T*ennessee Christian* had not been able to "discover."

The American Christian Missionary Society was born in the "Cincinnati Convention" in 1849. Immediately after its birth, circulars were sent out to the churches over the country to try to get them help feed and support the newborn babe. One of these circulars went to the church of Christ at Connellsville, Pa., and called forth the following resolutions:

1. Resolved, That we deem it the duty of every Christian to do all within his power for the advancement of the cause of Christ by "holding forth the word of llfe" to lost and ruined man.

2. Resolved, That we consider the church of Jesus Christ, in virtue of the commission given her by our blessed Lord, the only Scriptural organization upon earth for the conversion of sinners and the sanctifieation of believers.

3. Resolved, That we, as members of the body of Christ, are desirous of contributing according to our ability for the promulgation of the gospel in foreign lands.

4. Resolved, That, conscientiously, we can neither aid nor sanction any society for this or other purposes, separate and apart from the church, much less one which would exclude from its membership many of our brethren and all the apostles, if now upon the earth, because "silver and gold they had not."

5. Resolved, That we consider the introduction of all such so-

cieties a dangerous precedent a departure from the principle for" which we have always contended and sanctioning the chapter of expediency, the evil and pernicious effects of which the past history of the church fully proves.

6. Resolved, That we also consider them "necessarily heretical and schismatical" as much so as human creeds and confessions of faith when made "the bonds of union and communion."

7. Resolved, That for the missions, both foreign and domestic, we approve of a plan similar to that adopted by the brethren of Tennessee for evangelizing in that State. (See C*hristian Magazine,* Volume II., page 228.)

8. Resolved, That we deem it the duty of all the churches to cooperate in home missions; and, that we are will*ing and ready* to unite with those of Western Pennsylvania in sustaining evangelists to proclaim the gospel in destitute places.

9. Resolved, That we highly approve of a new and pure translation of-the ffoiy Scriptures, both for home and foreign uses.

10. Resolved, That a copy of these proceedings be sent for publication to each of the following papers--viz.: C*hristian Age, Christian Magazine, Millennial Harbinger, and the Proclamation and Reformer.*

The above resolutions are not the offering of an overheated imagination, not the results of wild enthusiasm;, neither were they prompted by a spirit of envy or covetousness. We have no desire to appear peculiar, no disposition to divide or distract the body of Christ, no longings for rule or pre-eminence. But they are the result of mature deliberation, calm and dispassionate reflection, and a thorough investigation of the word of God; and are dictated by a spirit of love and a determination to be guided by the Holy Scriptures, though they should fall to furnish a king like those of the nations surrounding us; and to sanction nothing for which we cannot find a "Thus saith the Lord." *(Christian Magazine,* Volume III., pages 141, 142.)

The above was signed by L. L. Norton, E. Holliday, and A. Shallenberger, elders. These men were giants, and I am wondering if their descendants, if any, are still true to the Book.

David S. Burner, father of the "society system" among the disciples of Christ, replied to this Connellsvi]le letter in his paper, the C*hristian Age, and* his reply was copied in the C*hristian Maga*zine, published at Nashville, Tenn., by Jesse B. Ferguson. I quote from his reply:

The article, furnished by the Connellsville church, for several reasons deserves a more lengthy answer than I can give this evening, when the press waits and the room is aiready preoccupied. Though I hope to make it obvious that the writers are laboring under a delusive notion of both the offaces and honors of the church;

yet it must he conceded that these brethren have written a calm and temperate document.

I was born into the missionary spirit, and did not relinquish it when I associated myself with nay present brethren. Before I was eighteen years of age, I was one of the secretaries at the first session and at the formation of the Ohio Baptist Convention for missionary purposes; and the Bible and missionary causes have lain near my heart from before that time to the present. *(Christian Magazine,* Volume III., page 173.)

Mr. Burnet said--and I suppose he knew--that he brought the idea of conventions and missionary societies with him from the Baptists. Evidently Mr. Burner never got far away from denomi-tionallsm. I will quote from his address delivered at the "Cincinnati Convention" when the American Christian Missionary Society was organized:

One of our sister denominations [Italics mine.--John T. Lewis.] standing beside us on the great question of the action of baptism, but long hampered with speculations relative to the designs of God, has, within comparatively a few years, astonished the world by the extent and success of its missionary and its home-directed efforts to disseminate the word of God and upbuild their views. With nobler confidence in the sword of the Spirit, according to our number, we ought to equal, if not exceed them, in achievements of such moral value. *(Millennial Harbinger,* 1850, pages 32, 33.)

The same old story of wanting to be like the nations around *us--our sister denominations.*
The leading society brethren themselves gave David S. Burnet credit for being "the father of the American Christian Missionary Society." Brother Clubb told you that D. S. Burnet and Tothert Fanning were two of the pioneers elected vice presidents of the society when it was first organized. I quote the following from F. M. Green:

But Tolbert Fanning has dropped out, and the earnest missionary man, A. S. Hayden, Ohio, appears on the roll. In the beginning, some of these brethren were elected to office in the society upon their supposed interest in its welfare. A few mistakes were made, but as fast as they were ascertained, from year to year, they were corrected and more active friends introduced. ("Historical Sketches of Missionary Societies Among the Disciples of Christ," pages 85, 86.)

I will give some quotations to show the principles for which D. S. Burnet and Tolbert Fanning stood. In the A*merican Christian* Rev/ew for June 12, 1860, "A Ministers' Meeting in Carthage,

Ohio," was announced, with the following subjects and names to them: (I) "The Way to Conduct a Protracted Meeting to the Best Results." (2) "The Way to Conduct Ourselves Toward Other Denominations." (3) "The Best Method of Settling Church Diffi-cuities." (4) "The Responsibilities of the Church and Her Ministry." (5)'"Fhe Duties of Pastors of Churches." "D. S. Burnet, George Catt, J. M. Henry, Thomas Munnell."

Of the above meeting Tolbert Eanning wrote:

The brethren whose names are subscribed to these questions are men of unquestionable talent, and we consider Brother Burnet our best pulpit orator; yet there is something quite singular in them. We presume the brethren will not call them Scriptural interrogatories. We cannot well resist the conclusion that there is a disposition to send a flag of truce into the enemy's camp. Have the brethren who have so long been sticklers for the authority of the Word grown tired, and are they ready to say to denomination% Give us quarters, and we will speculate with you and be as you are? We make no charges, and we regret the apparent necessity of calling attention to such matters. Let us look briefly at the questions:

1. "The way to conduct a protracted meeting." We ask our brethren for authority for any meeting which they are disposed to call *'protracted." What kind of a meeting is it, brethren? Is it a meeting to teach the world the manner of becoming Christians? You have the instruction: "Preach the gospel. He that believes and is baptized shall be saved." Paul dwelt "two whole years in his own hired house" in Rome, "and received all that came to him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence." Here we have both the matter of preaching and the manner of conducting meetings for the world's conversion. We oh ect to introducing questions in reference to which there s no room for debate. The Scriptures are replete with instruction regarding every meeting that should be held.

2. "The way to conduct ourselves toward other denominat'ons." It is mortifying, indeed, to see such a question in the columns of a respectable paper among us and over names most honored Yet, after rejolc ng these many years that we are no *heresy,* no *sect or party,* we are put down as another "*denomination."* This a plain admission that we, as a denom nation or sect like others, should meet together and discuss the treatment of our sister sects. Hence all that has been claimed regarding he church of God's is idle. We have accomplished nothing and we should now study how to cooperate with "*other denominations."*

What do you mean, brethren? Are we but one of the "*denominations?"* Prove this, and we will prove that God has no church, and that religion is a farce.

3. "The best method of settling church difficulties." The simple fact that the brethren presume there is a *good, better, and best* way of settfing difficuities, and we have arigbt to discuss them, philosophize, and adopt such *wise* conclusions as may suit our fancy, is a plain admission that there is no authority in the Scriptures, and every one has a right to make or adopt such a plan as he may ke. By losing sigbt of the Bible and the church of God, the cause of the Savior is often clothed in sackcloth and sits in the dust. It will always be the case till we learn that Christians have no choice in matters of authority. The man that is a falsifier, thief, drunkard, and habitually wicked, must be put away, in order to preserve the body in health. When men forget law and appeal to feelings, sympathy, the cause suffers. A false sympathy strengthened Ferguson and Collinsworth to do much mischief in Tennessee, and we have more than once witnessed a sympathy for drunkards .not drunken-ness--that brought the church into reproach. We have known, occasionally, heroes and martyrs made of men, mean and despised, simply because, by falsifying and deep hypocrisy, they impressed such as would encourage them, that they were persecuted and were suffering grievous wrongs.

We say then to our brethren, that we find no room for debate or even discretion in settling church difficuities. The law and testimony must govern. If one has sinned, he must bring forth fruits worthy of repentance in order to restoration, and those who keep company with him, or recognize him as a Christian, or do anything in opposition to the righteous action of Christians, connive at wickedness and are really enemies to the cross of Christ. Why, brethren, then philosophize in regard to matters of law and authority?

4. Touching the examination of the "responsibility of the church and her ministry,"wewould respectfully intimate that everything is a subject of authority and there is no room for debate.

5. If the brethren mean by "duties of pastors of churches," the duties of such shepherds, overseers, or pastors as the Spirit made in the days of the apostles, there is no ground for controversy; but if they refer to a class of pastors not recognized in the Bible, there may be room for nmch vexatious disputation. Will the brethren be spec tic and tell us plainly what they expect to accomplish by the examination of such unscriptural questions? We would be gad to publish all they have to say on these matters. *(Gospel Advocate,* 1860, pages 209-2ll.)

David S. Burnet replied to the above in the A*merican Christian Review of* August 18, 1860, and his reply was copied in the G*ospel Advocate, 1860, page273. His* reply follows:
Now, as to Brother Fanning's fears that we legalize the use of the word "denomination," in the sectarian sense, I cannot see any ground for it. I would not have worded the question as it is, but

at the same time the criticism is unwarranted. I should have said *the* denominations rather than *other* denominations, bad I written it. Yet the church of Cbrlst is a denomination, a sect, "this way," etc.; and it may be asked how members of this sect, way, denomination, may treat other denominations, ways, and sects. The reasons assigned by the movers, for the questions selected, was that they were questions of interpretation, on the most practical subjects, avoiding everything theoretical and speculative.

Let me say to Brother Fanning, that had I spoken on the theme assigned me, I should have reproduced, substantially, the speech I delivered before the missionary society last October, concerning which he (Brother Fanning) said, when I came down from the pulpit: "You ought to die after that speech, Brother Burner, for you will never equal it again." I then said what I have to say about the denominations, for my subject was "Our Plea, and the Way to Urge It."

Begging pardon for the occupancy of so much room on so unimportant a subject, I subscribe myself, D. S. Burnet.

CHAPTER VII

"IS THE CHURCH OF CHRIST a denomination, a sect?" Under the above caption, Tolbert Fanning repiled to D. S. Burnet:

Will Brother Burnet bear with us while we offer a few respectful thoughts in regard to his conclusions? We are sorry to differ from him, touching the unimportance of the subject. While we never presumed that he was the originator of the themes, "The best mode of conducting protracted meetings," "Treatment of other denoml-nations," etc, we felt that his connection with such discussions would not exert a good influence. We were also aware that there is a disposition on the part of many to lay down the weapons of their warfare against denominations, and, if the parties will acknowledge their orthodoxy, to be at one with them. [This is the bane of the church today. I am sure there are congregations all over the country that feel they have gained a great victory for the cause when they get to where the denominations will recognize them, and *give them a meeting day.--John T.* Lewis.] These, to us, are matters of some importance. Are we a denomination, a party, sect, or heresy? Is this a subject of no concern to the saintsl Brother Burnet says: "The church of Christ is a denomination, a sect." He also says that our "criticism is unwarranted." Will the Scriptures enable us to decide as to the truth respecting such matters?

In the first place, we regard it as a subject of some importance to inquire if we are a "denomination" in any correct employment of the term. The style is used in the theological circles, to designate one of the religious parties of the age, and hnplies not the slightest connection with Jesus Christ. A denomination, a sect of the world, is not an admissible style, and a denomination or sect of Christians is equally objectionable. The Bible designations are never employed *indefinitely.* There is no *a* Baptist, *a* Christ, *a* cburch, in the Scriptures; but we read of *the* baptizer, *the* Christ, *the* church, *the f*aith, the name of Christ; and we, therefore, consider it highly unbecoming for Christian men to talk of the kingdom of God as a denomination. We trust Brother Burner will look at the subject again.

2. Is the cfiurch a sect? We hope that lengthy arguments are not necessary. Brother Burnet says it is a sect. We say nay. Who is right? "To the law and to the testimony." Brother Burnet, we presume, will admit that sect and heresy are from the same Greek noun. He will also, doubtiess, admit that divisions and heresies are forbidden in the Bible. Paul, indeed, commanded his son "to reject *a heretic* [partisan] after the first and second admonition." (Tit. 3: 10.) The greatest misfortune that befell the Corinthians consisted in their parties: some were for Paul, some for Apollos, some for

Cephas, and some for Christ. Who were right? We answer, those for Christ. He asked, "Is Christ divided? . . . or were ye hap-tized in the name of Paul?" as much as to say, if you were baptized in the name of a man, wear his name; but if in the name of the Lord, honor him by bearing his name.

He says: "I hear that there be divisions among you; and I partly believe it; for there must be also *heresies* [sects] among you, that they who are approved may be made manifest among *you."* (1 Cor. 11:18, 19.) But to conclude our authority for the present, Paul places *heresies, or sear,* among the works of the flesh. (See Gal. 5 :20.) Peter pronounced them *damnable.* (2 Pet. 2:1.) What need we more? Brother Burner, no doubt, will say that Christians were styled a *sect in* the Bible. Yes, three times. Let us read the passages.

Paul called the chief of the Jews at Rome together, who said: "For as concerning this sect [heresy], we know that everywhere it is spoken against." (Acts28:22.) Paulanswered this charge made by the lawyer Tertullus, before Felix. Among other crimes the lawyer specified that: "We have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes. (Acts 24:5.) But hear the insulted, indignant, and glorious Paul speak. He said: "I do the more cheerfully answer for myself: . . . there are yet but twelve days since I went up to Jerusalem for to worship. And they neither found me in the temple disputing with any man, neither raising up the people, neither in the synagogues, nor in the city. Neither can they prove the things whereof they now accuse me." What is the worst charge, Paul? That I am a sectarian? What say you? "But this I confess unto thee that after the way wh!¢h they call heresy [sect] so worship I the God of my fathers. (See verses 10-1t.

We wish to say to Brother Burnet, that while we were much pleased with his address in Cincinnati and sincerely commended it, we are not pleased with his connection with the Carthage meeting, less pleased with his declaration that our "criticism is unwarranted," and we consider his teaching in regard to the church of Christ being a denomination, a sect, so antipodal to the letter and spirit of the Christian institution, we think that he owes it to himself and the cause to modify his conclusions. (T. Fanning, G*ospel Advocate,* 1860, pages 273-275.)

Tolbert Fanning did not believe that the church of Christ is a denomination. David S. Burnet, "the father of the American Christian Missionary Society," said: "Yet the church of Christ is a denomination, a sect, 'this way,' etc.; and it may be asked how members of this sect, way, denomination, may treat other denominations, ways, and sects." He also spoke of "our sister denomina-

tions." Surely, David S. Burner never got far away from denominationalism when he left the Baptists. If David S. Burner and other great men who left the denominations and came into the Reformation had really been converted to New Testament Chris-tianlty, 1 doubt that such things as missionary societies and instruments of music would have ever been introduced into the work and worship of the church. There is a tendency today, upon the part of many, to overlook the denominational ideas and phrases of those who come into the church from the different denominations. They forget the Scriptural teacbing, "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." Better teach them the Scriptural way, rather than yield to their sectarian ideas or whims.

Now listen to the editor of the T*ennessee Christian* again: "My orthodoxy can take care of itself while I am busy working hand in hand with my brother of another religious body trying to bring lost souls to Christ." I wish the brother would "feel free and un-cramped in plainly giving us the benefit of his learning and study," and tell us to what "body" will Christ add those "lost souls" that he and his "brother of another religious body" bring to him. Would the editor and his "brother of another religions body" be satisfied with anything less than a fifty-fifty division? Paul says: *"There is one* body, and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all." (Eph. 4:4, 5.) Just as well say "my brother of another hope," or *"my* brother of another calling," or "my brother of another Lord," or "my brother of another God," as to say "my brother of another religious body." Tbere is but one *of* each. It is evident, therefore, that Brother Clubb and his "brother of another religious body" are not both in the "one body" the body, or church of Christ. Both of them may be out of the body of Christ, and belong to different "religious bodies," but not in Christ.

"Shall two walk together, except they have agreed?" (Amos 3: 3.) Brother Clubb says yes, "despite the fact that we do not see everything alike." "Our religious neighbors" do not think there is anything in the church. Some of them think sprinkling or pouring is baptism; they teach that baptism is not essential to salvation, etc. Yet our progressive brethren "gladly admit that they are Christians," and will work "hand in hand" with their brethren "of another religious body trying to bring lost souls to Christ." I sup-

pose that "Amos, who was among the herdsmen of Tekoa,"would not be expected to know as much as the secretary of the Tennessee Christian Missionary Society. However, I stand with Amos; I cannot walk with "our religious nelgbbors," because we are not agreed.

Mention has been made of Tolbert Fanning's visit to the Cincinnati Convention. That was in 1859, ten years after the organization of the American Christian Missionary Society. It was his first and last visit to the convention.

We will now let Mr. Fanning speak for himself concerning his visit to the convention:

We deem it due to truth, to the brethren generally, and to ourselves to give our readers a brief report of our missionary operations in Tennessee, as published in the proceedings of the Anniversary Meeting of the American Missionary Society, held at Cincinnati, Ohio, on October 19, 20, 21, 1859. We, in the first place, are quite willing for our views to be known in regard to missionary operations; and, secondly, some of our papers having failed to give all the proceedings of the meeting at Cincinnati in October, present us not in our true colors before the publlc. We feel bound to cooperate with our brethren in every good work; but when we think that we see them disposed, either intentionally or otherwise, to rob the church of her honor by the adoption of human schemes for the execution of the Lord's work, we consider it our duty to file our objections. While we rejoice in all the missionary work among us (and would that each congregation on earth had at least one missionary in the field), we consider the church of God the only divinely authorized missionary society. We took occasion at Cincinnati to give the pleadings of a large portion of the brethren, when, to our surprise and deep gratification, Brother Isaac Errett, the talented and devoted corresponding secretary, moved the publication of our views in the proceedings. We regard it altogether proper to give from the report pubilshed by the society, the course we thought proper to adopt in the meeting. See the twenty-second page of the Proceedings. (T. F., in G*ospel Advocate,* 1860, page 6.)

This is Mr. Fanning's own explanation of his visit to, and part in, the convention.

Whenever brethren get to hobnobbing with the society and fiddling brethren, they generally "deem it due to truth, to the brethren generally, and to ourselves," to do a lot of explaining afterwards. I never go down "in the plain of Ono" to talk things over with the society folks. If they want to work with me, let them get on the walls of Zion and go to building according to God's plans and specifications, and we will be working together without any conference or convention.

I will now give the report of the work in Tennessee, which Mr. Fanning made to the convention. After his complimentary and introductory remarks, he said:

By the kind invitation of your worthy president, brethren, I arise to give information in reference, particularly, to our missionary labors in Tennessee. We have done something in planting and building up churches in that State, and, indeed, in most of the States, South, yet our performances have scarcely been adequate to our means. To be sure, we have helped evangelists on their weary way, sent our funds abroad to rear colleges and other institutions, and the brethren have been most liberal in their contributions to the Bible Unlon. They ardently desire to see and handle a pure translation of the word of life. We believe, also, that the churches are generally willing to cooperate with the servants of God here and everywhere, in any service which can be presented with the grace of Scriptural authority. Still, we have no cause of boasting, and are almost ashamed to let the church or the world know that we have not done more. As to the truth of our religious position, no one can doubt. We have no cause; it is the Lord's, and marvelous in our eyes; and in contemplating our feeble performances, with our vast resources, we are almost ready to cry, "God be merciful to us," if not "miserable sinners," at least very frail and inactive Christians.

But, brethren, I am.. most. happy in making, the. announcement that we, too, can rejoice in having an able missionary in, if not a heathen, at least a semibarbarous land, in the person of Elder J. J. Trott, well-known in many churches of the West. He is bearing the word of life to the Cherokees far beyond the mighty Mississippi. Near the close of last year, he was chosen by the church at Franklin College, near Nashville, and after fasting and prayer, was solemnly set apart by the imposition of the hands of the seniorship to carry the message of peace to the red men of the West. The church at Lavergne, Rutherford County, and at Hartsville, Sumner County, eoSperate with us in sustaining this mission. We have asked not others for help, because we needed it not. When our brother lacks anything, he makes known his wants to us, and the brethren so far have not failed to respond to the call. It may be in place to state that much of his time to the date of the last report from him, he had labored chiefly among the white population of his field, and by thealdof others has held several good meetings. Ifweremember, about one hundred have been brought to a knowledge of the truth, and are now rejoicing in the Lord. Still, he has been able to give a portion of his time to the Indians; and by the aid of his son and daughter, will soon establish a school among them.

Our plan of laboring, as churches, without the aid of a missionary society, executive board, president, vice presidents, or able and efficient traveling secretary to get subscriptions, has succeeded to

our satisfaction; and while we are resolved to cooperate with the disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ everywhere, in every good work, yet, till we can be convinced there is a better way, we shall likely endeavor to do all that may be in our power, as Christian kings and" Christian priests, as churches of Jesus Christ, striving together for the conversion of the world, and building up the saints in the faith, as it is written in the oracles of God.

We are sorry, brother president, and brethren assembled from so many parts of our great and glorious country, that we have not something more and something much better to report; but should we he spared, we hope you will hear better things of us in the future.

Blessings attend you, beloved brethren, and all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. Amen. T. FANNING. (*Gospel Advocate,* 1860, pages 8-10.)

Our digressive brethren are like the Roman Catholics: if they can get a great man to recognize their schemes, or in any way connected with them, if it is nothing but to attend a convention and make a speech, they never quit talking about it.

I quote the following from the lamented David Lipscomb:

The new editor of the Texas Department of the G*uide* starts out in order to prick some bubbles that older heads and more experienced pens have often tried, but failed to prick. Here is the way he does it: "Tolbert Fanning, for reasons best known to himself, after years of labor in its behalf, turned against it and became an enemy to organized missionary efforts."

This declares that Toffiert Fanning labored for years in behalf of the missionary society, then turned against it. He intimates that he concealed his reasons for so changing. The truth is, he never spoke a word, nor penned a sentence, nor drew a breath in approval of it. At its first organization, without his knowledge or consent, his name, with a number of others, was placed on the list of managers. His repudiation of it was so prompt and unequivocal he was dropped off at the next meeting.

Years afterwards he attended one of the society meetings and made a speech intended to expose the wrong of the society by showing what the churches in Tennessee were doing in a Scriptural manner. A prominent member of the missionary society, seeing his speech had a most deleterious effect on the members present in reference to their society, moved that the society adopt Brother Fanning's report as a part of the proceedings of this body. It was done, Brother Fanning always believed, as a piece of chicanery to destroy the effects of that speech. He never afterwards had any confidence in the fairness of the man. Such was Fanning's report of it, at least.

Never having advocated, it is not true that he changed against

it. Not having changed, he never concealed his reasons for the change. Indeed, the thought that Tolbert Fanning ever concealed his reason for any act of his, betrays entire ignorance of the man. (D. L., in *Gospel Advocate,* 1886, page 451.)

Brethren, stay away from their conferences and conventions, and you will never have to explain: and your motives will never be questioned.

CHAPTER VIII

THE QUOTATIONS wbich I make in this arrlcle wilI be from "Christian Missions and Historical Sketches of Missionary Societies Among the Disciples of Christ," by F. M. Green, associate editor of the C*hristian Standard.* He was also corresponding secretary of the "General Society," 1877-1882. (See page 178.) Mr. Green says:

The question will be naturally asked by the younger Disciples who are working with us today, Was there no objection raised against this organization in the beginning? We answer, yes. In the first form of the Constitution of the society the third article provided for annual delegates, life membership, and life directors, upon a "money basis," as it was called. It was also supposed that the Constitution opened the door of membership to Christian, Jew, arid infidel alike, "thereby amalgamating the church and the world." These objections made by the general meeting of the Dis. ciples of Virginia, in May, 1850, P. Woolfolk, president, and R. Y. Henley, secretary, and substantially urged also by congregations and individuals in other States, were not captious or censorious, but in the best feeling and with many expressions of interest in the general purposeof the society. They were met with a noble courtesy by the next annual meeting of the society and the objectionable article was promptly stricken out of the Constitution. This was in October, I850; but in 1852, I think, the propriety of this action was reconsidered, and the clause which, in the spirit of compromise, had been stricken out but two years before, out of deference to many brethren who objected, was again restored to the Constitution as the.wlsest policy for the financial success of the society. (Pages 75, 76.)

It seems that the society brethren thought more of "the financial success of the society" than they did of the conscientious convle-ttols of the Disciples of Virginia and congregations and individuals in other States." They are running true to form today.

Instead of Brother Clubb having that becoming modesty that Mr. Green said "the younger Disciples who are working with us today" would have, and inquiring into this matter of which he seems to know nothing, listen to him:

Our brethren have always been committed to organized mission agencies. It is worse than folly to dispute this. The pioneers were almost unanimous in favor of organization. They may have been wrong in their position, but one thing is certain: *Brother Allen and his people are not standing with them.* I am, and about one million

five hundred thousand others of my brethren are, today. I challenge any man to prove that this is not true. The pioneers stood for organized missionary work. Brother Allen does not. That is the whole truth about it. *(Gospd Advocate, F*ebruary 6, 1930, page 133.)

Isn't that a learned (?) dissertation in view of the facts in the case?

The editor of the T*ennessee Christian and* his people must consider "*Brother Allen and his people"* a set of ignoramuses. Of course, Brother Allen is of age and can speak for himself and *"his people." I* have accepted Brother Clubb's challenge as an individual Christian, and one who does not believe all the buncombe that I see in our religious papers today.

I quote again from Mr. Green:

Such extreme views, as are found in the following paragraph, had their advocates among the editors of Disciple newspapers: "*The point I make is not that your society sins, but it is a sin and necessarily sins and exists only to the dishonor of God, in the depreciation of the church, and brings evil to men by calling their attention away from God's appointments and institutions and directing their love and service to a device of men."*

It was not, therefore, until 1849 that any were bold enough to strike out for a thorough and general cooperation for preaching the gospel. In that year a sufficient number were of "one mind" long enough to organize the A*merican Christian Missionary Society.* Each succeeding year the Board of Managers made a report through the corresponding secretary of the society. These successive reports are revelations. They reveal the facts and incidents, the labor and of the year's campaign; but they also reveal the "ups .and downs" the visible results of the cooperative idea among the Disciples, and the tremblings of heart, the uncertainties, and the real obstructions in the fine of its progress. (Page 119.)

We read again on pages 12f, 122:

In 1856 the report of the Board is tinged with gloom. D.S. Burnet read the report. Unexpected and violent opposition to the society had prevailed. The report, therefore, says: "There seems to be a general want of concert, which is truly alarming. Our district and State organizations, hereabouts, have felt the same withering influence, and have neither gathered nor expended funds to any considerable amount . . . .There is much difference of sentiment in regard to our foreign missionary enterprise.

This is the report that the father of the "society system" made of his child when it was just seven years old. It was a poor showing, but the best "the father" could say about his "system." Here is

where Brother Clubb's "learning and study" would have stood Mr. Burnet in hand, because, I am sure, he would have been glad to give a glowing report of "organized mission agencies," instead of the gloomy one he did make.

I quote again from Mr. Green, on pages 92, 93:

Pardon me for the dull recital of facts. To make them short, I must needs give them dry. You may clothe them with what body of inference it pleaseth you. I have recited them mainly as introductory to a few words about the Louisville plan. This plan, as we so well remember, was adopted at Louisville in October, 1869. It grew out of the wear and tear of a protracted prejudice against the organization of the society.

It would be fine if our challenger could "feel free and uncramped in plainly giving us the benefit of his learning and study," and tell us how "the wear and tear of a protracted prejudice against the organization of the society" wore the "American Christian Missionary Society" out in twenty years and called forth the "Louisville plan." And yet, M. D. Clubb, editor of the T*ennessee Chris-tfan, sa*ys: "Our brethren }lave always been committed to organized mission agencies. It is worse than folly to dispute this."

We will let Mr. Green continue his "*folly*":

The prejudice still murmured against us. "The organization is not Scriptural; it is not founded upon the churches. It is in no organic sense representative of the churches." These objections and inferences from them were conscientiously urged byaome, and with much severity and denunciation by others. In May, 1869, the society held a semiannual meeting in the city of St. Louis, Mo., and here the effects of disagreement on this great subject were painfully felt by many of the truest friends of missions in the convention. And so it came to pass that at a recess in the sessions for dinner, W. T. Moore proposed to your speaker that we should take a walk and talk this matter over. I he result was a morton, before the convention, offered by Brother Moore, to refer this whole matter to a committee. The resolution read: "That a committee of twenty be appointed to take into consideration the whole question of evangell-zataon and report, if possible, a Scriptural and practical plan for raising money and spreading the gospel; said committee to report at the Louisville meeting in October next." This resolution was adopted by the society. (Pages 93, 94.)

Notice, the committee was to "report, if possible, a *Scriptural* and *practical pl*an for raising money and spreading the gospel." That was an admission tfiat the American Christian Missionary Society was neither Scriptural nor practical. Mr. Green says:

The General Christian .Missionary Convention is the legal successor of the American Christian Missionary Society. (Page 372.)

It is a pity that the unscriptural and impractical "system" ever had a successor, legal or otherwise. "The American Christian Missionary Society was organized by the pioneers in 1849, at a general convention of churches in Cincinnati, Ohio," and died in Louisville, Ky., in 1869, at the age of twenty years, and under the implication that it was neither Scriptural nor practical. Not a very honorable passing.

Errett Gates, Ph.D., had the following to say about its demise:

The American Christian Missionary Society was the pioneer in the struggle for organized missionary work among the Disciples, and, consequently, bore all the blows and suffered all the experiments incident to pioneer work. (Gates' History, page 264.)

Brother Clubb might tell us where those "blows" came from. He says: "The pioneers were ahnost unanimous in favor of organization."

The tendency of an human societies is to usurp authority which does not belong to them. If it is a missionary society, it will finally want to dictate to, and control, the churches. Out of this natural tendency of human organizations grew the Roman Catholic hierarchy. The American Christian Missionary Society -- the first society ever organized among the "Disciples of Christ" showed that we are subject to the same fraiities. It was only a short time till the society began to usurp unwarranted power, as the following will show.

I quote from Jacob Burnet, Recording Secretary's report of the convention in 1863--"Theological Papers," Volume I., page 24:

Brother R. Faurot offered the following preamble and resolutions:

"Whereas, there is no power but of God, and the powers that be are ordained of God; and, whereas, we are commanded in the Holy Scriptures to be subject to the powers that be, and obey magistrates; and, whereas, an armed rebelllon exists in our country, subversive of these divine injunctions; and, whereas, reports have gone abroad that we, as a religious body, and particularly as a missionary society, are, to a certain degree, disloyal to the government of the United States; therefore, be it

*"Resolved, T*hat we unqualifiedly declare our allegiance to said government, and repudiate as false and slanderous any statement to the contrary.

*"Resolved, T*hat we tenderour sympathies to our brave and noble

soldiers in the field, who are defending Us from the attempts of armed traitors to overthrow our government, and also to those bereaved, and rendered desolate by the ravages of war.

"*Resolved, T*hat we will earnestly and constantly pray to God to give to our legislators and rulers, wisdom to enact, and power to execute, such laws as will speedily bring us the enjoyment of a peace that God will deign to bless."

A motion was made to adjourn and lost. The question was then raised by a member whether the resolutions were in order. The chair decided that, according to a vote of the house two years ago [Similar resolutions were offered in the convention of 1861, two years before; but the society had not augmented its power sufficiently to pass the unwarranted resolutions at that time.--John T. Lewis.], the reso]utions were not in order; and he should, therefore, so hold, although contrary to his own clear convictions. An appeal to the house was taken from his decision, which appeal, being discussed, was sustained. It was then moved that the society adjourn. The motion was lost. It was then moved that the resolutions be laid on the table. The motion was lost.

The previous question was called for, and the vote of the house sustained the call. The preamble and resolutions were then adopted, with but few dissenting.

Moses E. Lard, like Benjamin Franklin, was with, and worked for, the society in its beginning; but we have learned (see third chapter, page 26) that in 1869 he, J.W. McGarvey, and others, establisbed the *Apostolic Times,* "with the avowed purpose of resisting thc tide setting in, in favor of modern methods and organizations in church work."

I will quote from Lard while he was with the society:

Missionary societies are dangerous institutions. Not in themselves, of course, or while doing right, or acting within their own proper bounds; but dangerous because of their extreme liability to usurp6power which does not belong to them, and to perform acts hurtful and oppressive to the feelings of God's children, which they cannot lawfully perform. No man living can say that the danger here does not exist, or that it is imaginary. The tendency of alI human institutions, especially of all moneyed and chartered institutions, is to augment continually their power, that thereby they may become the more effective in their operations. This is perfectly natural; nor can it be pronounced absolutely wrong. But just herethe danger appears. Let now any one, no .matter who be may be, or from what motive he may act, rise up to oppose these institutions, and not more naturally does the wild beast defend to the death her young than do they seek to maim or crush the interfering party. But their most dangerous features lie, not in their efforts to preserve themselves, but in their usurpation and use of unwar-

rantable power. As a mournful and humiliaBng illustration of what is here said, we have only to refer to the action of our own general missionary society, within the two years preceding the past, in turning aside to pass resolutions expressive of the political feelings of ama ority of those then present, to the pain and grief of remonstrating and dissenting brethren. In th s act the feelings, not merely of young men with high blood: but of venerable men whose whole grand lives had been given to the cause of Christ, not even excepting those of the patriarchal president of the society, were rudely disregarded and trampled upon. [Alexander Campbell attended thc convention in 1863, and delivered an address. (See *Millennial Harbinger, 1863, pages 496-506.)* It was at this convention that the war resolutions were passed, and Mr. Campbell's "feelings were rudely disregarded and trampled upon." Yet Brother Clubb would have us believe that Alexander Campbell was not only president, but leader of the society. Certainly the society brethren kept Mr. Campbell president of the society--not so much for his counsel and advice, but for the influence and magic of his name.--John T. Lewis.] Boys and women there cast votes, and rushed the party papers through, while men, like John Smith, hung their heads in shame. For this act no justification can be pleaded. It is a stain upon the records of the society which it will take long years to efface. How much more sublime would its action have been, if, like an affectionate mothei, it had thrown itself between its chaffed and chaffing children and said : Not a word on the angry theme; be still; ye are brethren; let there be no strife among you; work only for the cause of Christ, and the salvation of the lost; work with a whole, undivided heart. Why, oh, why, brethren, dld you not act thus? But if in coming time all shall go well, then will we, in the lofty and noble spirit of the Master, forgive the seventy times seven, and forget the bitter past.

Here, moreover, while speaking of the foregoing society, we beg to call attention, in no peevish or fretful spirit, to the fist of honored speakers for the time aiready named. Is there nothing partisan in this? Or can there be no true men among those who are unable to pronounce in favor of the dogmatic shibboleths of the managers of said society? I*s it a general missionary society? Can all* the children of God meet there on equal footing, or none, save those who shout M*agna est Diana? If* such be its decrees, it may yet live to learn that after a day of passion comes a day of sober thought, and with a day of reckoning. Are such men as F. R. Palmer, John B. McGinn, John I. Rogers, Curtis J. Smith, Alexander Proctor, Lans-ford B. Wilkes, John W. McGarvey, et *ah,* to be slighted and overlooked because they cannot chant the *te deum* of the wild passing hour? Surely this can never happen with a Christian Missionary Society. Gentle, amiable Haley, we have not forgotten thee, nor that apology. But in reply to this it will be said the society is at best but human, and, therefore, not to he judged by a perfect

standard. This is just and true, and no one wishes to judge it more leniently than the pen that traces this. If, then, in time to come it will do right, then are we its steadfast friend; but if in time to come it will not, then we cannot be.

Hold! cries a brother, close at hand. We have the Quarterly on probation. Lift your voice against the A. C. M., and we silence you, silence your paper, take from the wife and little ones the bread that feeds, and consign all to disgrace. We believe that, rude stranger; and more than that we believe. Afford you the chance and you would once more religbt the fires of Smithfield about the man that dares dissent from you on the difference between dum tweedle and tweedle dum--that we believe. But, by the Lord's leave, we shall dare speak our honest thoughts in defiance of your taunt and heartiess threat. *(Lard's Quarterly,* Volume II., pages 138, 139.)

You have here portrayed by the trenchant pen of Moses E. Lard, who was at that time himself a society man, the ruthless spirit developed and manifested by "our" first missionary society. History repeats itself. Organlze, today, an institution larger than the local congregation to do the Lord's work, and let the churches recognize it, and it will soon assume the prerogative of speaking for the congregations, and will try to silence all who oppose its methods or plans. We need more Moses E. Lards today. I quote from same volume, page 140:

Considering what our general missionary society had already done, and been the cause and the occasion of--lts assumption and use of unwarrantable power; the bitter feeling it has engendered; the distrust in which it is held; the fears that are entertained in regard to its future course--we say with real candor we believe its friendly dissolution at present would afford relief to a hundred thousand hearts in our ranks.

CHAPTER IX

IN 1891 CHARLES LOUIS LOOS, president of Kentucky University, wrote a tract of ninety-six pages, entitled, "Our First General Convention." In this book of ninety-six pages President Loos did not quote a single passage of Scripture to justify "our first general convention" or the "American Christian Missionary Society" which was organized by the convention. This ignoring of Scriptural authority is the peculiar earmark of all human inventions and devices in religion.

President Loos frequently spoke, in his pamphlet, of the part that Carroll Kendrick took in the convention, without stating the fact that Mr. Kendrick afterwards quit the society and went back to the Lord's plan of doing missionary work. "To the intent that now unto the principalities and the powers in the heavenly places might be made known through the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Eph. 3:10, 11.)

In the G*ospel Advocate,* 1891, page 455, Carroll Kendrick wrote:

This book of ninety-six pages has just been issued by the Guide Printing and Publishing Company, Louisville, Ky. Price, twenty-five cents. It is having an extensive sale, and several things in it and pertaining to it seem urgently to demand a reply and explanation. I attended and participated in that convention, and have been repeatedly requested to write a reply to this book. I was at that time publishing the *Ecclesiastic Reformer in* Frankfort, Ky., and gave several favorable notices of the convention and society it formed. The following letter from an aged and worthy brother expresses a very general demand, and will serve as an introduction and partial explanation of my purpose:

"Leon, Kan., June 24, 1891.--Dear Brother C. Kendrick: A friend sent me a copy of President Loos' pamphlet giving a history of the first national convention of the Christian Church, held in Cincinnati in 1849, and participated in heartily by A. Campbell, yourself, and many others. He says that Campbell remained equally hearty in the way it was conducted to the day of his death. Loos says nothing about the cause that induced B. Franklin, yourself, and many others to become dissatisfied with the proceedings of the convention. The pamphlet was sent to me to show me the folly of those who are opposing the course pursued by the society in later years. Now, I want to know if there is anything now published that shows the causes that led any or all that now oppose the course of the society and the conventions in later years. If you

have any such document and will send it to me, I will remit to you the price of it. Or if you will write a piece on the subject, please have it published in the Christian Leader.

"Yours truly,
"ARCHIBALD BUTTS."

Mr. Kendrick wrote fourteen articles, which were published in the *Gospel Advocate,* 1891, in reply to President Loos' tract. It would not be practical, neither is it necessary, for me to rewrite all these articles, since I am only "challenged" to show that there was "opposition to organized missionary work" among the pioneers. Therefore, I will quote only a few extracts from Mr. Kendrick's articles.

But some were not satisfied with this way and had much to say concerning general organization. Individual preachers and editors urged a general meeting and a general organization; hence "our first general convention," at Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1849. Here were
one hundred and fifty-five delegates, or messengers, from one hundred and twenty-one congregations in ten States; and they formed a society which the reading of the Bible would never cause one to think of, and which the church had got along without for eighteen hundred years, and which, it seems to me can never harmonize with our adopted motto. Most certainly "the *Scriptures* speak" of no such society organization though, if needed now, it was more
needed then.

If sending abroad the gospel is not a *religious* matter, it would, I suppose, be impossible to find one; and our adopted rule requires *Scriptural warrant for* all such.

But the great mass of the brotherhood was not at that convention. They never favored it. I could here name a host, who were giants in any crowd, and whose piety could not be questioned, who *refused* to attend, and opposed the organization. Another class who doubted were induced to take part in it, because they were anxious to do missionary work, and saw no better way at that time, and disliked to oppose the leaders in the convention. Of these I could name a number. I was one." (Page 492.)

He says further hi the same article:

We have some half dozen papers for the societies, and ten or twelve against that way of doing missionary work. And we are doing even better and more efficient missionary work, I think, than the societies are and doing it as the fathers of this Reformation did and as the first Christians did.

The editor of the T*ennessee Christian sa*id: "The pioneers stood for organized missionary work." H*e should have said: "Some of the*

pioneers stood for organized missionary work after 1849." That *would have been* "the whole truth about it."

On page 499 Mr. Kendrick says:

By noting Brother Loos' mistake it is not my purpose to question the excellency of his judgment, ordinarily, or the purity of his motives. I would, if I could, exalt him in the estimation of all the peoples. But we are all liable to err, and as one who has obtained mercy, and has had large experience in church missionary work, etc., I speak freely--as I would be spoken to.

Brother Loos says (page 5): "The grand men of that day understood well the whole question, and I do not think that the years that have since passed have brought forth anything really new in this debate."

Two points in this [question: (1) That those worthy men "understood well the whole
question." (2) That succeeding years have not "brought forth anything really new." Perhaps nothing new has appeared to Brother Loos or to many others occupying his position to the society. Would it be unkind to suggest that, possibly, they have not continued their examination, or that they were not in the best state of mind for seeing new developments? I participated in that convention, heard and read all had read before, and bare observed and read much since; and I am sure I have learned much, especially have I learned that I did not fully understand those great matters then. Indeed, I am not sure I fully understand a few items yet. In this review, however, I shall not be positive when I am not certain. Fairness and candor require this.

If they "well understood the whole question" then, *it* seems to me they should have formed a society--if one were needed at all--that would not have needed "altering and amending" at almost every succeeding meeting, and that is even yet far from being satisfactory to many of its own members, or to a vast mass of intelligent and godly disciples.

After mentioning several changes in the constitution, and finally the adoption of the "Louisville plan" in 1869, Mr. Kendrick continues:

Now it does seem to me these changes show that neither the first nor the last of these many organizations or organizers "understood well the whole question." Whenever it is mastered and acted upon accordingly, such changes will not be required.

It may yet appear that even Brother Loos does not well understand "the whole question." His own report and all reports of that convention show that almost every item in the society plan was *differently understood by those participating in that convention. T*he plan adopted was a *compromise; not* by any means the result of understanding "well the whole question." Hence the changes.

On page 519 Mr. Kendrick says:

Feeling the need of a more general attendance, Brother Loos, page 36, after naming many leading men present in 1849, adds: "And an innumerable company of such veterans from Indiana, Illinois, and elsewhere." I really did not think Brother Loos so poetically imaginative. He *wanted* an innumerable host, and imagined he saw them.

Again, on page 630, Mr. Kendrick says:

Even in the first convention, as has been noted, a spirit of intolerance, of bitterness and strife, was manifested by some. This evil grew. Many of us soon learned it would not do to rely on resolutions and pledges, while power was concentrated in the hands of a society whose membership and control were purchased with fil*thy lucre; and* we avoided the concern.

You now have the testimony of Carroll Kendrick, who was listed by President Loos as one of "the younger stalwarts" that attended the first convention, offered resolutions, bought life membership, etc. However, his testimony does not agree with the claims of our digressive brethren.

Let the readers of the *Gospel Advocate* keep in mind that the following *challenge f*rom Brother M. D. Clubb called forth these articles I am writing on "The Pioneers and Missionary Societies." In the G*ospel Advocate* of February 6, 1930, Brother Clubb said:

I am quoting only a tithe of what Mr. Campbell said in support of organized work. He met with very little opposition from any source, so far as we can discover. Our brethren have always been committed to organized mission agencies. It is worse than folly to dispute this. The pioneers were almost unanimous in favor of organization. They may have been wrong in their position, but one thing is certain: *Brother Allen and his people are not standing with them. I* am, and about one miffion five hundred thousand others of my brethren are, today. I challenge any man to prove that this is not true. The pioneers stood for organized missionary work.

This is the *challenge that* I have accepted. You notice Brother Clubb did not "*challenge any man"* to show what Jesus Christ and his apostles taught on "organized mission agencies," but on what Mr. Campbell and the pioneers stood for.

That you may get Brother Clubb's challenge fixed in your rabid, I quote the following from his article:

Finally, Brother Allen tells us that he and his brethren are standing just where the apostles and the pioneers of the Restoration stood in their opposition to instrumental music and organized missionary work. Our conservative brethren are constantly making

this claim. Their position does not agree either with the apostles or the pioneers. I will pass over for the present the claim that they stand with the apostles and look into the claim that they are standing with the pioneers in regard to organized missionary work. What was the position of the pioneers on methods of missionary work.

Brother Clubb says: "I will pass over for the present the claim that they stand with the apostles and look into the claim that they are standing with the pioneers."

In accepting the above challenge it was necessary for me "to pass over for the present" what the apostles taught and "look into" what the *pioneers* taught. It would not take a Solomon to see, if I should quote all that Jesus Christ and the apostles said about preaching the gospel to the nations, that I would not meet the challenge. His challenge was not on what the apostles taught, but on what "the pioneers stood for."

Again, Brother Clubb says: "The literature of that period shows very little opposition to organized missionary work." How could *any man* show the fallacy in this statement by quoting what the apostles sold? T*herefore,"long quotations" from the pioneers were* necessary to answer Brother Clubb's *arguments* (?). I can understand how Brother Clubb's friends, who consider him "one of the leading and outstanding writers on that side of the question," can see too much of Campbell and the pioneers in my articles, because the "long quotations" which I have made from the pioneers show Brother Clubb's *arguments* (?) to be mere vagaries.

Again, Brother Clubb says:

For Brother Allen we have great respect and esteem as a Christian brother. We are dealing with a situation a situation which requires fairness and frankness and a strict regard for the plain, unvarnished truth. Brother Allen's article is full of inaccuracies and misrepresentations.

I feel sure Brother Allen has books in his library that will take care of these "*inaccuracies and misrepresentations"* with which Brother Clubb charges him, so I will only notice the "situation" that he mentions.

In view of the "opposition to organized missionary work" which the "long quotations" I used from "the literature of that period" show, it seems to me "*a* situation which requires fairness and frankness and a strict regard for the plain, unvarnished truth," is, that the editor of the T*ennessee Christian* confess that he was ignorant

of "the literature of that period," or that he *thought* Brother Allen was, and he was trying to put something over on the readers of the G*ospel Advocate. Certainly it was one or the other.*

The secretary of the Tennessee Christian Missionary Society and editor of the T*ennessee Christian sa*ys: "The Tennessee Christian Missionary Society is merely the method or agency through which the churches of Tennessee cooperate in the common task of building up the cause of Christ in the State." Here the secretary and editor makes another *situation--"a* situation which requires fairness and frankness and a strict regard for the plain, unvarnished truth." Therefore, he should have said: "The Tennessee Christian Missionary Society is merely the method or agency through which *some, or a few,* of the churches of Tennessee cooperate." That would have been "the plain, unvarnished truth;" but to say that it "is merely the method or agency through which the *churches* of Tennessee cooperate" is absolutely misleading. What percentage of the *churches in* Tennessee *co-operates* with the "Tennessee Christian Missionary Society?"

We will now study the history of the cooperative, or society, work in Tennessee. This, of course, will necessitate some "long quotations" from Tolbert Fanning, David Lipscomb, F. D. Srygley, and others. I am sure that "long quotations" from these faithful soldiers of the cross will be "worth nothing" to the great luminaries that are among us, but they will be interesting and instructive to those brethren whose libraries are not bulging with the writings of the pioneers.

In the *Gospel Advocate,* 1891, page 721, we have several questions that Brother Gilbert A. Sipes asked Brother F. D. Srygley about the society in Tennessee. His first question was: "Why do the editors and correspondents of the G*ospel Advocate* misrepresent Brother A. I. Myhr by stating that he is the head of a society; that he is pald fifteen to eighteen hundred dollars per year to split the churches in Tennessee; that he is not working and preaching on the llne of the Lor*d's plan; that* those who feel able and willing to contribute to build church houses and pay preachers to labor in destitute fields and who visited the late Nashville convention are not a part of the church of Christ in Tennessee, etc.?"

Brother Srygley's reply to Brother Sipes is found in the same issue of the Adv*ocate,* pages 721-723. I will quote some extracts from Brother Srygley's answer:

Brother Sipes has addressed his compialnt to the wrong man. He has no case against me. I have never said Brother A. I. Myhr is at the head of a society or that he is paid from fifteen hundred to eighteen hundred dollars a year. I do not know which end of the society he is at or how much money he is paid. He is called "corresponding secretary" by some and "State evangelist" by others, but I am not well enough posted in society anatomy to know which end of the thing that is. To confess the truth, I have never said much about Brother Myhr, anyway. He seems to be a very nice young man, and I am sure I have nothing but the kindliest feelings for him and everybody else, but I gravely doubt whether he is either better or wiser than hundreds of others who have labored faithfully in the Master's cause all their lives, but have received less newspaper notoriety, if not less sympathy and money, during all that time than Brother Myhr has received during the few months he has been in Tennessee. And as to misrepresentations, persecution, and abuse, such men as David Lipscomb and T. W. Brents enjoyed more of it before Brother Myhr was born than a whole State
meeting like me and Brother Myhr will ever be able to bear. Again, Brother Srygley says:

All talk about splitting the church in Tennessee, at present, however, is the veriest twaddle. Of course no man knows what future developments may be, but after two years of vigorous work in behalf of the convention the disciples in Tennessee today are practically unanimous against it. There are not enough advocates of it in the State to raise a respectable disturbance, much less split the church. [This is evidently some of "the literature of that period" that Brother Clubb had not read, and I feel that it is worth *"the ink"* to let him read it now.--John T. Lewis.] I call to mind, just now, twenty-six preachers who live in fifty miles of the house where the late Nashville convention was held. Fifteen of them, I have since learned, were holding protracted meetings and two were sick while the convention was in session. Brother Harding and Brother Smith were both engaged in protracted meetings in Nashville while the convention was in session, and each of them had a larger audience than attended the meetings of the convention, including the delegates from all over the State and distinguished visitors from other parts of the United States. The exact truth is that preachers and other disciples in Tennessee just now are busy preaching the gospel and paying very little attention to either Brother Myhr or the convention. No, brethren, I have no fears that the convention will spllt the church in Tennessee. If it should five long enough to produce any fruit at all, the harvest will probably be a few apples of discord and a heavy crop of unemployed preachers.

The secretary-edltor seems to be wbisfling to keep up his spirit while he is reaping the harvest.

Any man who knows how to "tabulate facts" can make as many reports like Brother Myhr's as he needs out of the labors of the scores of preachers at work in Tennessee or anywhere else, provided the men who are doing the work will consent, like Brother Myhr's men, for him to "tabulate" the results of their labors. For instance, F. B. Srygley has added two hundred and ten and organized two churches within a year; J. W. Grant has added one hundred and fifry-three and organized three cburches in ten months; J. A. Harding has added three hundred and fifty-three and organized three churches in a year; T. B. Larimore has added five hundred in a year; and J. H. Morton has added over one hundred and fifty since July.

This is the way the work was done in Tennessee forty years ago, when Brother Clubb and I were barefooted boys. Can Brother Clubb's society "tabulate" today anything that will beat this record?

Lest some should think our statement that not one-seventh of the churches in the United States have been enlisted in the convention work, we append this statement made by the official board to the late General Convention. It reports four hundred churches responding to the call. Near eight thousand churches exist. This is only one-twentieth of the whole. It says not one-half the churches cooperate even in the sections most thoroughly enlisted in convention work. Yet a great many insist the majority of disciples approve the societies.

You now have these "plain, unvarnished" facts from the pungent pen of the lamented F. D. Srygley for *whatever they are worth.*

CHAPTER X

WE WILL NOW STUDY how, where, and when the Tennessee Missionary Society began its efforts in Tennessee.

I will quote from "The Depositions of David Lipscomh and E. G. Sewell" in the Newbern, Tenn., church trial. On pages 224 and 225, Brother Lipscomb said: The \¥oodland Street Church started the matter, as I told you yesterday, and it produced a division in the church on the society question rather than the organ. The organ afterwards grew out of it, as I corrected my first statement. The Vine Street Church here has gradually gone into it, and quite a number of their members who want to make contributions to missionary work came and asked me to send it through other means, and it is quite a recent thing that they have got to work with the societies. When they were working without the societies, they agreed to raise and did raise four hundred dollars a year to sustain a forelgn missionary. I don't know--I have noticed the reports some--but I don't think they give near that much now through the society. I don't think that is the tendency of things. The other brought the work close to them, and it was "our work." It comes directly in contact with us, and the society separates the people from the work; they don't feel the same responsibilty and interest, and the tendency is to make them feel more indifferent to the work.

Brother Lipscomb was then asked to "state whether there are churches yet in the city and in Davidson County that are not cooperating with the societies or using the instruments of music in their worship." His answer was:

I don't know the exact number; at least, I don't recollect it. I have counted them over, and I could count them now by taking the time. I think there are about thirty churches in the city and county, and there are only four that use instruments--three white and one black. There may be two of the colored I am not sure--that are using instruments. There are three white, and they are the only ones, and they are working through the societies, and they are the only ones that do it.

This was twenty-seven years ago. There are more than forty congregations in Nashville now and about seventy-five in Davidson County. I wish the secretary of the Tennessee Christian Missionary Society would "feeI free and uncramped in plainly giving us the benefit of his learning and study," and tell us bow many churches in Davidson County, and especially in Nashville, that

have been won to his "method or agency" since 1903, when David Lipscomb gave the above facts.

Of course, I would not expect him to quote what Jesus Christ and the apostles said to show this. Brother Clubb says: "Our brethren have always been committed to organized mission agencies. It is worse than folly to dispute this." It certainly would be *worse than folly* to quote what the apostles said to disprove this statement. Again, Brother Clubb says: "The pioneers were almost unanimous in favor of organization." No apostolic authority called for here.

I will now quote from Brother E. G. Sewell's deposition. Question:

"You say you were a member of a church, Woodland Street, I believe, that introduced the organ. What effect did the introduction of an organ in that congregation have?"

Answer: "I don't know that it had much effect, with very few indlvidua]s at least, because they had introduced the society and had got the congregation so educated and trained by having introduced the society that when the organ question came up, I don't know that there was much opposition. 1 was not in the congregation then; but I didn't hear much opposition to the organ when it was finally introduced, as the society came first and opened the way for it; both upon the same principle."

Q. "What results attended the introduction of the society? Was there division or trouble in the church at that time?"

A. "There was division. I was a member of the congregation, and preached for it almost all the preaching that was done for that congregation for some tea or eleven years, is my recollection of the dates. When I quit preaching regularly, they got other preachers. They got one of the men that helped to introduce the society from Missouri, R. M. Giddens. He began to work with the societies; and just as quick as that began and they began to introduce them into the work and the service, I began opposition to the societies, and that kept up until they went on, and finally the elders of the congregation determined to adopt the society and attended the convention at Chattanooga, where the society originated; and after they had made that arrangement to take the thing in charge, calling it the State work, and after having opposed it all that I thought was proper and right in the spirit of the gospel, I then wrote out a petition to the elders and the preacher, R. M. Giddens, making this statement: 'We have worked in harmony in this congregation on until it has been built up to its present proportions. We have had no society; have been in harmony. But with the introduction of the society we cannot continue in harmony; it will bring division and difference. You know that it is not required in the New Testament; it is a human invention and not required. Now, then, will you not, for the sake of peace and harmony, lay aside this State

work, so that we may still go on and work in harmony, which we can do without it, but cannot do with it?' I got about forty names signed to that petition and handed it in to the elders and the preacher making that request. They wrote me back about this answer, 'We cannot lay aside the State work,' and utterly refused and went on with the society and all the elders except myself, and a number of leading members of the congregat on, were in that movement."

Q. "About what date was that?"

A. "Well, that was about the year 1889 or 1890."

Q. "How many members left the Woodland Street Church on account of the introduction of these innovations?"

A. "I suppose about twenty in all. I couldn't say definitely."

Q. "What became of those members?"

A. "We went off and started another congregation soon after we went out from the Woodland Street congregation, which is now known as the 'Tenth and Russell Streets congregation.'"

Q. "Has that congregation prospered and grown?"

A. "Yes, sir; it has prospered beyond our expectat'on. '

Q. "Who is pastor of that congregation?"

A. "No especial pastor; but Brother McQuiddy and myself do most of the preaching, except in protracted meetings and the like."

Q. "Does that congregation have societies and organs in its work?"

A. "None at all. Never has had any, and never wanted anything of the sort."

Q "What do you know of the organization objects, and operation of the Tennessee Christian Missionary Convention? Please give the matter as fully as you can--the nature of its organization, Its purpose and plan of operation."

A. "They claim that their purpose was to preach the gospel in destitute places, but claim that they could not do that as effectively without some organization of that character; and other claims that poss b y might be mentioned besides these. But these things all came up, not by members that were in that congregation at the start; members that came in, moved in afterwards, some of them from other States, and became members of that congregation that started the work. I*t was first started by ladies in what they called a 'sewing society.'* [Italics mine.--John T. Lewis.] Those ladies consulted together and wrote letters and sent to all the churches that they eou d hear of throughout Middle Tennessee requesting those churches to send money to their congregation to he used in sending the gospel out to destitute places in the country. That failed. They got no responses from that, that I ever knew of, at all. Then they employed A. I. Myhr. They had saved up some money, and they employed A. I. Myhr to come and go out and visit the churches and rase funds to assist ia sending the gospel out to destitute p aces, as was their claim at the time they met."

Q. "Who is this Brother Myhr that you speak of, and was be originally a member of the Woodland Street Church?"

A. "No, sir; he never was a member of the Woodland Street Church, that I know of. He came here first before the society was introduced. R.M. Giddens got the congregation to send and have him come and hold a wotracted meeting. That introduced him into the congregation of Woodland Street."

You now have the how, where, and when the so-called "mcthod or agency" began its work in Tennessee. I have quoted Brethren Lipscomb and SewelI as authority *only* on "the few apples of discord" that the introduction of the Tennessee Christian Missionary Society produced in the Woodland Street congregation forty years ago.

When the Jews wanted to get Pau] and Barnabas out of Antioch, they "urged on the devout women of honorable estate." So, when R. M. Giddens wanted to introduce the Tennessee Christian Missionary Society into the Woodland Street congregation, what better could he do than to "urge on the devout women of honorable estate" to "organize a sewing society?"

The Russell Street Church, where Brother S. H. Hall preaches, is the congregation that was built up by Brother Sewell and those who were driven out of the Woodland Street Church, which they had also built up. After forty years of separation, we do not need Brother Clubb, with his "learning and study," to tell us which one of those congregations is the stronger, and which one is doing the most work in the Lord's cause. The comparison, however, would help to *advertise his* "method or agency!"

I have three volumes of Brother Lipscomb's and Brother Sewell's depositions. These volumes belong to Brother J. W. Shepherd, who was with Brother David Lipscomb all the rime his deposition was being taken. These depositions were taken to be used in the
Newbern (Tenn.) church trial--an "apple of discord."

I quote from page 220:

I would, in conclu sion, if you are going to let me conclude, make this statement, both on the use of instruments of music in the church and in the adoption of the society: That I have stated what I have understood was the general teaching of the earlier preachers among those aiming to make the Christian Church, as you are calling it in this case, and I have given, as far as I could, the true statement of that. I read to you the writings on instrumental music from different ones, and from a number of men; they were the prominent men that from seventy-five to twenty-five years ago

did more to mold the teaching and thought of the churches than any men among them. If I were to look out and call the names of those who were leading men, I wou]d not know how to add to the number, scarcely, excepting some that died before these questions came up.

I feel sure that no man ever lived who had more respect for the authority of Jesus Christ and the apostles than David Lipscomb; yet he did not quote them here, but rather from "the prominent men that from seventy-five to twenty-five years ago did more to mold the teaching and thought of the churches than any men among them." If some of our wise scribes of today had been present, doubtiess they would have gravely informed Brother Lips-comb that "it does not matter what the pioneers say, or Brother Campbell, the Bible is authority." David Lipscomb *knew* what an argument was, and he knew what to quote to prove it. Some of our younger scribes seem not to be blessed with that happy faculty.

That you may know what David Lipscomb thought about those who challenge God's authority by adding to his ordinances, I will quote from "Cross-examination," Volmne I. pages 23, 24:

Question: "Now, in answer to question 40, you say your opinion is that the Christian church that adopts the organ goes into apostasy. Is that your conviction?"

Answer : "Yes, sir."

Q. "Do you mean by this, that such a church ceases thereby to be a Christian church, and that the members thereof responsible for such action cease to be Christians? Or do you mean merely that they are in error upon this subject?"

A. "The test of a man's being a Christian is that he will add nothing to, take nothing from, the requirements of God. He will serve God, and him only. The same test applies to a church. A man or a church that consciously adds to or takes from the order of God unchristianizes himself or itself. This is the case in which to 'offend in one point is to be guilty of all.' Those who consciously add the organ, knowing it is not required, set aside the authority of God and are in apostasy. Many accept these things, thinking they are in harmony with the will of God. These latter are in error--'erring Christians.' "

Q. "Well, then, would you say that there are any Christians that are not in error upon any subject or practice?"

A. "I think we are all in error on some points, but here is a violation of a plain, recognized rule iald down by the Savior and by the apostles. It is not like mistaking as to what is duty in individual and minor matters. And I do not mean to say, either, that every man that worships with a church that has an organ in it win be lost. Those who deliberately introduce things not commanded by

God reject the authority of God, and a church that does this is not a church of Christ. They assume to change the order of God. I think a great many of them that go into it without a study of it do it without proper thought, and are led into it by the leaders, and come under the head of what we call sinning through ignorance. There are a goodly number of them that go into it, right or wrong, regardless of the teaching of the Bible or regard for their brethren. They, I think, will be condemned."

In "Cross-examination," Volume I. page 50, we read:

Q. "Suppose a congregation has a preacher and, being poor, is unable to pay him an adequate amount, and the Tennessee Christian Missionary Convention supplements or adds from its funds toward the support of that preacher that has been employed by the congregation. For what reason, if any, would that be trenching upon the rights of the church?"

A. "If the organization of a society like the Tennessee Christian Missionary Convention is wrong, it is a sin in itself to exist. Its existence is a sin. Its existence is an assumption of authority and power that God has committed to the church. It is based upon a membership, upon qualifications of membership that are contrary to the teaching of the Bible. It takes men and money that justly belong to the churches and builds itself up with them. I cannot see the difference in principle in its selling the right to become a member or director of a religious organization, for money, and selling the right--well, I started to say, to sell indulgences. The Romish Church, it is said, did sell the right to sin. The society sells the privilege of controlling the gospel and influencing the church, and in principle I cannot see the difference. A society that would adopt that principle unchrlstianizes itself. It sells positions of trust and honor for money."

On pages 147, 148, we read:

Q. "Do you observe that principle in the selection of men to preach the gospel with reference to the society movements that we have in the State?"

A. "Explain your question a little more. What do you mean in reference to it?"

Q. "I mean, do you, in the selection or appointment, or the church that you cooperate with, in selecting and sending preachers out to preach, send out preachers to preach and inveigh against those who may be sent out to preach by the society in the State or who affiliate with the societies?"

A. "I would not be willing to support a man that supports a society, because I think he is building up something contrary to the Bible and subverting the gospel that we are sending him to preach. We do not expect them to inveigh against any one."

Q. "Upon that question, I want to ask you, Brother Lipscomb, if it is true that you and others had Brother Calhoun before you

on one occasion several years ago with the view of determining what his feelings were with reference to the society, and if *you, in* the effort, requested or wanted to know if he would sign or agree to certain articles or principles: and upon his failure to do so you ceased cooperation with him."

A. "No, sir; not as you state it."

Q "Please state what you did do."

A. "Well, what we did grew out of his proposed teaching in the Bible school, not with any church. Brother Calhoun agreed with us fully: and he told me that he never had seen a sentence that I had penned in reference to societies or organs that he could not indorse. I think he wrote it; I think I have it written. We asked him to state that publicly or act on it. He refused to do it, and we objected to employing him as a teacher in the school because he was not willing to proclaim his convictions and what he believed was true."

Q. "Then, in that instance, it did require a public proclamation by a preacher otherwise acceptable to you of his principles with reference to societies before you would employ him in the school.

A. "We would have required nothing of him, excepting that the others were claiming that he was affiliated with them and that he was with them, and we wanted him simply to express his convictions, not to be on both sides."

Q. "Did the expression which you requested of him go simply to the fact that the societies claimed him and that you wanted him to publicly proclaim that he was not of them.

A. "It was. We wanted him to make his convictions known to the public. We did not want him to profess to agree with us and stand in a different light before the public. That was the point with us. We would not have accepted him) though, as a teacher, if he had been an advocate of the societies and the organs, because we believed that that would he subverting the teaching of the Bible."

Q. "You do make that, then, a test of Christian character?"

A. "We make those things a test of a man's soundness in the faith. We think a man's advocacy of those things adds to the teaching of the Bible and subverts the teaching of the Bible where it says we shall add nothing to and take nothing from the Scriptures, just as we do the man that would teach infant baptism or sprinkling. We believe that is contrary to the teaching of the Bible, and when he adopts it we think he sets aside the teaching of the Bible; and we act upon the same principle precisely with reference to the societies."

Q. "So that, under that principle, if Mr. Campbell were living today, he would not be eligible to teach m that school? A. "Not if he was president of a missionary society. His teaching, as given in his earlier days, and all the clear and distinct teaching that I know of his up to 1849, I will say, would be acceptable."

I make these "long quotations" from Brother Lipscomb *as authority* on how he felt about missionary societies and those who advocated them. It would have done Brother Lipscomb's great heart good to know that Brother Calhoun has taken a *definite* stand for "the faith" upon which he once wavered.

CHAPTER XI

THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST in Tennessee have never been a very fertile field for missionary societies. I feel sure that the churches in Tennessee will do more in one week toward having the gospel preached than the "Tennessee Missionary Society" will do in a year.

The society work in Tennessee was weighed in the balance and found wanting before Brother Clubb and I were born. The society work is not only useless, but it is a failure in Tennessee today.

THE TENNESSEE EVANGELIZING ASSOCIATION.

In a social meeting of the disciples of Christ held at Franklin College, April 21, 1852, the subject of Christian effort was elaborately discussed, and especially with regard to *educating and supporting ministers of the gospel, and* after due deliberation it was agreed to form a society in this State, having these objects supremely in view. Whereupon the society was organized with the following Constitution:

Proceedings.

Whereas, it is the duty of Christians to employ all their means, both temporal and spiritual, in glorifying God; and, whereas, we are fully satisfied that the cause of Christ demands of us greater exertions in educating and sustaining ministers of the gospel; therefore, we solemnly agree to form an association for the better direction of our energies in the accomplishment of this object, and we promise to be governed by the following

Constitution.

Article 1. This association shall be called "The Tennessee Evangelizing Society."

Art. 2. The object of the society shall be to educate ministers of the gospel, and sustain the inexperienced in preaching till their qualifications and success shall insure their employment as evangelists.

Art. 3. It shall be composed, first, of annual members, by the payment of not less than one dollar; second, of life members, by the payment of twenty dollars; third, of life directors, by the payment of fifty dollars; and of such other persons as shall be elected honorary members.

Art. 4. The officers shall be, a president, vice president, recording secretary, and treasurer; and these shall constitute the Executive Committee, to transact the business of the association, as the society or its directors may advise.

Art. 5. To aid the Executive Committee and better secure the permanency and correct proceedings of the society, there shall be a board of directors of not less than twelve persons, elected by the society at the annual meeting in each year, or by the payment of the requisite funds, whose duty it shall be to assemble as often as the president may suggest, or as often as they may believe the business of the society shall demand; and they may adopt such expedients and regulations as will best insure the success of the enterprise.

Art. 6. The annual meeting shall be held on any day from the first to the sixth of July in each year, as the society or officers may determine.

Art. 7. The officers shall have authority to employ agents to collect and disburse funds, and do whatever may seem, in their wisdom, best calculated to promote the objects of the society; and they shall hold their office for one year, and till others are elected in their place.

Art. 8. This Constitution may be altered or amended at any annual meeting of the society, by a vote of a majority of the members present.

Officers.

J. J. Trott, president; N. B. Smith vice president; E. D. "Warder record ng secretary; T. Farm ng, corresponding secretary; W iam Lipscomb, treasurer.

Board of Directors.

W. H. Wharton, J. B. Ferguson, J. Eichbaum, E. R. Osborn, W. H. D. Carrington, S. E. Jones, M. D. Small, D. R. Gooch, G. W. McQuiddy, D. E. Nelson, W. D. Carnes, Wade Barrett, J. H. Spear, G. W. Cone, E. W. Carmack, W. L. Murpbree, J. C. Anderson, John Hill, P. R. Runels, W. F. Fall, J. L. Goodafi, B. F. Hall, J. W. Richardson, David G. Ligon, Henry Dean O. D. Williams, James Young, A. J. Fanning, J. M. Harris, A. G. Branham, Granville Lipscomb.

William Lipscomb, F. M. Carmack, and T. Fanning were appointed a commitee to prepare a circular setting forth the objects of the society. W. H. Wharton and John Eiehhaum were selected to give addresses at the first annual meeting in July, 1852.

J. J. Trott, president; E. D. Warder, recording secretary. *(Christian Magazine,* 1852, pages 187, 188.)

This was the first missionary society that was ever orgaMzed by the gospel preachers in Tennessee. I say "preachers," because the churches never had anything to do with it. This society had all the objectionable features of any society. It was organized on "the money basis"--membership so much per.

This society died in embryo, if there was ever another meeting of it, "the literature of that period" does not show it.

It must not be understood that all the men whose names were down as directors of this society were present or favored it. In his cross-examination of which we have aiready spoken, Volume II., page 583, Brother Lipscomb says:

Here is a board of directors appointed, and there is another Lips-comb on that Granville Lipseomb. He was my father, and I know my father never approved anything of that kind and never met with those brethren once, because that was in 1852, and he died a year afterwards, and he had been an invalid for five years and bad hardly been out of the house. My brother, William Lips-comb, was prominent, and that probably caused them to put his name on. But I know this to be true, and I am sure that a number of these brethren who are named here never attended that meeting at all. Those who were there organized the society themselves, selected a board of directors, as the society did in the beginning of the General Society, when they put Mr. Fanning on and he refused to serve.

The churches in Tennessee had had for a long time what they call "cooperafion" and "cooperative meetings;" but the organizing of this society had about the same effect on the brethren that an "empty gun" would have exploding in the hands of children-- they *dropped the whole thing, and* never bad another meeting to see what the thing looked like.

In the Newbern (Tenn.) church trial, Mr. Meeks, Tillman, and others tried to make it appear that Brother Lipscomb was the "jonah" in the brotherhood, and was proscribing brethren; but they had just as well been shooting paper wads out of a popgun at the Rock of Gibraltar. I quote from Cross-examination, Volume II., page 547:

Question. "Now, if I understand your position, these men who were still affiliating with that organization had departed from the faith "

Answer. "I think so."

Q. "Were in apostasy?"

A. "Well, in error."

Q. "And if living today and affiliated with a similar organization, would not, by reason of that fact, be eligible or acceptable as teachers in your Bible schools?'"

A. "They would not, sir, if they were holding to these positions. l went to school to Mr. Fanning, and I know this is out of harmony with all of his teachings. I was at the school some time before that. I quit school in 1849, not quite eighteen years old, but I was familiar with his teachings and have been since. My brother was teaching with him, and this is out of harmony with all of his teachings both before and since."

Q. "Now, Brother Lipscomb, do you not think you were mistaken a while ago when you said that Fanning and the leading brethren in Tennessee opposed societies?"

A. "I don't think I am. I am willing to give any number of Fanning's articles where he said to Elley and Munnell, indicating very dearly that it would cost their fellowship if they pressed that society on the brethren."

When this society was organized at Franklin College, Mr. Fanning was president of the college. He was also present at the "social meeting" when the society was organized, and was appointed corresponding secretary, and, thereforej seemed to have favored it.

We will now take up Mr. Fanning's writings, and when we hear him give his reason for establishing the G*ospel Advocate* we will possibly understand why this society was *stillborn and* never put in operation. Remember that the secretary-editor under revlew says: "Our brethren have always been committed to organized mission agencies. It is worse than folly to dispute this." *(Gospel Advocate,* 1930, page 133.)

Suggestions.--We regard it a privilege and high duty to God and our brethren to submit to the calm resection of our friends a few respectful thoughts and suggestions in relation to cooperation in general, and the cooperation of churches in particular. It is well understood that for many years I have doubted the practical re-suits of the cooperation in Tennessee, and, indeed, in other States; but [have yielded to my brethren of age and experience, and I should be willing to yield longer, could I conclude it would be to honor God. It has been intimated that as my profession is not preaching, I should not meddle with cooperative movements. Indeed, I have been insuitingly told that, in as much as I am not a member of any one of the churches poisoned and degraded by the sensualism of spirit-rappers, it was none of my business. [This has reference to J. B. Ferguson and the crowd he led off into spiritualism.--John T. Lewis.] A still more mortifying insinuation, and one brought against older and better men than myself, is, that ambition and envy prompted the opposition to the daring encroach-ments upon our Zion in Tennessee.

In establishing the G*ospel Advocate, I* determined, by the help of the Lord to give the subject of cooperation a thorough examination. I do not pretend to say how it has been brought about, but I have for years believed that a change must take place in our views of cooperation before we can labor to each other's advantage or to the honor of God.

I beg permission to state what seems to me evidence of defective cooperation among us. It has always occurred to me that the

brethren most generally write and speak upon the subject as men at sea, without chart, compass, or even a polestar to guide them. At the World Convention in London, every one has a theory, a suggestion, a plan to urge, or at least a question to ash, if such or such a plan will not answer. Such a course is an acknowledgment that we have no directions or examples to guide us. With the word of God before us, the thought is most humiliating. We have complete instructions in all matters pertaining to religion, or we have nothing. (Tolbert Fanning, in the G*ospel Advocate,* 1855, page 110.)

The G*ospel Advocate was* established by Tolbert Fanning and William Lipscomb in 1858. The first issue appeared in July, 1858. The quotation above, from Mr. Fanning, was pubfished in the second issue of the G*ospel Advocate* (August, 1858).

Thus, when the G*ospel Advocate was* born, it opened its eyes, scanned the fields of church cooperation, and set the compass that has guided its course through seventy-five years of tempestuous religious journalism. It came here fighting the inventions and devices of men in religious matters; and should it ever cease the fight, I pray that the ink may fade from its pages.

But we must go on in the study of Mr. Fanning's writings. In 1858, 1886, Mr. Fanning wrote fourteen articles under the heading, "The Church of Christ." I will quote some extracts from these articles which will sbow Mr. Fanning's position on missionary societies, the subject we are discussing:

Under this head we expect, all things concurring, to discuss as thoroughly as we may be able most of the great and cardinal principles of the Christian religion. Indeed, a chief purpose we had in view in establishing the G*ospel Advocate was* to examine the subject of "Christian cooperation," "church organization," the classes and qualifications of officers in the body, and especially the worship of the saints, public and private.

We most respectfully suggest at the very threshold that we feel not the least pride in differing from any person, and, in truth, we are always mortified at the thought that good *men,* owing to the influences which exert themselves, do sincerely differ. Let us ad-mlt no adequate ground of difference among Christians, and we are fufiy persuaded that the light at our command, when it shines into our hearts, enables all to see eye to eye, and to speak the same thing.

In our essays on the themes contemplated, under our new heading, we have concluded to adopt an unusual style in the management of our arguments. Generally, writers and scholars, after examining subjects, draw their conclusions; but we have made up our mind to give the result of our investigations first, and after-

wards we will submit our reasons. Rhetoricians inform us that it is a dangerous system, if a possibility of prejudice can arise from stating a conclusion for which the mind is ilot prepared. But from the fact that the brethren generally seem to he unsettled, particularly upon "cooperation," "church organization," and the officers of congregations, it occurs to us there is little or no danger in clearly stating some of our conclusions first.

We are willing to admit that, if most of our writers do clearly comprehend the meaning of these subjects, we have read to no valuable purpose. While we believe that the brethren in no State have gone further, in cooperation, than in Tennessee, we are satisfied, and have been from the beginning of our efforts, that they have been wrong; and regarding it a hard system of morality which encourages the practice of evil for the sake of the good which may grow out of it, we shall in the future endeavor to show a better way.

After submitting several "propositions for discussion," Mr. Fanning said :

The practice of the cofiperation of any body of men, such as association, conference, presbytery, or cooperation meetings, acting *outside of the church, in*dependent of her, and with a view of bringing the respective churcbes under obligation to do anything which such body might suggest, is an outrage against the church of Christ. *(Gospel Advocate, I*855, pages 134, 135.)

The above will show conclusively Mr. Fanning's position on missionary societies and church cooperation. It wilI also explain his apparent acquiescence in the formation of the "Tennessee Evangelizing Society," at Franklin College, in April, 1882. He was told that as his "profession" was not preaching, he "should not meddle with cooperative movements." He had also "been insuitingly told" that it was none of his business.

Human nature has been the same in all ages. If you want to be "insultingly told that it is none of your business" and be ostracized today, just question or challenge some of "our" modern movements.

In the G*ospel Advocate,* 1857, page 360, Mr. Fanning says:

Brother Trott has gone forth as a missionary of the church at this place, and, in our view of the Christian economy, we can recognize no other missionary society. Paul and Barnabas were "recommended" by the church at Antioch, set apart by the elders, prophets, and teachers, and when occasion suggested they returned to report success. Others cooperated in thelr support, in thelr own way, as God gave them ability. What the brethren may do in this mission, time can alone reveal.

In the G*ospel Advocate,* 1857, pages 23, 24, Mr. Fanning, replying to Professor Milligan, said:

My position is, and was, that through the church alone Christians should exert all their influence; and because I thus, in sincerity of soul, pleaded the Christian cofiperation of churches, you conclude that I am with you in your unauthorized, unchristian, and worldly institutions. I hope, Brother Milligan, that you will admit the point in discussion.

Should you, my brother, repudiate your teaching in your essays relative to the necessity and transcendent superiority of worldly organizations and unqualifiedly maintain the honor and dignity of the church, and, above all, her true agency in the salvation of the world, we may proceed to examine minor questions. Till you do this, I shall feel that any effort at discussion with you will not prove very edifying.

I close this article with the following gripping paragraph from one of Mr. Fanning's articles, which was a reply to Professor Robert Richardson :

Courteous Reader: In the forty and seven years of our pilgrimage and particularly in the twenty-eight we have labored in the Lord's vineyard, our journey has been rather pleasant than otherwise. Thankful to Heaven are we that much of the time we have been able to look on the bright side of human nature, when frequently there was no small amount to discourage us. Not only have we been successful in the cuitivation of kindly sentiments toward our fellow beings, but we have even been scrupulous to entertain a fair degree of self-respect, without the least envy toward any living mortal. True, we have not, like Paul, been "in prison," "received from the Jews five times forty stripes save one;" neither have we been "beaten with rods," "suffered shipwreck," been "a night and a day in the deep," or "fought with wild beasts at Ephesus" or elsewhere; but we have endured what is much worse--we have on several occasions been forced to taste a bitter cup from the hands of those who called us "brother." In our nineteenth year we enlisted as a corporal in the cause of One who "has gone to prepare a place" for his friends; so soon as we were able to bear the King's weapons, we threw his banner to the breeze for a life voyage, and we have not yet taken down our sails or put off the armor. We now hope not for peace, nor even an armistice. When we consult the flesh, our Master's enemies oft whisper in honeyed strains, "Compromise, compromise"; but our Captain says: "Onward! There is no time for trifling. Fight the good fight of falth, take the kingdom by violence, and lay hold on eternal life." In our wen-intended struggles for the cause we plead, we have necessarily been forced into severe conflicts with some of our brethren of earth; but while sin abounds, we can hope not for rest. Our *inclinations,*

and especially our desire to merit the favorable opinions of men, oft urge us to abandon the field, and sincere friends whisper in our ear, "You will appear to love debates and strifes"; but we endeavor to heed them not, and pray God for strength to more skillfully wield the spiritual weapons furnished us. We hope by the favor of our King still to stand for the defense of the heavenly oracles "as they are written." *(Gospel Advocate,* 1857, pages 181, 182.)

I am sure that Mr. Fanning here expresses the experience and sentiments of every true gospel preacher. M*ay the Gospel Advocate* ever remain true to the principles of its founders.

CHAPTER XII

MR. FANNING'S BOLD CHALLENGE of missionary societies and also the unorganized cooperation of the churches in Tennessee, which was nothing but missionary societies in embryo, resulted in "consultation meetings." One of these "consultation meetings" was held in Frauklin, Tenn., April 10-14, 1856. J. J. Trott, S. E. Jones, and F. M. Carmack were selected to prepare an address selting forth the results of the deliberations. TEe address was published in the G*ospel Advocate,* 1856, pages 175-184. I will quote some extracts from the "address."

Dear Brethren: In obedience to the wishes of the Disciples, in consultation at Franklin, we have prepared the fonowing address in reference to the sub ects discussed during the meeting which we respectfully submit for your consideration.

The church of Christ is presented to the wor]d as an authoritative body, whicb was established about eighteen hundred years ago by divine appointment. The purpose of its establishment was to rule the race of man for good--to supply a place in the government of humanity which none of the systems of human invention could fill. It is therefore superior, both in power and authority, to all the governments of earth. The latter have their origin in human wls-dora, and are consequently imperfect. They are intended to regulate the *actions* of men in their relations to civil society, but beyond this they cannot go. The government of Heaven's kingdom--the church of Christ--goes farther still, asserting its sway over the *motives* by which man is actuated in alI his varied relations, thus purifying the fountain whence the stream of human action flows. (Page 175.)

The church of Cbrist, in carrying out its mission, has two distinct objects to which its labors shouId be continually directed: (I) The instruction, control, and edification of its members. (2) The proclamation of the gospel to the world.

The means by which these purposes are to be accomplished are not left to be devised by man's wisdom. The new Reign is no popular democracy, in which the will of the majority necessarily directs the action of the whole. All power and authority, legislative, judicial, executive, is in the heavens. God has committed his oracles to the church, in which he has given specific directions for its guidance in the fulfillment of its glorious mission. It is therefore not for men in conventions and councils, with whatever wisdom composed, to pass authoritative decrees and legislative enactments for the government and direction of the church of the living God.

He speaks with supreme authority, and it is man's duty to hear and obey. (Page 176.)

We now come to consider the church of Christ as a missionary institution. As before intimated, the church has all things necessary to constitute it an authoritative kingdom, which is destined to move onward to the conquest of the world. Now the question arises, bow is the great conquest to be achieved? In th s again we are not left to be guided by our own views of expediency. Our King directs. He reigns as a Sovereign absolute, and the dictates of his will alone constitute the law. He has both given to the church the means and taught here how to use them. The great weapon which she must wield for the subjection of all things to the Reign of Heaven is the "sword of the Spirit" the mighty Word--the gospel. (Page 179.)

The churches of Christ are the only bodies authorized to qualify, appoint, and support evangelists, and to direct their labors. (Page 182.)

This is all I wilI quote from this wonderful "address," but I wish you could read all of it. It is the greatest human document that I ever read upon the all-sufficlency of the church of Christ in carrying the gospel to the world. Thus, the *church of Christ* at Franklin, Tenn., seventy-five years ago, contended for "the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints."

Tolbert Fanning, commenting on this meeting, in the G*ospel Advocate,* 1856, page 154, says: "If we are not mistaken, the brethren generally, after very careful examination, were disposed to conclude that the church of Christ is fully adequate for all of our moral and spiritual wants, that she indeed is competent for all the good work of Temperance, Freemason, Odd Fellowship, Conference, Missionary, Co6peration, Bible, and Remission Societies of earth." F.M. Carmack, on the committee that prepared this clear and decisive document, setting forth the results and conclusions of the "consultation meeting," was the father of the late, Iamented, Senator E. W. Carmack, the peerless statesman.

Those stalwart heroes of "the faith," who lived seventy-five years ago, were free and bold in their use of the term, "the church of Christ." They do not seem to have been entangled in the meshes of modern sectarian phraseology. They were not hairsplitters, but teachers of the common people.

I now quote from the lamented David Lipscomb:

There is no way in which we can so easily defile the church of God as by compromising these sacred truths for the friendship and favor of the world. Every touch of uncircumcised hands--every

offering from a disbeliever, from a disobedient person who withholds himself, accepted by the church of God, whether it comes as an indorsement of the truths she holds, as gifts to advance her cause, a mingling in the observance of church ordinances, or a par-tlcipation in the holy worship of the sanctuary--is a defilement of that spiritual temple built in three days without hands by the death, burial, and resurrection of the Prince Messiah. Then, would we have our preaching and practice effectual, would we have the church become an efficient agent for the conversion of the world and for the promotion of the growth in grace of the converted and their perfection in true holiness, we must away with this temporizing, compromising spirit which is courting the favor and winking at the errors of all, which is *generally falsely* called "liberality," and sometimes almost blasphemously called "*Christian charity." (Gospel Advocate, I*856, page 73.)

I would like to say "amen" to the above loud enough to be heard around the world.

I will close my last chapter on what the pioneers stood for, with the closing paragraph of an article written by David Lipscomb and signed by several brethren:

We accord these and all other people the right to form such organizations as they desire. But we deny their right to claim to represent the disciples of Christ, who repudiate their course, or to take possession of and appropriate property belonging to them, as is now done on Woodland Street. This article was written at the urgent request of a number of preachers and teachers, my own judgment concurring, and has been read and heartily approved by those signed below, some of them not being cognizant of all the special facts stated. We believe that it would be almost unanimously signed by thepreachers and teachers in Middle Tennessee and by nine-tenths of all the State.

Signed: E. G. Sewell, J. C. McQulddy, W. H. Timmons, J. A. Harding, W. Lipscomb, St., E. A. Elam, L. R. Sewell, G. Lipscomb, Nashville, Tenn.; J. W. Grant, Gallatin, Tenn.; J. E. Scobey, F. W. Smith, Franklin, Tenn.; W. D. Anderson, Leiper's Fork, Tenn.; H. Zellner, Brentwood, Tenn.; James H. Davis, Decherd, Tenn.; J. L. Bryant, Donelson, Tenn.; T. A. Smith, Dover, Tenn.; F. B. Sryg-ley, Lebanon, Tenn. *(Gospel Advocate,* 1891, page 677.)

Of course, this one paragraph, written by David Lipscomb and signed by these brethren, would have answered the challenge I have been reviewing, but the editor of the T*ennessee Christian is* such a promising leader and such a bold challenger that I thought it *might* help him to take him on a free excursion through "the literature of that period." Should he ever want to write again on what the pioneers stood for, he can state the facts, if *he wants to;* he has them *now.*

CHAPTER XIII

WE HAVE LEARNED that there was no missionary society among the pioneers of the nineteenth-century Reformation for more than thirty years, and during that period the pioneers had turned the denominational world "upside down" as "in thCr church capacity alone they moved."

The editor of the T*ennessee Christian sa*ys : "The American Christian Missionary Society was organized by the pioneers in 1R49, at a general convention of churches in Cincinnati, Ohio. This convention was the first ever held in our brotherhood." We have learned that not since 1849 has the Reformation presented a united front against the denominational bulwarks, but that in the wake of the American Christian Missionary Society have followed strife, alienation, and division. I have also shown that this editor was rather reckless with the truth, or with facts, wfien be said: "Our brethren have always been committed to organized mission agencies. it is worse than folly to dispute this. The pioneers were almost unanimous in favor of organization." I am now wondering if he will "prove himself to be an inherent gentleman" by admitting that he was wrong in the above statements. "it is worse than folly" for him to do otherwise.

I will now show that this human "method or agency"--the Tennessee Christian Missionary Society--is out of harmony with the teaching of the New Testament. This calls for apostolic authority. Quoting from the pioneers would not show this. "*To the* intent that now unto the principalities and the powers in the heavenly places might be made known through the church the mallifo]d wisdom of God: according to the eternal purpose which be purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Eph. 3:10, 11.) There is, therefore, no place in God's "eternal purpose" for a ladies' aid, a missionary society, or any other organization than the *church, in* making known God's "manifold wisdom." Here we must move as "the church," if we move by God's authority.

Every missionary society that has ever been organized "to make known God's manifold wisdom" to the world has been a challenge of God's wisdom and an insult to his "eternal purpose," whether intentional or otherwise. It is equally true that every congregation of God's people that is not doing what it can to have the gospel

preached to the world, thereby "making known God's manifold wisdom," is thwarting God's "eternal purpose," whether ignorantly or otherwise. One is a sin of commission, the other a sin of omission, and both will be condemned if they do not repent and bring forth "fruits worthy of repentance." There never would have been any excuse for organizing a missionary society if the church had always done its duty in having the gospel preached to the world; but because the church failed to do its duty in carrying out God's "eternal purpose" was no reason to conclude that God's plan was a failure and that a missionary society was necessary.

Under God's plan, in the apostolic age, the gospel was preached to the whole creation. (Col. 1:23.) There was some excuse for the pioneers not teaching the churches their duty along this line. They were in the front-line trenches fighting for the first principles of the gospel. But there is no excuse for trying to get the churches of Tennessee to join the Tennessee Christian Missionary Society. The digressive brethren ought to quit trying to work through a humanly organized society and join us in teaching the *church* to carry the gospel to the world.

"Now there were at Antioch, in the church that was there, prophets and teachers .... The Holy Spirit said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. Then, when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." (Actsl3:l-3.) Paul and Barnabas traveled through Asia Minor, visiting Antioch of Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, preaching and establishing churches. "And when they had preached the gospel to that city [Derbe], and had made many disciples, they returned to Lystra, and to Iconium, and to Antioch, confirming the souls of the disciples, exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that through many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of God. And when they had appointed for them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they had believed." (Acts 14:21-23.) Notice that they did not go to a city, teach and baptize a lot of people, and then "set in order a church" by appointing elders; but they taught and baptized the people, and left them to worship God and develop leadership, then they returned and appointed "elders in every church." [n New Testament times the development of the elders came before the appointing. A "novice," a new convert, was not to be appointed. Some-

times a preacher will go into a new field, where the gospel has never been preached, baptize a lot of people, "appoint elders," and then report that be has "set in order a new church." I have never understood how a man could "set in order" something, when he was "out of order" himself.

Alter Paul and Barnabas had returned through Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch of Pisidia, and "appointed elders in every church," they safied back to Antioch in Syria. "And when they were come, and had gathered the church together, they rehearsed all things that God had done with them." (Acts 14:27.) No missionary society here. The church at Antioch, by sending the gospel to new fields, was thus carrying out God's "eternal purpose," honoring God and magnifying the church as God's only missionary society. It is a pity that men are not satisfied with God's "etcrnaI purpose," but have to build up a "method or agency" unknown in the New Testament to do the work that God has committed to the *church.*

On the second missionary journey, "Paul chose Silas, and went forth, being commended by the brethren to the grace of the Lord. And he went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches." (Acts 15:40, 41.) They were not commended and sent forth by a missionary society, but by "the brethren" "the church" at Antioch. Being commended and sent forth by "the brethren," or by *the church, is* not the language of a missionary society. When a missionary society gets into the work, it is like the proverbial turkey's head in the tree--the society is all you can see and hear.

Paul and Silas went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches," not organizing societies. Doubtiess, if the secretary of the Tennessee Christian Missionary Society had lived in that day, he would have *followed P*aul and Silas and tried to convince the churches that his "method or agency" was very necessary to keep Paul and Silas in the field.

Passing through Syria and Cificia on their second journey, Paul and Silas came again into Asia Minor. "And he came also to Derbe and to Lystra .... And as they went on their way through the cities, they delivered them the decrees to keep which had been ordained of the apostles and elders that were at Jerusalem. So the churches were strengthened in the faith, and increased in number daily." (Acts 16:1-5.) The New Testament way is to visit "the churches" and strengthen them in "the faith." Man's way is to visit "the churches" and organize "missionary so-

cieties." We are following Paul and Silas now, trying to find something that looks like a missionary society. So far we have only found "the church" at work.

When Paul, Silas, and Timothy left Derbe and Lystra, they traveled through Phrygia, Galatia, Mysia, and came to Troas. At Troas Paul received the "Macedonian call." Here Luke joined Paul's company, and they sailed across the !Egean Sea and came into Macedonia. They preached the gospel in Philippi and established the church there. And "when they had passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia, they came to Thessalonica." Luke stayed with the church in Philippi and rejoined Paul on the return of his third journey. The church at Philippi, although made up of poor people, was one of the most active churches in the New Testament. Of course a church, under the teaching or leadership of a man like Luke, weuld develop elders and deacons who would lead the church into every good work. "And ye yourselves also know, ye Philippians, that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no church had fellowship with me in the matter of giving and receiving but ye only; for even in Thessalonica ye sent once and agaln unto my need. Not that f seek for the gift; but I seek for the fruit that increaseth to your account. But I have all things, and abound: I am filled, having received from Epaphro-ditus the things that came from you, an odor of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God. And my God shall supply every need of yours according to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus. Now unto our God and Father be the glory forever and ever." (Phil. 4:15-20.) No one would ever get an idea of a missionary society from reading the above Scripture.

In fact, a missionary society is not a Bible idea. "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith Jehovah." (Isa. 55:8.) The difference between the *church* carrying the gospel to the world and a *missionary society* carrying it is the difference between God's way and man's way. Let the advocates of the missionary society tell us why some *society* did *not"send once and again" unto Paul's need.* If they do not, "we" will be confirmed in "our" belief that the editor of the *Tennessee Christian "*and about one million five hundred thousand others" of his brethren are *wrong "*today," *trying to do the work God has committed to the church through missionary societies.*

There are both spiritual and temporal blessings promised the

church in carrying the gospel to the world. Paul says: "Not that I seek for the gift; but I seek for the fruit that increaseth to your account." Just as one feels good when he sees his bank account increasing, so ought the church to feel good when it sees its "account" increasing in heaven. Sending the gospel to the world is one way of "laying up treasures in heaven" (Matt. 6:19-21), and there is no danger of our having too much to our "account" in heaven. Again, Paul says: "And my God shall supply every need of yours according to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus." This is a promise of temporal blessings for carrying the gospel to the world. If we could get the brethren to believe God and trust him for his promises, the gospel would soon go to the ends of the earth.

Paul says: "For it is God who worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure." (Phil. 2:13.) A father can work in and through his children, if they will let him; but when they get to where they *think the*y know more than "the old man" ever knew, they have him blocked. So God purposes to work in his children; but when they get to where they *think the*y know more than God ever knew, they have him blocked. And that is what they do when they think missionary societies and other aids are necessary in carrying out God's "eternal purpose." One of the reasons Paul gave for God's rejecting the Gentile world was: "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of corruptible man, and of birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." from. 1:22,23.) There is today a danger of people's "professing themselves to be wise, and becoming fools," and changing God's "eternal purpose" for the inventions and devices of men. Of course it is natural for people like this to look upon God's way as foolishness. Hence, Paul says: "The foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men." (1 Cor. 1 :25.) "The foolishness of God" and "the weakness of God" is only from the viewpoint of those who are wise in their own conceit. "For behold your calling, brethren, that not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called." (1Cor. 1:26.) That is, "not many" with worldly "learning and study" are satisfied with the *gospel calling.*

If the digressive brethren would drop the missionary societies and the unscriptural things they use in the worship, and join us in teaching the *church,* "To the intent that now unto the principalities

and the powers in the heavenly places might be made known through the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord," it would amalgamate, in Christian love and fellowship, a once united, happy, and powerful people, who were ruthlessly torn asunder by the introduction of missionary societies, organs, pianos, fiddles, horns, etc, into the work and worship of the church. And it would not be long till the knowledge of God would cover the earth as the waters cover the deep. Surely they could do this without violating either their consciences or God's law. Will they do it? C*ome back,* brethren; you will find "us" where your fathers left our fathers eighty years ago, "moving in our church capacity alone." We will receive you with outstretched arms, and with tears of joy in our eyes, for the happy confirmation of our Savior's prayer.

However, we are engaged in a great work, trying to extend the borders of our Master's kingdom according to his plans, and have no time or disposition to come down "in the plain of Ono" to talk the matter over with you. You left the teaching and practice of the New Testament without consuiting our judgment or considering our feelings. You can come back the same way. You have the same right to follow the teaching and practice of the New Testament that we have--no discussion or consuhation needed here. If you will come back to the teaching and practice of the New Testament church, that will *make us one in fa#h and practice,* just as obedience to the gospel made us members of the church. There is nothing to compromise, therefore no need of a conference to get together.

CHAPTER XIV

WE HAVE LEARNED that when Paul and Silas left Philippi, "they came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews; and Paul, as his custom was, went in unto them, and for three Sabbath days reasoned with them from the scriptures, opening and alleging that it behooved the Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom, said he, I proclaim unto you, is the Christ. And some of them were persuaded, and consorted with Paul and Silas; and of the devout Greeks a great muiti-tude, and of the chief women not a few." (Acts 17:1-4.) This was the beginning of the church in Thessalonica. It was here that the church at Philippi "sent once and again" unto Paul's need.

When Paul left Thessalonica, he went to Berea, then to Athens, and from Athens to Corinth. After Paul left the church at Thessa-lonica, he wrote them two letters. He began both letters thus: "Paul, and Silvanus, and Timothy, unto the church of the Thessa-Ionians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ : Grace to you and peace." (1 Thess. h l.) In verse 8 of the first chapter Paul says: "For from you hath sounded forth the word of the Lord, not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but in every place your faith to God-ward is gone forth; so that we need not to speak anything." Does this look like a missionary society, or a human "method or agency?" How many preachers of today could write to churches they have established and say: "For from you hath sounded forth the word of the Lord, not only in ___ and ___, but in every place your faith to God-ward is gone forth; so that we need not to speak anything?" If a preacher is laboring with an old, established congregation today, and goes away and comes back, he does not make a report, but he *gets* a report about like this: "Our crowds have fallen off and the *contribution* has gone down to almost nothing. *You will just have to stay at home more."* The prevalent idea of today is: "if we have a preacher, be must preach to us." *So much preaching, so much pay; no preach, no pay. J*esus Christ said, "Go," and the apostles went. The churches of today are saying, "Stay," and the preachers are staying. In the apostolic age the churches "sounded forth the word"; today the majority of the churches are "sounding in the word." This may offer an excuse for organizing a missionary **society;** but there is nothing in the New Testament that *looks like*

a missionary society. The church, not *a missionary society, in* the New Testament times, carried the gospel to the then known world; and if the society brethren would drop their missionary societies and join "us" in teaching the churches their duty in carrying the gospel to the world, we would soon preach it to the "whole creation" again.

Luke gives us a summary of Paul's labors in Corinth: "And Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, believed in the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized." (Acts l8:8.) This was the beginning of the church in Corinth. The term "church" is used both in a universal and a local sense in the New Testament. "Upon this rock I will build my church." Here Christ uses the term in a universal sense, to include all who would ever he baptized into him.

"Paul, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God, and Sosthenes our brother, unto the church of God which is at Corinth." (1 Cor. 1:l, 2.) Here "church" is used in a local sense, to include the baptized believers in Corinth, but not all the saved in Corinth. Infants, idiots, and innocent children are saved but not in the church. "But in giving you this charge, I praise you not, that ye come together not for the better but for the worse. For first of all, when ye come together in the church, I hear that divisions exist among you; and I partly believe it." (1 Cor. 11:17, 18.) "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I gave order to the churches of Galatia, so also do ye. Upon the first day of the week let each one of you lay by him in store, as he may prosper, that no collections he made when I come." (1Cor. 16:1,2.) Therefore, the church in a local sense, the only sense in which it concerns us, has reference to a body of baptized believers, who meet together at some definite place at appointed times to worship God and to otherwise carry on his work.

"The church" is a definite idea, designating a definite body of people, and is not a vague, indefinite, incomprehensible something. You have to obey the gospel to become a member of the church. You can buy a membership or directorship in a missionary society. One is a divine institution or organization, the other is a human organization.

"And Paul, having tarried after this yet many days, took his leave of the brethren, and sailed thence for Syria, and with him Priscilla and Aquila: having shorn his head in Cenchrea; for he had

a vow. And they came to Ephesus, and he left them there; but he himself entered into the synagogue, and reasoned with the Jews. And when they asked him to abide a longer time, he consented not; but taking his leave of them, and saying, I will return again unto you if God will, he set sail from Ephesus. And when he had landed at Cesarea, he went up and saluted the church, and went down to Antioch." (Acts 18:18-22.) Paul went up to Jerusalem and saluted the *church, not* a missionary society. We have followed Paul on two of his missionary journeys. The only institution he organized, recognized, or even mentioned, was the *church.*

"For we stretch not ourselves overmuch, as though we reached not unto you: for we came even as far as unto you in the gospel of Christ: not glorying beyond our measure, that is, in other men's labors; but having hope that, as your faith groweth, we shall be magnified in you according to our province unto further abundance, so as to preach the gospel even unto the parts beyond you, and not to glory in another's province in regard of things ready to our hand." (2Cor. I0:14-16.) ThechurchatCorinth, fike hundreds of churches today, was not doing anything to have the gospel preached in "parts beyond"; but Paul did not "tell them to organize a missionary society, "but having hope that, as your faith groweth, we shall be magnified in you according to our province unto further abundance, so as to preach the gospel even unto the parts beyond
you."

Thus Paul "proves himself to be not less than one of the leading and outstanding writers" on the New Testament church side of the question. Paul was inspired; the secretary of the Tennessee Christian Missionary Society is uninspired. Paul magnified "the church"; the secretary-editor magnifies the "Tennessee Christian Missionary Society." Which one shall we follow?

"These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly; but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how men ought to behave themselves in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." (I Tim. 3: 14, 15.) "The pillar and ground" of anything is that which supports it. "The church of the living God" is the pillar and support of the truth and should support it. A missionary society is not *the*

pillar and support of the truth, and, therefore, has no business trying to support it.

Whose position agrees with the apostles, those who recognize the church as the pillar and support of the truth or those who organize missionary societies to support the truth?

PART II

PART TWO

THE CHALLENGE made by the editor of the *Tennessee Christian inv*olves two propositions the teaching of the apostles and the position of the pioneers on "organlzed missionary societies" and "instrumental music in the worship."

The first part of this book deals with the innovations in the work of the church. The second part deals with the innovations in the worship of the church.

The teaching of the apostles represents actual authority, and is our final appeal in all matters of faith. The position of the pioneers is solely a matter of historical facts. I have dealt with the challenge from both viewpoints.

Others have treated the music question from the viewpoint of scholarship--meaning of words, etc. This book does not enter that field, and is, therefore, a book for the "common people." It will fortify them against the impious hand of digression in the church of the living God.

The waves of innovation will spend their force in vain splashing against the Gibraltar of truth--the position of the pioneers as presented in this book.

John T. Lewis.

INDEX--PART TWO

CHAPTER ONE

The issue stated. "A popular preacher comes out in favor of instrumental music in churches, and social dancing in our families." John Rogers. Alexander Campbell. David Lipscomb says Campbell would not preach where the organ was used. Melodeon the first instrument. Tolbert Fanning. Isaac Errett.

CHAPTER TWO

R. E. McCorkle. J.W. MeGarvey. "Our religious neighbors are Christians." M. D. Clubb. J.W. McGarvey withdrawn from "Broadway Christian Churcb2' McGarvey's funeral.

CHAPTER THREE

Moses E. Lard. W. K. Pendleton. *New York Herald.* Prof. Charles L. Loos.

CHAPTER FOUR

"The law of expediency." M. D. Clubb. Prof. Charles L. Loos. J. B. Briney.

CHAPTER FIVE

Clubb's change. PauI's command. Mussolini and the Pope. Adam Clarke.

CHAPTER SIX

Prof. L B. Grubbs. W. K. Pendleton, in the last volume of the *Millennial Harbinger* (1870).
M.D. Clubb.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Clubb's arguments (?) examined. The church at Sioux City, Iowa.

CHAPTER EIGHT

A study in the Old Testament. Scriptures on the music question. Adam Clarke's comments on 2 Chron. 29:25

CHAPTER NINE

A study of the New Testament Scriptures on the music question.
J. W. McGarvey's comments on "the singing of psalms."

CHAPTER I

IN THE G*ospel Advocate,* February 6, 1930, pages 132, 133, the secretary of the Tennessee Christian Missionary Society and editor of the *Tennessee Christian* says: "Finally, Brother allen tells us that he and his brethren are standing just where the apostles and the pioneers of the Reformation stood in their opposition to instrumental music and organized missionary work. Our conservative brethren are constantly making this claim. Their position does not agree either with the apostles or the pioneers."

I have already examined and exposed the secretary's "challeiige" on "the pioneers and organized misslonary work." I will now look into his claims about the pioneers and instrumental music in the worship. I believe that in all our preaching and writing we should have clear-cut issues before us. So I will say: W*e are standing where the pioneers, and every gospel preacher of the Reformation, stood, on instrumental music, for more than a quarter of a century.* This statement is diametrically opposed to the statement of the secretary of the Christian Missionary Society. Both statements cannot be true. Therefore, you have the is*sue* before you. It is my duty to show that the position of "our conservative brethren" on instrumental music does agree with both the apostles and the pioneers. "I will pass over for the present the claim that they stand with the apostles and look into the claim that they stand with the pioneers in regard" *to instrumental music.*

I shall not make a lot of bold, unsupported statements, and then, with the audacity of a Spanish matador, say: "It is worse than folly to dispute this." I have too much respect for my own intelligence to thus deal with an intelligent people, and too much honor to thus trifle with the credulity of the credulous. Therefore, I shall ask you to accept *no statement* from me, on this subject, not supported with *undeniable fa*cts. I "challenge" the editor of the *Tennessee Christian* to show, "from the llterature of that perlod," where a *single v*oice was heard, *among the Reformers, "in* favor of instrumental music in churches," prior to 1851. I also challenge him to show where one was used prior to 1859. If this cannot he done, and it can't, it is strange that a man at the head of as many *Christian in*stitutions as Brother Clubb seems to he would make such audacious statements. He is evidently a good psychologist

and knows that a lot of bold statements will satisfy the masses in religion today. It is possible, however, that the secretary has made the above statements so many times before conventions that he believes them himself, and is, therefore, laboring under mental delusions in the matter. If so, I hope to help him and all who have believed his vagaries. One departure from God's truth always calls for another, and the floodgate once opened, there is no cheekhlg the innovations. In less than two years after the American Christian Missionary Society was organized John Rogers wrote to Alexander Campbell as follows:

Carlisle Ky., June 9, I851.--Brother Campbell: It is now seven years since I felt myself called upon) in view of the ncreas ng d s-position to frivolity in our churches) to prepare and publish a discourse against dancing, as an amusement. But however that and kindred efforts from the pulpit and press may have checked the evil, most certainly it is still on the increase in this section of Kentucky. For years past, many persons of wealth and influence have been advocating dancing as a social amusement--as innocent, elegant, healthful, and every way improving. But they have been much hindered, hitherto, by the old-fashioned sort of Christians, who have not so learned Christ; and the preachers, too, have all been against them.

But my brother, (would you believe it?) a popular preacher has come out in two numbers, in the "E. *Reformer,* n favor of nstru-mental music in churches, and social dancing in our families! Hear him: "That the fasldonable dancing of the day should be denounced by the churches, is not strange, but social dancing affords a very healthful and elegant exercise for the young) which, in itself, is enter talning, improving, and inoffensive." (E. R. for June 1, 1851.)

"Watchman, what of the night?" I call upon you, my dear Brother Campbell, in the name of God--in the name of the crucified One--in the name of poor, bleeding Zion; upon Brothers Richardson, Pendleton, and every editor and every scribe who can lift a pen, and every orator in this Reformation, to speak out in a voice of thunder, and say: O, say! is this the goal to which you have been driving the car of this Reformation? This the grand ultimatum of all your toils and sacrifices; of this terrible war you have waged against creeds and confessions, disciplines and covenants, sects and sectarianism; against mystery, Babylon, and all her offspring? O, say! has the object of this warfare, for more than a quarter of a century, been to in*troduce instrumental music into our meetinghouses, and the elegant, healthful, inoffensive, improving practice of social dancing into our families?* . . .

Brother Campbell, more than a year ago I wrote to you in reference to some of these matters and urged you strongly to present your views concerning them. You promised me you would; but a

press of business, I suppose, has prevented. I do think the wilo]e weight of your influence is called for upon thls question. Are we to have instrumental music in our churches? Are Christian parents to be allowed to send their children to dancing school, and have social dancing in their houses? Is the church to tolerate and encourage all this? Circus going, card playing as an amusement, theatergoing, and all kindred practices? Give us, my dear brother, your best thoughts on this subject.

God bless you, and make you yet a blessing, is the ardent prayer of yours, as ever,

JOHN ROGERS.

[The subject laid before us in the above communication from its excellent author merits our profound consideration and that of all the brethren. We will attend to it in our next.--A. C.] *(Millennial Harbinger,* 1851, pages 467, 468.)

Mr. Campbcll's reply to the above is found in the M*illennial Harbinger,* 1851, pages 503-507. I will quote only a few extracts from his lengthy reply.

Our most estimable brother, Samuel Rogers, of Kentucky, having called my attention to the subject of promiscuous dancing--a growing fashion in Kentucky and certain other places, not only amongst the sons and daughters of men, but amongst the professing sons and daughters of God--and having conceded a few pages to this interesting subject, I now proceed in due form of an essayist, to redeem my pledge. (Page 503.)

After referring to dancing mentioned in "the book of Job," which he says was the oldest on record, and Miriam dancing, and the daughter of Herodias dancing before Herod, and "Washington balls on Washington's birth nights," Mr. Campbell says:

In these four dances we have the prototypes of all the dancing in all story, sacred or profane. They are, in the philosophy of them, animal and bodily movements, indicative of the passions, emotions, and impulses of the animal soul; not of the spirit, nor the spiritual nature of man ....

But, in the New Testament age, we read of no religious dances, any more than of religions harps psalteries and trumpets. Amongst all the directions and exhortations in the New Testament, I have not found one on the subject of dancing. Yet there was dancing in those times, as well as in the ancient times of the patriarchs and Jews. (Pages 505, 506.)

Mr. Campbell closes his reply as follows:

As idle they who dream of pleasure in what is called the fashionable amusements of the day. Why look to Paris, the metropolis of atheism, sensuality, and crime, for any other fashion or custom than those which drown men in destruction and perdition? I would say, if need there be, to every brother in the land: "Lift up

your voice like a trumpet cry aloud and spare not. Show Israel their transgressions and Jacob their sins;" for because of these things "iniquity abounds--the love of many waxes cold." The gospel is spoken and heard in vain and "because of these things, the wrath of God comes upon the chddren of disobedience. "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness! what communion hath light with darkness? what concord hath Christ with Belial? what part hath he that befieveth with an unbeliever? and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols!" (Page 507.)

It is significant that the first "popular preacher" among the Reformers who came out "in favor of instrumental music in churches" also favored "social dancing in our ramifies." Instrumental music, social dancing, card playing, and kindred practices all appeal to the animal emotions of man, but never to the spiritual nature of man. These practices, in many places, today, as leeches, are sucking all spiritual life out of the churches. Where churches are spiritually dead, it takes organs, fiddles, and horns to keep up an interest; because, if their animal nature flagged, they would be religiously dead. Instrumental music has no place in spiritual assemblies. It belongs to entertainments, but not in the worship.

On instrumental music 1 stand with John Rogers and Alexander Campbell The society secretary stands with "a popular preacher" who came out, in 1851, "in favor of instrumental music in churches" and "social dancing in our families."

In the M*illennial Harbinger,* 1851, pages 581,582, Mr. Campbell says:

The argument drawn from the Psalms in favor of instrumental music is exceedingly apposite to the Roman Catholic, English Protestant, and Scotch Presbyterian churches, and even to the Methodist communities. Their churches having all the world in them --that is, all the fleshly progeny of all the communicants, and being founded on the Jew sh pattern of things--baptism being given to all born into the world of these politico-ecclesiastic communities--I wonder not, then that an organ, a fiddle, or a jew's-harp, should be requisite to stir up their carnal hearts, and work into ecstasy their animal souls, else "hosannas languish on their tongues, and their devotions die." And that all persons who have no spiritual discernment, taste, or relish for their spiritual meditations consolations, and sympathies of renewed hearts, should call for such aid, is but natural. Pure water from the flinty rock has no attractions for the mere toper or winebibber. A little alcohol, or genuine Cognac brandy, or good old Madeira, is essential to the beverage to make it truly refreshing: So to those who have no real devotion or spirituality in them, and whose animal nature flags under the

oppression of church service, I think with Mr. G., that instrumental music would be not only a desideratum, but an essential prerequisite to fire up their souls to even animal devotion. But I presume, to all spiritual-minded Christians, such aids would be as a cowbell in a concert.

Gentle reader, whose position coincides with Mr. Campbell's position on instrumental music? Is it the position of "our conservative brethren," or is it the position of "our digressive brethren"?

In the Newhern (Tennessee) church trial, in his chief examination, page 187, David Lipseomb said:

I stated that Mr. Campbell was so opposed to organs in worship that he would not preach where one was used. I saw a statement made by his son-in-law, I reckon about the time of his death, or soon afterwards, when the organ question was up, he wrote an article that was published in the A*merican Christian Review,* that on one occasion, in New Orleans, a Presbyterian house was offered to Mr. Campbell to preach in, which had an organ in it, and an organist that usually operated it during the services, taking for granted that they wanted the usual services, began the overture or whatever part it was, and Mr. Campbell arose and requested it to be stopped, that he could not preach where the organ was used. He preached in McKendree Church when he was here, which was offered to him, and no organ was used. I suppose there was an organ in the house, but there was none used. I do not know how that happened, but I know it was not used. I was there.

Suppose Alexander Campbell were living today, and should visit Nashville again, go to the Vine Street Christian Church, and tell them that he "could not preach where the organ was used." It would be interesting to know what *Brother Clubb and his people* would say about the old *mossback.* Surely, if John Rogers and Alexander Campbell were living today, and should visit Nashville, Tenn., they would go among "our conservative brethren." Possibly the next time we hear from the secretary-editor on *tkt music question,* he will be saying that John Rogers and Alexander Campbell, "in their opposition to instrumental music," started all the trouble that has ever come up in "our" churches over instrumental music.

Of course, to the digressives, the "popular preacher" who came out in 1851 "in favor of instrumental music in churches, and social dancing in our families," which called forth the withering protests from Rogers and Campbell, was a Christian gentleman who believed in Christian liberty and Christian union. C*hristian liberty,*

to Brother Clubb and his people, is to have what you want in the worship, whether required in the New Testament or not, without protest from others. To "our conservative brethren," C*hristian liberty is to have, and use, only what is ordered or required in the New Testament.* Unquestionably the position of "our conservative brethren" is *the original, and invulnerable, position of the pioneers.*

The question of instrumental music in the worship, as we have already said, admitted of no compromise. They who made it a matter of conscience treated the introduction of musical instruments into the worship just as they would have treated the sprinkling of infants. The only way, therefore, to reconcile a difficulty on this question is for one party to surrender to the other. In this state of the case it is not surprising that many hard words were spoken and written.

Mr. Franklin's first article against it was published in January, 1860. He did not, at that time, foresee the dreadful strife which was to grow out of it, and supposing that only here and there could ever be found a church which would use an instrument, he suggested, ironically, some cases where the use of an instrument might prove to be an advantage; for instance, "Where the church never had, or have lost the spirit of Christ," or, "If the church only intends being a fashionable society, a mere place of amusement." The church in Midway, Kentucky, under Dr. L. L. Pinkerton, were using a melodeon, and Dr. Pinkerton therefore felt called on to reply. We quote the opening and closing paragraphs:

So far as known to me, or, I presume, to you, I am the only "preacher" in Kentucky of our brotherhood who has publicly advocated the propriety of employing instrumental music in *some* churches, and that the church of God in Midway is the only church that has yet made a decided effort to introduce it. The calls for your opinion, it is probable, came from these regions. The paper containing your strictures has been much circulated among our congregation, and even sent to some of its members from distant places. Under these circumstances you will, I trust, see the propriety of this communication. I shall endeavor, in the few lines I propose to write, to give your example as wide a berth as possible, by observing some rules of courtesy, and a few of the more common rules of English syntax ....

Now, touching this I have only this to say and I say it for the consideration of all whom it may concern that if your art c e on church music reflects the notions of the R*eformation* as to what constitutes Christian courtesy, manly literature, logic, rhetoric, religion; nay, if any considerable portion of the R*eformation* can even

tolerate such coarse fulminations, then the sooner it is extinct, the better; and I, for one being assured of this would feel myself im-pe ed by everything I owe my family, my country, myself, and my Savior, to aid in ridding the world of it, as of an immeasurable abomination. By what law of man or of God, written or unwritten, what law of gentlemanly civility, is one man authorized to denounce another as without the spirit of Christ, an ape, carnal without devotion, etc., on account of a difference of opinion as to what is expedient in a community of which the denounced is a part---of which the denouncer knows nothing? But I forbear. Finally, I am ready and willing to discuss the subject of instrumental music in churches with any man who can discriminate between railing in bad grammar and Christian argumentation; but I am as fully resolved as any man can be to have nothing to do with "silly claptrap."

"Yours truly,
L. L. P1NKERTON.

Mr. Franklin promptly published the Doctor's reply, and in commenting thereon said:

We heard that the church in Midway had an instrument in it probably a year ago, but heard again that it had been taken out and supposed t to be st out. We found an nstrument in another congregation a few weeks ago, and, by our request, it did not sound a note in our hearing, nor did we see it afterwards. By several persons at this point, and several at other points, we were called out and certainly did not intend to be personal, especially toward the Doctor. We have aimed for severn years to let him pass quietly without the slightest interruption from us. We do not wish to annoy him in the least, as we do not desire to make him unhappy in the least degree; and ask him if, he *possibly can,* to forgive us *grammatically, logically, ironically,* and every other way, and then rest assured that we do not *mean him in* anything he may find in the *Review;* or, if he does not read it, and any one should call his attention to anything we say, he may explain that he has assurance that it *does not mean him.*

As to any extra copies sent him, or any in his community, we know nothing. We ordered no copies sent to anybody in his vicinity, and did not write the article for any particular community, nor to fit any particular person. One thing is certain, and that is, if the instrumental music had as happy an influence upon his "poor heart" as he appears to think, our article or something else has **had** a very different influence upon it since, judging from what he has written above. We wish the Doctor well, and think he will feel better after meditation, reading the Scriptures, and prayer. He does not do himself justice in this article. He is a much better man than any one would suppose from this piece. By the way, we would rather let him have his plaything in the church than to have him so much out of sorts again. Will some one who understands

"English syntax," "logic," "courtesy," etc., discuss the merits of instrumental music in churches with the Doctor? ("The Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin," by Joseph Franklin and J. A. Head-ington, pages 409-412.)

From the above we learn that the first musical instrument introduced into the worship of the nineteenth-century Reformation was a melodeon put in "the church in Midway, Kentucky, under Dr. L. L. Pinkerton." This was in 1859, just fifty years after Thomas Campbell published his famous "Declaration and Address." I will say, however, in justice to the editor of the *Tennessee Christian,* that this all happened before he was born, and belongs to that period of the Reformation about which he seems to know nothing.

In the *Gospel Advocate,* 1856, page 199, Mr. Fanning said: The disciples are commanded to "teach and admonish one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in the heart to the Lord." We are to "sing in the spirit" and with a proper understanding of what we sing. It is scarcely necessary for us to say to *our* readers that we regard the organ and violin worship, and even the fashionable choir singing of our country, as mockery of all that is sacred. It is a piece with "hiring out" the teaching, admonitions, and prayers of the saints. A spiritual mind gives sweetness to the roughest voice, and the hymn of devotion never fails to inspire a love of purity and goodness.

If Tolbert Fanning "regarded the organ and violin worship, and even the fashionable choir singing of our country, as mockery of all that is sacred," surely, if he were living today, *he would not worship with "Brother Clubb and his people." H*e, along with Rogers and Campbell, would have to find fellowship among *our conservative brethren who are constantly making the claim that they are standing just where the apostles and the pioneers of the Reformation stood in their opposition to instrumental music and organized missionary work. H*owever, Brother Clubb says, "Their position does not agree either with the apostles or the pioneers," and thereby "proves himself to be an inherent gentleman, not less than one of the leading and outstanding writers on that side of the question." Verily, his temerity "excites our" pity.

Isaac Errett, coeditor with Alexander Campbell, wrote a long article on "church music," published in the M*illennial Harbinger,* 1861, pages 551-560. I will quote from this article only what is germane to our subject:

We do not intend here to enter into this rising controversy. We prefer to forestall the discussion by a full statement of facts bearing

on the question and a calm and unprejudiced utterance of the conclusions which we think legitimately flow from the premises submitted. We think the following are lessons clearly taught in the facts which we have presented:

1. That music is a powerful auxiliary in the work of human redemption; and that it is a sacred religious duty, and ought to be a high religious pleasure, to employ it in public and social worship, as a means of spiritual edification.

2. That melody in the *heart is* the great end to be sought; and that artistic excellence is only valuable as it may conduce to that end.

3. That the highest artistic skill in sacred music has somehow generally been associated with the lowest spiritual culture, and has been far more promotive of sensuous than of *spiritual* attractions.

4. That the genius of this reformation movement, like that of previous reformations, is not favorable to choir singing and instrumental music. Its sympathies are with the bewildered and sin-oppressed masses, and it wants "music for the millions." Its original power will be largely lost when the stirring melodies of its early days shall have been supplanted by stately artistic *performances.*

5. As the church of Christ is the common home of all his people, "Barbarian $cythian bond and free" who are "all one in Christ Jesus," and as singing s the on y part of worship n which the great mass of Christians can personally participate, no choir singing or instrumental music should ever be allowed to interfere for a moment with this privilege and right of the saints. If such appliances can be made to *assist* rather than *hinder* this great object of uniting the whole congregation in worship, the most serious objection to them is removed.

6. The innovation of choirs and instruments will not be checked by captious objections. The only way to put a stop to it is *to set to work diligently to train churches in oocal music.* Take away the cause of complaint. We forewarn the brethren especially in the cities and large towns, that if they wish to block up the way against the introduction of choirs and organs, and the formalism resulting therefrom, they must employ suitable teachers of vocal music, and spend a portion of every year in teaching all the voices in the churches in the knowledge of musical science and the practice of suitable tunes, so that the present partial, discordant, and unedifying music of our churches may be abandoned and forgotten.

The church of Christ has a right to good music. The songs of Zion should find utterance in every variety of joyful, exulting, or tender and plaintive strain that is needed to utter suitably the lofty praises of our God, the sentiments of a pious heart, and the pleading of Divine Mercy. (Pages 558, 559.)

Can Brother Clubb tell us how Isaac Errert, in 1861, could have written of "this rising controversy," "the innovation of choirs and instruments," and "that the genius of this reformation movement,

like that of previous reformations, is not favorable to choir singing and instrumental music," if *the pioneers had always stood for those things, as he claims?*

I have a letter from Edwin R. Errett, of the C*hristian Standard,* dated January 29, 1931, saying: "I have read these paragraphs carefully. I should say that this is a complete statement of Isaac Errett's position all through his ministry."

CHAPTER II

IN THE C*hristian Standard,* December 20, 1930, page 15, we have an article titled, "The Fathers AreWeeping Over These Antics." I will quote the article because it shows the tendency and logical, if not the ultimate, end of all departures from God's truth. The article follows :

"The world do move" and the fashion thereof changes. Here comes a letter telling of another so-called "church of Christ" federating with a Congregational church. O, yes; here comes the program of a disciples' convention now in session at Jackson, Miss., in which we have the following item for Thursday evening: "8:45 P.M., communion services, elders in charge."

I wish some one would pinch me and see if I am awake or dreaming. "We are a Bible people" with a vengeance. Well, what next? [God only knows.--John T. Lewis. Who will deliver us from the body of this death? ["Body of death" is a very appropriate name for the leg timate offspring of all departures from the New Testament order of things. Evangelist R. E. McCorkle can deliver h m-self from "the body of this death" by cutting loose from all the inventions and devices of men---such as missionary societies, instrumental music, etc.--in the work and worship of the church and coming back to the teaching of the New Testament.--John T. Lewis.] Methinks if the dead take an interest in the affairs of men on earth, that Campbell, McGarvey, Errett Stone and a great company of the departed spirits are weeping over the antics some of our modern churches and preachers are cutting.

Is t a de usion that an apostolic example is equal to a divine command? My understand ng s that the communion is a fixed and mmovable monument and inseparably united to another fixed monument, the Lord's day, the communion showing Christ's death and the Lord's day his resurrection. I can see no significance in either separated from the other.

"What God hath joined together, letno man put asunder." [And what God has separated, let no man join together.--J. T. L.] Jesus should come, would he find loyalty among us? Would he find any who hold fast to sound teaching? May God have mercy upon our unrlghteousness! (Evangellst R. E. McCorkle, Harrison, Ark.)

This wall from Evangelist R. E. McCorkle is pathetic. The idea of the dust, in which the bodies of the fathers are molding, being moistened with their tears "over the antics some of our modern churches and preachers are cutting" is pitiable indeed. Brother M. D. Clubb says: *"Brother allen and his people are not standing*

with them [the fathers]. I am, and about one million five hundred thousand others of my brethren are, today." We want Brother Clubh to feel free and uncramped in plainly giving us the benefit of his "learning and study," and tell us which side is "cutting the antics" that are causing the fathers to weep. Is it *"Brother Alien and his people,"* or is it Brother Clubb and his "million five hundred thousand other brethren?" Did Brethren Clubb and McCorkle ever hear of any of "our conservative brethren" wanting to "fed-eratewith a Congregationalchurch?" Did they ever hear of them taking communion at "8:45 P.M., Thursday?" These "antics" are natural performances for all who have departed from the *faith of "the fathers."*

There is no filtering system in our religious stream or course. If you want to keep the water clear and pure, go to the source and remove from the work and worship of the church "the body of this death"--all missionary societies, ladies' aid societies, Sister So and So's class contributions, the penny-a-day programs, organs, fiddles, horns, ad infinitum--and the stream will clear itself.

Men and women constitute the church, and whatever the church does, it is as much the women doing it as the men. Therefore, the New Testament makes no provisions for women to act separate and independent of the church. A ladies' class working independent of the church is a ladies' aid society in the embryo. "Upon the first day of the week let each one of you lay by him in store, as he may prosper." If this means putting our contributions into a common treasury, then the class contributions violate Paul's injunction.

If Brother McCorkle had been familiar with the teaching of "the fathers" and less imaginative, he doubtless would have seen their literal tears, and heard their entreaties and protests against the introduction of instrumental music into the worship of the church, flowing through their writings, rather than imaginary rivers of tears flowing amid the dust of the dead. I have already quoted Campbell and Errett on the introduction of instruments of music into the worship of the church. I wilI now quote J. W. McGarvey. Remember, these are three of "the fathers" that Brother McCorkle mentioned as "weeping over the antics some of our modern churches and preachers are cutting."

In the M*illennial Harbinger,* 1864, pages 510-514, J. W. Mc-

Garvey had an article headed, "Instrumental Music in Churches." I will quote some extracts from it:

In the earlier years of the present Reformation there was entire unanimity in the rejection of instrumental music from our public worship. It was declared unscriptural, inharmonious with the Christian institution, and a source of corruption. (Page 510.)

Is this the position of "our conservative brethren" *today?* Or is it the position of "our digressive brethren?"

We read again:

It is sometimes assumed by the advocates of instrumental music that the Scriptures do furnish authority in its favor. They find this authority in the fact that instruments were used in the temple worship of the Jews, and that they are also represented as being used by the angels in heaven. In view of these two facts, two questions are propounded: First, can that be wrong in the Christian congregation which was acceptable to God in the Jewish congregation? I answer, it may be. The offering of victims, the sprinkling of blood, the burning of incense, and the perpetual light of burning lamps were acceptable to God in Jewish worship; but they are not in Christian worship; and so may instrumental music not be. But, in view of the second fact, it is asked, Can that be wrong among saints on earth which is fight among saints and angels in heaven? I answer again, it may be. Angels and saints in glory may be granted privileges which ought not to be granted to men in the flesh; for that may be harmless there which would be dangerous here, as children must be denied privileges which older persons may enjoy with impunity. If, then, the inhabitants of heaven do literally use harps of gold, which may well be doubted, it may still be unsafe and improper that harps or any other musical instruments should be used in Christian congregations.

How, then, are we to decide whether a certain element in Jewish worship, or in the worship of heaven, is acceptable in the Christian church? Undoubtedly we are to decide it by the teaching of the New Testament, which is the only rule of practice for Christians. Whatever is authorized by this teaching is fight, and whatever it condemns is wrong in us, whether it belong to the service of the Jews or the service of angels.

But it is argued that the New Testament is silent upon the subject of instrumental music, and we are therefore left to judge of what would be acceptable to God by what he did accept in Jewish worship. Now, it must be admitted that the New Testament is silent upon this subject, and that this argument is at least plausible. But is it conclusive? Before we affirm that it is, we should first look ahead and see whether the affirmation will involve some unwelcome consequences.

There is nothing said in the New Testament about burning in-

cense in connection with Christian worship; it was authorized in Jewish worship, and it is represented in John's vision as accompany-mg the worship of the angels. Shall we thence argue that, in the silence of the New Testament, these facts should be taken as an indication of the divine will, and, like the Catholics, shall we burn incense in our public worship? Shall we, for the same reason, keep lamps or candles burning in our churches, and array our preachers in gorgeous robes? For all these the argument is valld, if it is valid for instrumental music. If, therefore, we adopt the latter, we dare not pronounce any man or any church unscriptural in practice that adopts the other three. In whatever light this conclusion might appear to a Catholic or an Episcopalian, it must certainly convince every disciple that the argument from which it springs is unsound. (Pages 511, 512.)

The editor should be convinced, and he should show the readers of the *Tennessee Christian the* fallacy in the argument that is made, on the silence of the New Testament, in support of instrumental music in the worship. We can use crackers and water in the communion on the same ground.

Some writers, more sharp than logical, have endeavored to reduce this argument to absurdity by insisting that if we must avoid the use of instruments because they are unauthorized, we must also lay aside the note book, the tuning fork, and even the hymn book. But the hymns and spiritual songs authorized by the New Testament were human compositions, and the right to sing implies the propriety of everything necessary to singing. The notes of the scale and some standard of sound, being necessary to the art of singing, are therefore innocent and Scriptural. But the same cannot be said of an instrument designed to control the singing, and to constitute the chief element in the joyful sound which fills the house of worship. It cannot, therefore, be justified on this ground.

If, now, any man can mention an act or an element of worship known to be acceptable to God, but not authorized by the New Testament, he will prove this argument against instrumental music in the church to be invalid. I know not how it can be done in any other way. (Page 513.)

Let the digressive brethren tell us who are standing where J. W. McGarvey stood on instrumental music.

I am quoting J. W. McGarvey at length, because I consider his logical and Scriptural arguments against the introduction of instruments of music into the worship conclusive. I do not believe that such an "outstanding writer" as the editor of the *Tennessee Christian* can answer J. W. McGarvey's arguments on this subject. This is no reflection upon Brother Clubb's logical acumen. It is the weakness and unscripturalness of his position.

In the *Millennial Harbinger,* 1868, pages 213-219, J. W. McOar-vey replies to "Brother Hayden on Expediency and Progress." I quote some extracts from this lengthy reply:

Dear Brother Pendleton: In the March *Harbinger I* have just read Brother A. S. Hayden's artlcleon "Expediency and Progress," and I feel stirred up by it to the point of laying aside other pressing work for a moment and expressing myself on the same subject. I will premise by stating that I have learned to regard Brother Hay-den as a pious, amiable, good brother, and I entertain for him the highest personal respect. I desire, therefore, that neither he nor any one else shall construe anything in this article as in the least degree intended for a personal reflection on him.

With this statement premised, not by way of flattery or apology, but as the naked truth which I think ought to be stated, I must proceed to say that I find a most painful antagonism between my soul and the purpose for which the article named was written. It is an antagonism which I feel to be intense and inveterate; and when I ask myself whether I cannot suppress it, I feel that in doing so I would be suppressing my conscience. This feeling may be founded in ignorance; if so, my little stock of Scriptural knowledge, which I am daily trying to increase, still confirms me in it. Perhaps it is founded in prejudice; but if so, it is a prejudice which grows with my growth and strengthens with my strength. In either case, and for whatever cause, the progress which Brother Hayden's article is intended peculiarly to advance finds in me an enemy. I speak thus candidly, that Brother Hayden, and all brethren who stand with him in this matter, may know something of the difficulty of the task they assign themselves; for I am assured that I am by no means alone in the feelings I have expressed. (Pages 213, 214.)

These are the feelings and sentiments of "our conservative brethren" today. Of course, Brother Clubb knows this. But I must go on with McGarvey:

Your first specification has reference to instrumental music in the church. You adduce the ease of certain people in Canada who denied that it was Scriptural to build meetinghouses; then that of the brother who objected to your "singing the harmony of a fine melody which others were vocalizing"; and finally you add : "Once more, more recent and more marvelous: A brother of reputation, educated, and bearing titles, has recently issued a pamphlet of many pages to prove the use of instrumental music in churches to be a violation of the gospeh" And why is this *marvelous?* Why so much more marvelous than to oppose the use of meetinghouses? Can it be possible that our good brother here means what he says? More marvelous to oppose instrumental music in the church than to oppose the use of houses of worship! When did this become so marvelous? Has this practice been so long established among us

as to make it marvelous that an educated man should oppose it? Has this innovation of the Mother of Harlots been so long a welcome guest even among Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists as to make it a marvelous thing to write against it? Certainly it pots on very lofty airs for a thing of its origin and its history.

And what, forsooth, is the offense of this author of a "pamphlet of many pages"? Why, the church of which he is a member once used an organ, hiring a Dutchman who was not a member of the church to perform divine service on it for their entertainment; and fearing that they were about to renew the practice after suspending it for a time, he writes to oppose it. Surely when such a thing is considered marvelous, we ought to open our eyes and try to see whither we are drifting. (Pages 215, 216.)

Let our digressive brethren tell us which side did the drifting. There is a view of this question which I wish to present directly to Brother Hayden and all conscientious men who stand with him for the use of the organ. It is this: You know that such are the convictions of a very large number of the best and most intelligent class of your brethren that they will resist to the very last extremity the introduction of instrumental music in the worship, and that they will never, while they live, permit it to rest anywhere in peace. Such being the case, how can you, in the light of apostolic teaching, press the innovation in the manner you do? Do you say the opposition is unreasonable, and that you have a right to do as you please, and they have no right to dictate? You cannot say this, for you know that neither you nor I have any right to do as we please touching matters which affect the peace and fellowship of the churches. Do you say that you are under no more obligation to yield than they? *You cannot, because you are urging an innovation, one which* you confess the Scriptures do not authorize, and which, therefore, you cannot feel bound in conscience to maintain. Your only ground of defense is the expediency of it, and the assumption that our religion is flexible enough to receive it. If your religion is thus flexible, why must it all the time bend toward those corrupt parties who invented and have hitherto exclusively used the organ, yet remain as stiff as a crowhar against your own brethren who oppose it? Why is it so expedient to conciliate a sectarianized and vitiated public taste, but so inexpedient to conciliate your own conscientious brethren, whose heart's desire and prayer to God is for the restoration of the simple worship instituted by the apostles? (Page 217,)

I heartily commend this paragraph from the pungent pen of the scholarly McGarvey to our digressive brethren, who think they are standing with the pioneers on the music question. I hope they may read, sutttuxxxark, and inwardly digest it. In the light of what Brother J. W. McGarvey says about "conciliating a sectarianized

and vitiated public taste," I will quote again from Brother Clubb's article. Don't forget that I am answering Brother Clubb's challenge in the *Gospel Advocate,* February 6, 1930, pages 132, 133.

"But if we admit, and t gladly do, that our religious neighbors are Christians, despite the fact that we do not see everything alike, why should we not practice all the fellowship we can with them, looking forward to the day when all our petty differences and bickerings shall fade away in the beauty and glory of complete unity?" Isn't that nice? Our religious neighbors" are Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, etc.

Baptists teach and believe that baptism has nothing to do with man's salvation, but only initiates one into the fellowship of the Baptist Church after he has been saved. Many of the Methodists and Presbyterians are not baptized at all, but sprinkled. Yet Brother Clubb says: "We gladly admit they are Christians. "The day of petty differences and bickerings" has already "faded away in the beauty and glory of complete unity" with "open-membership" brethren, and I can see no difference in their practice and in Brother Clubb's teaching and practice as stated above.

I will quote the closing paragraph of McGarvey's article:

The loudest call that comes from heaven to the men of this generation is for warfare--stern, relentless, merciless, exterminating--against everything not express y or by necessary implication authorized in the New Testament. Such is my unwavering conviction; and my only regret is, that I cannot fight this fight as it should be fought.

In conclusion, let me add, that if any brother who reads this sees fit to style me intolerant dictator a or self-consequent, I say to him that I claim to be nothing more than one plain disciple of Christ, and to exercise a prerogative which belongs to us all. It is my duty to find fault with everybody and everything that is wrong, and it is equally the duty of every other brother. In the full and free performance of this task lies the only safety for the truth. Error alone can suffer in such warfare, and she alone is afraid of it. If I have struck one blow amiss, let it be returned on me double, and it will be well." (Page 219.)

Now listen to Brother Clubb: "Finally, Brother allen tells us that he and his brethren are standing just where the apostles and the pioneers of the Restoration stood in their opposition to instrumental music and organized missionary work. Our conservative brethren are constantly' making this claim. Their position does not agree either with the apostles or the pioneers."

Brother allen says: "Brother Clubb's candor and fairness excites our admiration. He proves himself to be an inherent gentleman, not less than one of the leading and outstanding writers on that side of the question."

Therefore, I feel sure, when I show from the writings of the pioneers that "our conservative brethren" are standing with them in their "opposition to instrumental music," that none of Brother Clubb's "million and five hundred thousand other brethren" will have the audacity to deny it. That will naturally make Brother Clubb an "outstanding writer on that side of the question."

That you may fully appreciate the spirit that characterizes innovations and innovators, I quote the following from the Louisville, Kentucky, *Times,* November 2, 1902:

"State News--The Rev. Dr. J. W. McGarvey, President of the College of the Bible, Lexington, and Mrs. McGarvey withdrew as members of the Broadway Christian Church at Lexington.

"The congregation had voted to install a pipe organ, and to this, Dr. McGarvey objected. He was the first pastor of the Church after its organization in 1870."

Then, to add insult to injury, in less than nine years, McGarvey's lifeless form was carried back to "Broadway Christian Church."

"Three songs were sung during the exercises, and each one was accompanied by the organ. They also played an organ solo as the bier was passing out of the house."

Remember, this was the same "organ" from which he fled only a few years before.

In the *Gospel Advocate of* October 19, 1911, Brother J. K. P. South writes from Jett, Kentucky, under date of October 9:

I am just home from a meeting. I stopped over in Lexington to attend Brother J. W. McGarvey's funeral. He died at his home, but his body was taken to the Central Church, where his remains were viewed by his students and friends. Brother J. S. Shouse preached the funeral, Brother Collis read the Scriptures, Brother I. J. Spencer, led in prayer, and Brother Dewees made remarks in behalf of the Bible college. Three songs were sung during the exercises, and each one was accompanied by the organ. They also played an organ solo as the bier was passing out of the house. Why this, I know not. I only know 1 was deeply chagrined, and an aged woman who sat by me said: "This is a great wrong, for he opposed it all of his life." Brother McGravey was a good man, and as one of his old students I shall always cherish his memory.

Thus we have the postlude to the passing of this great man.

CHAPTER III

IN THIS ARTICLE I will let you read what that sagacious, uncompromising, and fearless defender of "the faith," Moses E. Lard, had to say about *instrumental music* and those who "introduce it into the churches of Christ of the present day":

Now, in the light of the foregoing principles, what defense can be urged for the introduction into some of our congregations of *instrumental music?* The answer which thunders into my ear from every page of the New Testament is, None. Did Christ ever appoint it? did the apostles ever sanction it? or did any one of the primitive churches ever use it? Never. In what light, then, must we view him who attempts to introduce it into the churches of Christ of the present day? I answer, as an insulter of the authority of Christ, and as a defiant and impious innovator on the simplicity and purity of the ancient worship, fn no other light can we view him; in no other light should he be viewed.

But we are told that there is no harm in instrumental music, and therefore it may be innocently introduced into the churches of Christ. I shall certainly attempt no grave reply to this shallow thing, for "argument" I will not call it. Grant, then, for a moment, that there is no harm in instrumental music. The question arises, what kind of instruments shall be used? *An organ, shouts the sickly* puling of Rome. An organ, indeed! And shall we have only an organ? Is there no good music in any thing else than an organ? We know there is. Why, then, have only an organ? This is arbitrary and tyrannical. But what signify arbitrariness and tyranny in a church which has consented to be disgraced by an organ? Simply nothing. These are now its spirit and its law, and of course are no offense to it. But despite of even these, for now we care nothing for strife, nothing for the feelings of brethren, we shall insist on the right both for self and others to introduce each for himself the instrument with which he can best conduct his worship. For the son of Mars, then, we claim the right to introduce the fife and the drum; and for self the right to introduce--for I could never make music on anything else, but am capital on these--the jew's-harp, the tin pan, and the barrel bead. I even go farther, and with all the pluck of a Lacedemonian contend for the right of the Caledonian to have his bagpipes, and the ancient Israelite his ram's horn. To all of which let us still add a few fiddles, a tambourine, and a gong. *Five la* music made on instruments! This is about as like pandemonium as anything we can well imagine, and about as near that place as we can well get unless we could get between that place and the church that has adopted instrumental music, and we think there is left little room between the two on which to stand. Soberly and candidly, we are pained at these symptoms of degeneracy in a few of our

churches. The day on which a church sets up an organ in its house is the day on which it reaches the first station on the road to apostasy. From this it will soon proceed to other innovations; and the work of innovating once fairly commenced, no stop can be put to it till ruin ensues. And then the spirit which precedes and fosters these innovations is a most dangerous spirit--dangerous because cruel, intractable, and unreasonable. It is cruel because it is ready to immolate everything that in the least stands in the way of its wicked work; intractable, because it will not yield on even one tittle of its innovations; and unreasonable, because it will heed neither the voice of God nor that of man. Indeed, when a church has once introduced an organ, we believe it to be true, as a general rule, of those members who take the lead in the work, that they will suffer its Bible to be torn into shreds before they will part from their pet. No matter how unanimous or how kind the voice of remonstrance may be, the spirit of innovation never retraces its steps. When once it sets in to accomplish a certain object, accomplish that object it will, though ruin marks every step in its advance. Church history teems with proofs of what is here said. Let now, as further evidence of this, any set of brethren, no matter how pious and true, set about inducing a church which has introduced an organ to put it away, and these brethren will soon fall under its proscriptions, and it will absolutely go the length of putting them away before it will put away its organ. It will part from everything and anything rather than its infamous box.

But what shall be done with such churches? Of course, nothing. If they see fit to mortify the feelings of their brethren, to forsake the example of the primitive churches, to contemn the authority of Christ by resorting to will-worship, to excite dissension, and give rise to general scandal, they must do it. As a body, we can do nothing. Still we have three partial remedies left us to which we should at once resort. First, let every preacher in our ranks resolve at once that he will never, under any circumstances or on any account, enter a meetinghouse belonging to our brethren in which an organ stands. We beg and entreat our preaching brethren to adopt this as an unalterable rule of conduct. This and like evils must be checked, and the very speediest way to effect it is the one here suggested. Second, let no brother who takes a letter from one church ever unite with another using an organ. Rather let him live out of a church than go into such a den. Third, let those brethren who oppose the introduction of an organ first remonstrate m gentle, kind, but decided, terms. If their remonstrance is unheeded and the organ is brought in, then let them at once and without even the formality of asking for a letter, abandon the church so acting; and let all such members unite elsewhere. Thus these organ-grinding churches will in the lapse of time be broken down or wholly apostatize; and the sooner they are in fragments, the better for the cause of Christ. I have no sympathy with them, no

fellowship for them, and, so help me God never intend knowingly to put my foot into one of them. As a people, we claim to be engaged in an effort to return to the purity, simplicity, freedom from ostentation and pride, of the ancient apostolic churches. Let us, then, neither wink at anything standing in the way nor compromise aught essential to this end. The moment we do so our unity is at an end and our hopes are in the dust. *(Lard's Quarterly,* Volume I., pages 331-333.)

If the editor of the *Tennessee Christian* had said that the position of those who oppose instrumental music and missionary societies "do not agree with the pioneers," in that they are not as fearless and outspoken against those things as the pioneers were, he would have told the truth, and I would have said a regrettable "amen" to him. *But when he comes into the Gospel Advocate, with "his learn*ing and study," and asks the readers to believe that he "and about one million five hundred thousand others" of his brethren are, today, standing with the pioneers in their use of those things, he is misrepresenting the facts, and I am correcting his reckless assertions.

If Moses E. Lard were living today, no doubt he would be criticized by many of "our conservative brethren" for his uncompromising and unremitting opposition to those who introduce instrumental music into the church of Christ, and we would hear on every side: "We *believe in preaching the gospel; but it must be done in love, and ln the spirit of Christ."* Christ was the personification of love, and his Spirit we *must all* have. But what is love and the spirit of Christ? We can manifest the love and the spirit of Christ on*ly in* our supreme fidelity to his teaching, and in our fearless, outspoken opposition to error.

Christ never resented a personal insult; but when the "doctrines and precepts of men" counteracted his teaching, he was "the Lion that is of the tribe of Judah," and more caustic words never fell upon the ears of offenders. Read the twenty-third chapter of Matthew. Beat Paul with rods, put him in prison, and fasten his feet in stocks, and he would sing praise to God; but withstand his teaching, seeking to turn some one from the faith, and it was, "0 full of all guile and all villainy, thou son of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness[" This was the spirit of Christ that manifested itself in Moses E. Lard's life.

The Spirit of Christ moved David Lipscomb to say: "The church that adopts instrumental music goes into apostasy." Are "we" preaching that today?

May God Almighty help poor deluded souls to know what the Spirit of Christ is, when his teaching is being set aside and souls led astray!

W. K. Pendleton was twice son-in-law of Alexander Campbell, and coeditor of the M*illennial Harbinger. H*e also succeeded Mr. Campbell as editor of the H*arbinger* and president of Bethany College. He had an article in the M*illennial Harbinger,* 1868, pages 36-42, "Religion Degenerating Into Music."

No thoughtful observer of the state and expression of religious feeling in America can have failed to see that the vague and delightful, hut semisensuous, emotions excited by the grand and sublime power of music, are becoming the fashionable substitute for the simple and genuine worship of the apostolic church. (Page 36.)

If the editor under review had written this article, he doubtless would have told us how "the simple and genuine worship of the apostolic church" is elevated by instrumental music. But I must go on with Mr. Pendleton:

This tendency of the religious feeling of the American people is well portrayed in a recent article in the *New York Herald.* The writer, speaking of its manifestation in New York, says: "One thing is quite obvious: there has been a nobler growth of the beautiful in our manifestations of religious feeling since Boston received the 'cold cut,' and quite certain it is that religion has taken a musical direction. In public worship New York now absolutely wreaks its religion on music. No amount of Puritanic declamation has been sufficient to stay the progress of this instinct, and no pleading on the part of elderly clergymen for simplicity of form has been of any avail. Today an organist without an elaborate programme of solos, duets and quartet% would sit as uneasily on his cushioned stool of a Sunday morning as would the leader of a concert under similar circumstances on any evening of the week. It will be also impossible to expunge the excess of music from religious worship at present. Presbyterians, doctrinally orthodox, have fallen into it; Methodists exhort in musical notes and semibreves; Episcopalians cantillate everything, even prayers and responses; and Catholics, always grand and copious in this respect, are becoming more and more so, in consonance with the general spirit of religious worship in the metropolis. The Baptists, only, as a great body, have held aloof and kept to the letter of their original simplicity, and these will no doubt gradually soften and mingle with the general pulp! (Page 37.)

In the article from the *New York Herald we* learn that the Methodists and Presbyterians in New York City had introduced *instrumental music* into their churches over the pleadings and pro-

tests of elderly clergymen. The editor under review and his people, today, are just as heartless as those Methodists and Presbyterians in New York City were sixty-two years ago. We also learn that in 1868, in New York City, "the Baptists, only, as a great body, had held aloof and kept to the letter of their original simplicity." However, the writer predicted that they would "no doubt gradually soften and mingle with the general pulp." His prediction has come true, and there are thousands of Baptists today who don't know but that instrumental music has always been a part of their worship.

Mr. Pendleton says:

It is a high compliment to the Baptists to say that "the Baptists, only, as a great body, have held aloof and kept to the letter of their original simplicity." We trust that the prophecy will not prove true, "that they will no doubt gradually soften and mingle with the general pulp." Nothing can save them or any people from this all-engulfing tendency of the human heart, but to fill its yearnings, its aspirations, and its enthusiasms, with the great truths, the precepts, and the promises of the Bible. Men must worship something, and they will find modes of expressing this human instinct. God has made provisions for this propensity of our nature in the revelation of his word. But when this is not put into the minds of the people, their hearts run astray after inventions of men, and spend their zeal in forms which are not according to knowledge It s still true "where there is no vision, the people perish." The people are without "the knowledge of God and of Christ, whom to know is life eternal." This knowledge is revealed on y in the Bible It is no outgush of the religious instinct--no form, which the struggling religious sentiment shapes for itself, and to which it then bows down in worship. *All creation, originating in this way are idols.* Let these words be written in letters of fire upon the was of all our temp es that man may know, he is not to make his own religion. God has revealed it and written it in a book, and to that book we must go for it. (Page 39.)

It would be fine if the editor of the *Tennessee Christian* would persuade his "million and five hundred thousand other brethren" to go "to that book" for their faith and practice. That was the appeal "the fathers" made to the religious world, and that is the appeal for which Pendleton was pleading and fighting. Hear him again:

We must keep the people to the Bible, if we would save them: fill their hearts with the sure words of eternal life; inspire them, not with the love of music, but the love of God and their fellow man,

One law of human life should never be lost sight of,--that human nature is one and the same in its general tendencies everywhere. Let not *us* say, as a religious people, that *we* are not liable to the same aberrations and evil tendencies as others are, and that the*ir* errors *we* will never commit. The tendency of a Christian people to cater and suit itself to the carnal world, is proved so universal, that it is sheer folly and conceit for any people to claim by knowledge or holiness exemption from it. Moreover signs of such a tendency among us are already too

to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name." (Heb. 13: 15.)

Singing is worship only as it consists in prayer and praise. It is not the sound simply, the mere music, that renders it acceptable to God, but the sentiments of devotion. From the first of the above quotations we learn that in these sentiments of prayer and praise the spirit and the understanding unite. In the third quotation these sentiments are called the "sacrifice of praise," and are defined to be the "fruit of our lips." It follows, then, with the clearness of a sunbeam, that the in*struments* to be used in offering this sacrifice are the vocal organs with which God has endowed his creature, man. Here, then, is a divine ordinance consisting in the offering of prayer and praise to the Lord with our lips--this latter term being used generically to denote all the vocal organs.

Now, I affirm that an "instrumental accompaniment" is an *addition* to this ordinance, and affects its character, and is therefore an infringement of the divine prerogative.

That singing as worship is a divine ordinance will not be questioned in the face of the Scripture cited above. That the "instrumental accompaniment" is an addition is simply certain from the historical facts in the case, it having been born five hundred years out of time. Therefore, whatever men may think of its expediency, it affects the character of the divine appointment, and cannot be tolerated for a moment.

There is no room here for expediency, or man's wisdom. It is not the prerogative of expediency to say in what manner an ordinance shall consist. Inspiration has ordained that the sacrifice of praise shall be offered with the human voice. Then let expediency neither add nor subtract. Expediency may regulate my voice; that is, it may determine whether I shall sing with a bass, tenor or alto voice; but beyond this, and the like, it must not go. It must not say *with* what I shall praise, for it would then be determined in what an ordinance shall consist, which, as we have already seen, must not be allowed.

From the foregoing, it seems to follow, both logically and Scripturally that the "instrumental accompaniment" *nullifies the* ordinance! Now, at this somebody may get "scared, fee h s ha r standing on end, start to run, find somebody else sitting by the camp fires nodding," etc. Be it so. I could only wish that this fright were real. I should think that a man might well afford to become frightened when he sees himself tampering with an ordinance of the Almighty! But when I see a man affecting fright to try to excite mirth at the expense of a brother who is earnestly contending for the faith, my heart sinks within me. The "accompaniment" is expedient, we are told. Expedient, forsooth! Infant baptism is expedient, say Stewart and Beecher. Now, the New Testament Scriptures are just as silent upon the "accompaniment" as upon infant baptism. If, therefore, expediency may introduce that, why not this?

But in what respect is the "accompaniment" expedient? If it s expedient it is because it gives some good result which would not be obtained without it. But if this be true, the Savior either failed in his wisdom or his benevolence, for he never ordained the "accompaniment."

Expediency, stay thy impious hand! That the instrument in the worship gives a good result which would not otherwise be realized, is an assumption wh ch never has been and never will be proved.

And just here is the point at which the argument for the instrument must forever break down.

Am I told that it is expedient because it attracts the world? I beg leave to state that the worship of the Lord's house was not ordained for the world. Is the church of the Lord Jesus Christ to be brought down to the standard of the world? Is this the program of expediency? If the caprice of the world is to be regarded in these matters, the very same emergency that demands the organ will demand the very best skill in its use and, therefore, the beer-bloated Dutchman from the theater of Saturday night will be in demand in the sanctuary of God on the Lord's day!

We are told that the organ need not affect the worship of the individual; that those who are opposed to the instrument may worship in spite of it. This I might do. I might worship, but it would only be m the silent breathings of my spirit. I cannot engage in singing as an act of worship where there is an "instrumental accompaniment," for this would nullify the ordinance. Now, some one may say that in this I am so straight that I lean back a little. Be
it so. If I lean back, it is but to rest upon the word of God, and resting upon this I dread not the fall.

Call to mind the illustration of the supper. The bread and wine are on the table. But the congregation, from considerations of "propriety and expediency," have determined to add water. Do you observe the Lord's Supper when you sit down with those brethren and partake of the bread and wine, though you reject the water? You do not. Neither do I worship God when I sit down and sing with brethren who add an "accompaniment."

Yet once more. J.B.B.

*(Apostolic Times, J*une 10, 1869, page 69.)

THE DOCTRINE OF EXPEDIENCY (2).

In the discussion of the question relating to the use of instrumental music in the worship, some very obvious and shallow fallacies have been used, a sample of which follows: "Instruments were used in the Jewish kingdom. Instruments will be used in the everlasting kingdom. Therefore, instruments may be used in the present kingdom." I will submit a parallel case, viz.: Infants were in the Jewish kingdom. Infants will be in the everlasting kingdom. Therefore, infants may be in the present kingdom. Whoever sees the fallacy in this will detect it in that. That which proves too much proves nothing.

It is becoming quite apparent that certain persons are getting a little sore under these comparisons. (See H*arbinger,* current volume, page 266.) If people do not like to be pressed with the consequences of dangerous and unscriptural positions, they ought not to occupy them. Now, I beg leave to state that if there is an offense in the consequences of the doctrine of expediency, we of the opposition are not responsible for it.

The first object of these articles was introduced with an extract from Professor Stewart, to show that the ablest defenders of infant baptism base their defense upon "propriety and expediency"--the same ground upon which the attempt is made to defend the "accompaniment," and as they both relate to things about which the Holy Spirit has legislated, whatever argument supports the one, will, to the same extent, support the other.

It is no uncommon thing for a man, when he sees no other way to evade the force of the arguments and comparisons of an opponent, to declare them to be inapposite. All that a pedobaptist has to do to convince a pedobaptist audience that the sixth chapter of Romans does not teach immersion is to wave his hand majestically, assume a knowing look, and pronounce it all figurative. The work is then done, to his own satisfaction, and that of his auditory. But, thank the Lord, our brethren are a reading and thinking people, and will decide these matters for themselves.

In the preceding article it was shown that the instrument in the worship is an addition to a divine ordinance, and affects its character, and, therefore, must not be allowed.

The Holy Spirit has provided for the use of singing in another capacity aside from the worship proper: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." (Col. 3: 16.) Singing, then, may be used in teaching and admonishing. Can this be done with an instrument? Let the Spirit answer: "And even things without life giving sound whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sound, how shall it be known what is piped or harped?" (1 Cor. 14: 7.) Evidently, there is neither teaching nor admonition in inarticulate sounds. The instrument does not give the necessary distinction in the sounds. This being the case, there is no place in the assembly of the saints for the organ, and they who introduce it do so at their peril.

We are gravely told that the instrument tranquilizes the troubled mind, soothes the disquieted spirit, and fills the soul with solemnity. Grant it. Does it necessarily follow that this is worship? If this is devotion, then the lion may be as devoti0nal as man! Why does the ferocious wild beast lose its ferocity for the moment under the influence of the soft strains of music? Is it because its soul is filled with devotion? True, devotion consists in sentiments, not feelings, nor sounds. An instrument cannot beget sentiments, and therefore cannot aid us in our devotions.

Having seen that the "instrumental accompaniment" is sinful *per se,* I wish to put it upon another footing. In his first letter to the Corinthians, Paul teaches that when an enlightened Christian eats meat which has been sacrificed to an idol, his act is not sinful *per se.* But as he clearly teaches, there may be circumstances under which such an act would he exceedingly sinful. If there were those who were not so fury enlightened upon this point, and whose consciences were therefore weak, this weakness was to be the rule of action in the case. And of violating this rule the apostle says: "But when ye sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ." Now, in this music affair I am willing to he called a weak brother, if thereby the cause of my Savior can be served. Indeed, I like that weakness which fears to leave the channels designated by the word of God, to try the trackless and shoreless sea of expediency. My conscience will not allow me to engage in singing as an act of worship, where there is an "instrumental accompaniment." A weak conscience, you say? Be it so. I demand that my weak conscience shall be respected. Remember, that when you introduce an organ into the worship, and thus wound my conscience, however weak it may he, you sin against Christ, and he will can you to an account for it in the great day.

Let the plain truth be told. The introduction of the organ is no mere impropriety; it is a gross insult to the Lord Jesus Christ, and a sin against the God of Heaven. The observance of this Pauline principle will keep the instrument out while time lasts.

I do not believe that the congregation can be found among us, which uses an organ, that did not introduce it over the consciences of some of the brethren. True, the rector of the "parish" of Syracuse says that it has caused no trouble in his "parish," hut perhaps he has not investigated the matter thoroughly. Let New York City and St. Louis answer for themselves. The congregation that has introduced an organ into its worship over one protesting conscience has sinned against Christ, and stands in need of repentance before God.

The same principle that protects the minority in a congregation will protect the minority in the entire kingdom. Are the brethren in Australia in the kingdom? So am I. If, therefore, they introduce anything into the kingdom that wounds my conscience, they sin against Christ. Thus has the Holy Spirit so hedged the kingdom of the Master about, that there is absolutely no door of entrance for the instrument, and he who brings it in must break down barriers interposed by infinite wisdom.

Thus have we viewed the "accompaniment" from two standpoints, and found it to be sinful in both cases. It is sinful *per st,* and it is sinful *per accident. It* is not said that instrumental music *is sinful per se, for such is not the case.* But it is contended, and, as I believe, proved, that the "accompaniment" in singing, as an act of worship, is sinful *per se.* Sprinkling is not sinful *per se.* A lady

very innocently sprinkles her clothes preparatory to ironing them; hut when a priest sprinkles water upon a person and calls it baptism, his act is sinful *per se.* So with the "accompaniment." Each interferes with a divine appointment.

But of what is instrumental music in the house of worship an accompaniment? Is it an accompaniment of the worship of those who are poor in spirit? Never. But it is an accompaniment of pride, and of fashion, and vanity, and of dancing, and theater going, and the like. For the truth of this statement, I appeal to its history. The field extends before me, but I must desist for the present.

Respectfully and fraternally, J. B. B.

(*Apostolic Times, J*une 17, 1869, page 73. Published at Lexington, Ky.)

You now have the sophistry of M. D. Clubb, and the reasoning of Charles Louis Loos, and J. B. Briney on "The Doctrine of Expediency." "How long go ye limping between the two sides? if Jehovah be God, follow him; hut if Baal, then follow him." W. K. Pendleton, in speaking of "this folly of elevating organ-grinding and accompaniments into the place of apostolic worship," asked: "Who could have thought that with the Bible in their hands, the
American people could have drifted into such idolatry?" According to W. K. Pendleton, the digressive brethren are full-fledged idolaters. Yet they think we are narrow-minded because we will not have anything to do with their idolatrous worship.

CHAPTER V

IN THE G*ospel Advocate,* February 6, 1930, the editor of the *Tennessee Christian* says:

Finally, Brother allen tells us that he and his brethren are standing just where the apostles and the pioneers of the Restoration stood in their opposition to instrumental music and organized missionary work. Our conservative brethren are constantly making this claim. Their position does not agree with the apostles or the pioneers.

After making other bold and unsupported statements about the position of the pioneers, he says:

Brother allen and his people are not standing with them. I am, and about one million five hundred thousand others of my brethren are, today. I challenge any man to prove that this is not true.

Thus the twentieth-century Goliath of digression delivered himself. This is the constant and almost universal claim of the digressive church.

As a humble disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ, I was determined that this "uncircumcised Philistine" should no longer "defy the armies of the living God" and go unchallenged. So I went to the "brooks" of the "literature of that period," picked out a few facts and hurled them into the face of this impudent challenger. These facts evidently "sank into his forehead" because in the G*ospel Advocate, J*uly 3, 1930, he comes again, not as a defiant challenger, but as a compromiser. Hear him:

My sole purpose in this friendly correspondence with Brother allen is to help clear the way to a better understanding and to encourage the spirit of brotherliness and good will among our people. I may say here that I greatly appreciate the courtesy of the G*ospel Advocate in* giving me this opportunity to set before its readers some very important things, which, it seems to me, we ought to seriously and thoughtfully consider. It is no time to accentuate petty differences; it is time to "seek for the things that make for peace, and the things whereby we may edify one another." I have no relish for controversy. In the heat of partisan debate very little truth gets a chance to come to the surface; but I do think that a careful consideration of points of difference, as in the present instance, may do much good if carried on in the right spirit and with the right end in view. Perhaps Brother allen and I may be pardoned for at least trying to mend matters, even though we may not be able to get very far in actual results.

Let it be remembered that we are conducting this correspondence

with two things in mind--namely, organized missionary work and instrumental music accompanying the singing in worship. These are the things that have caused the division among us. In Brother Allen's first article he said that he stood with the apostles and the "pioneers" in his opposition to these things. In my reply I stated that he did not stand with the pioneers nor with the apostles, and introduced some evidence to show the real position of the pioneers on organized missionary work.

Isn't that sweet-spirited, in view of his challenge? Peter says: "Be sober, be watchful: your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." (1 Pet. 5:8.) Paul says: "For such men are false apostles, deceitful workers, fashioning themselves into apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for even Satan fashioneth himself into an angel of light. It is no great thing therefore if his ministers also fashion themselves as ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works." (2 Cor. 11:13-15.)

When His Satanic Majesty thinks he can crush out by intimidation, he assumes the role of a "roaring lion," and goes up and down the country "seeking whom he may devour." But when he is convinced that he is losing out by that method of procedure he transforms "himself into an angel of light," and becomes a great compromiser, crying: "It is no time to accentuate petty differences; it is time to 'seek for the things that make for peace, and the things whereby we may edify one another.'"

If the editor of the *Tennessee Christian is* sincere when he says, "My sole purpose in this friendly correspondence with Brother allen is to help clear the way to a better understanding and to encourage the spirit of brotherliness and good will among our people," I will let that prince of Bible teachers, J. W. McGarvey, reason with him:

There is a view of this question which I wish to present directly to Brother Clubb, and all conscientious men who stand with him for the use of organs. It is this: You know that such are the convictions of a very large number of the best and most intelligent class of your brethren that they will resist to the very last extremity the introduction of instrumental music in the worship, and that they will never, while they live, permit it to rest anywhere in peace. Such being the case, how can yon, in the light of apostolic teaching, press the innovation in the manner you do?

In the above quotation I have simply substituted the name "Brother Clubb" for "Brother Hayden" to make the appeal dl-

rectly to that great peace-loving soul, the editor of the *Tennessee Christian.*

Again, the editor under review says: "It is no time to accentuate petty differences; it is time to 'seek for the things that make for peace, and the things whereby we may edify one another.'" I cannot understand how any man who has any respect for New Testament teaching can speak of those things which have torn the spiritual body of Christ into smithereens; alienated God's people and over which a bitter warfare has been waged for more than sixty years, as "petty differences." Is it possible that the editor, with his natural ability, aided and abetted by his intellectual attainments, has made a careful investigation of these things and found that there is no principle of faith, or conscience, involved in these matters?

It would have been a great blessing to the nineteenth-century Reformation if Alexander Campbell, John Rogers, W. K. Pendleton, Charles Louis Lops, J. W. McGarvey, Moses E. Lard, Tolbert Fanning, Benjamin Franklin, and David Lipscomb could have sat at the feet of this twentieth-century Gamaliel and been taught according to the perfect law of his expediency. With such advantages, then, never would have spent their lives fighting "petty" things--organs, fiddles, horns, and orchestras in the worship of God.

Again, the editor of the *Tennessee Christian* says: "Let it be remembered that we are conducting this correspondence with two things in mind--namely, organized missionary work and instrumental music accompanying the singing in worship. These are the things that have caused the division among us." Exactly so, and removing "these things" will heal the breach us. Without these things we can have *peace and fellowship.* With them we *must* have *strife and division. "*Our" people stood fast in one spirit, with one soul striving for the faith of the gospel," for more than a quarter of a century, *without those innovations. They have never walked and worked together in peace with them, and they never will.* Therefore, let all the conscientious people among the digressive brethren choose which they will have, whether peace and harmony, and the fellowship of their "conservative brethren," or "organized missionary work and instrumental music accompanying the singing in worship." You can never have both. If the editor of the *Tennessee Christian* really has "no relish for controversy," let him

advise his million and five hundred thousand other brethren to put away these controverted things, and the controversy will cease.

While they "seriously and thoughtfully consider" this matter, I will quote from Benjamin Franklin's sermon, "INSTRUMENTAL Music in Worship":

If any one had told us, forty years ago, that we would live to see the day when those professing to be Christians; who claim the Holy Scriptures as their only rule of faith and practice; those under the command, and who profess to appreciate the meaning of the command, to "observe all things whatsoever I commanded you," would bring any instruments of music into a worshiping assembly and use it there in worship, we should have repelled the idea as an idle dream. But this only shows how little we know of what men would do; or how little we saw of the power of the adversary to subvert the purest principles, to deceive the hearts of the simple to undermine the very foundation of all piety, and tuna the v*ery* worship of God itself into an attraction for the people of the world, an entertainment or amusement. *(Gospel Preacher,* Vol. 2, Sixteenth Edition, page 411).

In the same sermon, pages 422, 423, we read:

We know that it is not *popular. W*e are perfectly aware that it is calling down on us the disfavor of many of the rich, the influential and popular; and that, on account of it, we are cut off from many amiable people, and cannot meet and worship with them. We are perfectly aware that it is against our temporal interest. We have not been, and are not, blind to all this, but have it before us, and have considered it carefully, and made up our mind to take all the consequences, and bear with meekness and patience whatever shall come. We do not court these consequences, nor desire them, but we see no way to avoid them, and maintain what we solemnly believe to be right. We, then, cheerfully accept the situation, and take the consequences, rather than give up the fullest, strongest, and most settled convictions of our inmost soul. We cannot worship, and maintain a good conscience, *with the organ.* We are certain that we can worship acceptably *without the organ.* The friends of the organ do not doubt this. They entertain not one doubt that they can worship acceptably without it. Here is something that is safe. There is no doubt or uncertainty about it. There is no one that has the least doubt that we can worship acceptably without the organ. Here, then is safe ground and here we can all meet and worship acceptably, in harmony and without doubt. But we cannot meet and worship with it without doubt. We hold it in doubt, to put it in the mildest form, and cannot yield to a doubtful practice, or doubtful worship, when we can have that about which there is no doubt.

Benjamin Franklin was one of those conscientious pioneers who

stood for the original claims of the nineteenth-century reformers and the New Testament worship.

The editor of the *Tennessee Christian* says: "Organized missionary work and instrumental music accompanying the singing in worship are the things that have caused the division among us." Surely, then, those who introduced them are responsible for the division "among us." Paul says: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned: and turn away from them." (Rom. 16:17.) I believe it is just as necessary to obey this command as it is to worship God in spirit and in truth. Therefore I have marked and turned away from them. Yet I always rejoice when one comes back to the truth.

It is true that the digressive brethren say we are causing the division by opposing those things. Of course the Vatican would say that Mussolini was causing all the trouble in Italy by opposing the Pope's claims. Certainly there would be no trouble in Rome if the people would recognize the Pope's pretensions and let him run both state and church. Just so it is with "our conservative brethren." If they would fall in with "our progressive brethren," accept all their innovations without protest, there would be no division--neither would there be any "conservative brethren."

We are not standing alone in our fight against those things, and in our claims that they are unscriptural.

I will now give Adam Clarke's comments on Amos 6:5:

I believe that David was not authorized by the Lord to introduce that multitude of musical instruments into the Divine worship of which we read; and I am satisfied that his conduct in this respect is most solemnly reprehended by this prophet; and I further believe that the use of such instruments of music, in the Christian Church, is *without the sanction and against the will of* God; that they are subversive of the spirit of true devotion, and that they are sinful. If there was a *woe to them* who in*vented in*struments of music, as did David under the law, is there *no woe, no curse,* to them who invent them and introduce them into the worship of God in the Christian Church? I am an old man, and an old minister; and I here declare that I never knew them productive of any good in the worship of God; and have had reason to believe that they were productive of much evil. Music, *as a science, I* esteem and admire; but instruments of music in *the house of God I* abominate and abhor. This is
the abuse of music and here I register my protest against all such corruptions in the worship of the author of Christianity. The late venerable and most eminent divine, the Rev. John Wesley, who

was a lov*er of music,* and an *elegant poet wh*en asked his opinion of instruments of music being introduced into chapels of the Methodists, said in his terse and powerful manner: "I have no objection to instruments of music in our chapels, provided they are neither *heard* nor *seen." I* say the same, though I think the expense of purchase had better be spared. *(Clarke's Commentary,* Vol. 4, page 686. Published by Carlton & Phillips, 1885.)

This would be good reading for our Methodist friends. I will now let our Baptist friends read what A*ndrew Fuller,* an eminent English Baptist scholar, said:

Instrumental music, the more I think of it, appears with increasing evidence to be utterly unsuited to the genius of the gospel dispensation. If my memory does not deceive me, it originated in the dark ages of popery, when almost every other superstition was introduced under the plea of its according with the worship of the Old Testament. *(Millennial Harbinger,* 1868, page 66.)

"Our conservative brethren" are not only standing with the apostles, and the pioneers, on the music question, but they are standing with all the great reformers. What did the editor of the *Tennessee Christian* say?

CHAPTER VI

Having quoted at length from A. Campbell, W. K. Pendleton, C. L. Loos, and J. W. McGarvey, I will now quote from that eminent scholar, and their collaborator in the relentless warfare they made against innovations in the worship of God, Prof. I. B. Grubbs.

In the M*illennial Harbinger,* 1868, pages 317-321, I. B. Grubbs replies to a paragraph from A. S. Hayden, headed, "*The Pauline* Principles of Compliance and Conformity":

"Many a reformer would have opposed 'in principle' the great apostle to the Gentiles in yielding to consort with four men who had on them the Jewish obligations of a vow, just as a show that he walked orderly toward the national customs, and kept the law: --'currying favor,' 'seeking popularity,' and sundry such convenient invective phrases would now be lavished on a poor disciple of Christ who would in matters equally indifferent have the temerity to follow Paul as he followed Christ. Especially would the cry become dolorous, if not pathetic, when it should become public that this sinless conformity cost some money, as it did the Hebrew-Grecian apostle. For he bore the charges of the four men; two lambs and a ram for each; in all, eight lambs, four rams, besides baskets of unleavened bread, and cakes, and oil, and provisions in the form of food offerings and drink offerings. 'Alas! what lavish expenditure!' cries one. 'a mere time server,' shouts another. 'Base surrender of principle,' respond a dozen voices, and the unmelodious concert swells to an anthem among those who have been schooled under Knox and Cromwell rather than in the Pauline principles of compliance and conformity."

We desire to call the attention of the author of this paragraph--Brother A. S. Hayden--to the connection in which is found the injunction of Paul to which he alludes, that we may know how to "follow Paul as he followed Christ." We transcribe the following: "Whether you eat or drink, or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God. Give none offense; neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God: even as I please all men in all things, not seeking my own profit, but the profit of many that they may be saved. Be you followers of me, even as I am of Christ., Now I praise you, brethren, that you remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances as I delivered them to you." Accordingly, when we persistently advocate any custom of the day against the earnest remonstrance of our brethren, we violate this precept of Paul. And when we turn upon them in consequence of their conscientious protest, and accuse them of being "schooled under Cromwell and Knox rather than in the Pauline principles of compliance and conformity," we betray a complete misapprehension of these principles

and show likewise that we are but little under their influence. This was the extent of Paul's liberty: when he regarded anything as innocent in itself, he would indulge or not, just as he could, by the one or the other, conciliate a brother or win an unbeliever. Thus, in order to conciliate his brethren in Jerusalem, he agreed to participate in a Jewish vow and its attendant ceremonies, which be looked upon as innocent in themselves. So sacred in his eyes were the religious feelings of his brethren, that for their sake he voluntarily submitted to much trouble and expense, and yet this act of his is referred to as proof that we have the right to introduce expensive machinery into our worship, contrary to the wishes of our brethren, claiming that we are acting in accordance with "the Pauline principles of compliance and conformity," because, forsooth, we are conforming to the customs of the day! . . .

But it is argued that the policy of conciliation would secure a recognition of us as "a Christian people" and that this would open a way to the acknowledgment of the fact "that we are holding the veritable apostolic ground." Never was there a greater mistake. Every effort upon our part to prevail on "other Christian societies" (save the mark!) to acknowledge us as "orthodox," but excites, *as it ought, the*ir contempt. And could we prevail in so unholy an effort, the only possible effect would be the degradation of ourselves to the level of a sect among sects or a "branch" among "branches." No, no; we still openly proclaim ourselves as taking an advance position, and all who poke at us the phrase, "self-laudatory commendations," must know that we care nothing for the sneer.

It is on this ground and this only that we can wage successful warfare against sin and sectarian infidelity, and we intend never to relinquish our position. The issues today are precisely what they were in the beginning of our movement, and we must still fight with the weapons that our fathers so effectually used. If "many an old sermon must be abandoned," it must be superseded by one of greater power to accomplish the object intended. To this "progress" we do not object. But every effort to "reform the reformation" will only end as such efforts have hitherto done, in demonstrating the folly of those who make the attempt.

We add in conclusion, that though we have written in earnest opposition to an error which we regard as fatal in its tendency, we have yet written with feelings of the utmost kindness toward those brethren who seem to lend their influence to this error.

I take the following from the M*illennial Harbinger,* 1868, pages 455-459:

REPLY TO BROTHER HAYDEN.

Brother Hayden: However earnestly or vigorously I may oppose what I believe to be erroneous or pernicious in its tendency, I will never condescend to a mere bandying of ugly epithets involving unbrotherly personal reflections. This among brethren is not only

egregiously out of taste, but excessively sinful. Let us guard our pens with the strictest care against the commission of this sin.

You complain of misrepresentations, and say that I and others are "*perpetrating* gross injustice" upon. your essay on "Expediency and Progress." We confess that we did (as I do even now) understand you to advocate in that article the introduction of instrumental music into our worship. But you say you "never wrote a line in favor of such use of musical instruments" and that you are "no advocate of such a custom." We accord to you, of course, perfect sincerity here, and if it shall appear that the aforementioned essay does actually represent you as advocating this practice, you will admit that you simply misrepresent yourself and take back all you have said about our "persistently perverting" your language,
etc.

We here take the following from your essay: "The man or the people who refuse to be moulded in manners and measures by the age which they seek to mould through the inflexible gospel are guilty of folly as egregious as the Asiatic simpleton, who, wishing to cross the Euphrates, sat down on its hanks, waiting till all its waters should run out. We must cross the stream which opposes our march, and march on, or if their course be our course, we must move with them." After thus advocating the necessity of being "moulded in manners and measures by the age" in which we live and pronouncing those "who refuse to be moulded" in this way as "guilty of folly as egregious as the Asiatic simpleton" described above, you add that "an example or two will aid both the understanding and the memory." You give two examples of those who refuse to be thus moulded, and then add: "Once more, more recent and more marvelous. A brother of reputation, educated and bearing titles, has recently issued a pamphlet of many pages to prove the use of instruments in churches to be a violation of the gospel! This, now, be it remembered, is your third example of those "who refuse to he moulded in manners and measures by the age" in which they live, and whose course, you say, is characterized by "folly as egregious" as that of the "Asiatic simpleton" mentioned above. Yet you say you "never wrote (have never written) a line in favor of such use of musical instruments"! May we not now retort in your own language: "Your record is unfortunate. It is against you." In our turn, too, we "venture to make protestation." We solemnly protest against the practice of writing articles that will be construed by everybody as favoring a pernicious custom, and thus throwing the whole weight of one's influence in that direction and then supposing it enough to declare that such was not the intention. Let us be careful not to countenance an evil by implication, and then such declarations will be unnecessary." (Pages 455,456.)

I wish all our preachers and writers would heed this admonition from the pungent pen of Professor Grubbs. Some of our most

brilliant preachers and writers are so pedantic in their discourses and essays when you hear or read after them, on the living issues of today, you cannot tell whether they are for or against them. Their deliverances are *frequently--Delphian* ambiguous, capable of double interpretation.

I quote the closing paragraph of Professor Grubbs' article:

You think we exhibit "a want of seriousness and solemnity and great inaptitude in appreciating and acknowledging a necessity for going on to perfection." Yes, because we stand up firmly for the purity of the Christian institutions we must be represented as opposed to advancement in the divine life and to "going on to perfection" in Christ an knowledge and virtue! We cannot allow the sophism. Nor are we children to be frightened out of the faithful discharge of our duty by tremendous epithets. We are sorry indeed to know that when such men as Franklin, Lard, McGarvey, Pendleton, and Loos are contending earnestly for the Christian religion in its purity, there are those among us who can see nothing in their conduct but "illiberal pugnacity." May the Lord increase our devotion to his cause and enable us to "love one another with pure hearts fervently." (Page 459.)

With Hayden's reply to Grubbs, W. K. Pendleton, editor of the *Harbinger,* closes the discussion, or rather *called off* Brother Hayden and turns Brother J. S. Lamar loose on Brother Grubbs. I quote from W. K. Pendleton's "Remarks":

We thought that the very animated and somewhat angry tilt with our excellent Brother Hayden would have exhausted the fire of the assailant ere this, but Brother Hayden's skill in defense seems to have so parried the blows aimed at him as to leave him, in the estimation of some, still in the field and unhorsed. The discussion, however, is running into personalities, and if indulged in this strain, will not only be endless, but become, also, disagreeable to mutual friends and disreputable to the disputants. We desire, therefore, to close it with the above reply of Brother Hayden, who is entitled to the last word.

We had intended to add a few words upon the positions taken by Brother Hayden and on the spirit which has been manifested in the criticisms which his discourse has evoked, but the article below, by Brother Lamar, touches upon these points so pleasantly and piquantly that we prefer to let our readers hear him. (Page 552.)

In the M*illennial HARBINGER,* 1868. pages 628-633, we have Brother Grubb's first reply to Brother Lamar. I will quote some extracts from Brother Grubbs' reply:

As all things in Christian worship, as in every other department of the Christian religion, are thus to he done "in *the* name of the

Lord Jesus," or *by his authority, it* follows that "inflexibility extends to public worship" that its elements are fixed and determined by divine law, and that what is here done must he done by divine directions. In other words, we must adhere as rigidly to the apostolic "traditions" or "ordinances" delivered to us in this, as in every other department of the Christian religion. We then claim, as pertinent and applicable to the issue before us, the following scriptures: "Stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle." Again : "Now I praise you, brethren, that you remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances (traditions) as I delivered them to you." To these may he added, with the utmost logical propriety, the exhortation of Jude: "Contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." Grant that "Jude did not have organs or melodeons in his mind" when he said this, does the passage fall to rule them out on this account? Then if he did not also have "the mourner's bench" in his mind, it fails to rule it out! What havoc would this logic make of the word of God! And would not the Bible be a strange book if it had anticipated and specifically condemned in detail all the thousand and one innovations, in the three great departments of faith, that man in his folly might invent? Yet you think you do justice to our method of treating this subject, in the following statement: "The case seems to be about this. It is evident, in advance of all investigation, that instrumental music is wrong; if wrong, then, according to our cardinal position, it must be prohibited in Scripture: now, if those Scriptures which say *nothing about it* do not prohibit it, pray tell us what Scriptures do!" Thus you distinctly recognize the principle that the Scriptures do not condemn an innovation that they do not specifically name. Are you prepared to follow this principle into all of its legitimate consequences? I think not. Even Brother Pendleton seems to nod in giving a statement of the nature of the controversy on this subject. To "demand a precept or precedent" for an innovation, he says, can only be legitimately, that is, logically, done, *where the thing proposed is to become a matter binding in faith or practice."* The great Neander, as many other learned men have done, advocated infant baptism, not as "a matter binding in faith," but as an innocent and allowable innovation. And can we not, in a case of this kind, "demand a precept or precedent" for this innovation?

You say: "I can understand how brethren should think instrumental music *inexpedient* But when they assume to place it on the high ground of the *faith* and declare it to be unscriptural *otherwise* than being inexpedient, then I begin to grow dizzy, everything gets to dancing before nay mind, the ponderous syllogisms of the brethren are too much for my poor head, and I give up." Let me help you a little then. Just apply an this to the mourner's bench, and to infant baptism as advocated by Neander and others, and all your dizziness will vanish, your mind become composed,

"the ponderous syllogisms" disappear, and the brightness of the grand generic principle of the Christian religion will flash upon your mind .... (Pages 630, 631.)

Beloved brother: If you have followed me closely in my reasoning, yon do not, I think, by this time believe that "the brethren are worrying themselves to death over a very small matter," nor will sport with us by asking us to "be as serious and dignified as the nature of *such* a question will permit." Things appear great or small according to the standpoint from which they are viewed. "In my humble judgment," the question here discussed is fraught with thrilling interest and pregnant with weighty consequences, affecting the purity of the Christian religion. Why should brethren desire the controversy to cease? The fundamental principles involved have not yet been brought to the surface and dearly presented before our eyes. 1 do not wonder that brethren grow weary of the discussion as it has by some been conducted, and become disgusted with the ridiculous attitude that it has been made to assume. Who cares what may be the latitude or longitude of this or that man in relation to this question? And who desires to hear or read a personal wrangle instead of a manly, courteous, and dignified discussion of great principles? Controversy is inevitable among a people educated to think with any degree of freedom, and it is both legitimate and profitable, when properly conducted. Let us not, then, discard it altogether, because a controversialist, here or there, may be guilty of rudeness and a display of bad temper. (Pages 632, 633.)

I wish gospel preachers and brethren everywhere would "*read, study, mark, and inwardly digest" this* last paragraph from Professor Grubbs. Whenever gospel preachers allow religious discussions in which they are engaged to degenerate into personalities and abuse, they are, whether intentional or otherwise, only helping his *satanic majesty* to discredit that which he dreads most--religious controversy. And whenever a sickly, sentimental, brotherhood raise their voices against religious discussions, they, too, are being used by the devil to check or destroy the most effective weapon used by Jesus Christ and his apostles. "Brethren, be not children in mind : yet in malice be ye babes, but in mind be men." (I Cor. 14:20.)

PROFESSOR GRUBBS' LAST REPLY.

In the M*illennial Harbinger, I*869, pages 61-70, we have Brother Grubbs' last reply to J. S. Lamar. I will quote only a few paragraphs :

Brother Lamar:--As nature has denied to me the powers of wit with which you are endowed, I must depend, for the defense of my

case, upon sober reasoning alone; and as I confess, at the outset, my inability to answer the *funny* part of your article, you will excuse me if I attempt to deal with your logic alone (Page 61.)

But what is the real effect produced by the introduction into our worship of this outward additional element? And this brings us to the consideration of the "issue of fact" presented by you. You deny that its effect is to formalize or carnalize our worship, or to supersede the ordinance of singing and thereby become a *substitute* for this delightful part of worship. Now, to decide this "issue of fact," a *few facts* belonging to the history of the practice in question must be noted. It was first introduced into public worship by Gregory the Great, about the middle of the sixth century. "Great attention was paid by him to the rhythm of sacred music, though regardless of poetical measure and rhyme. Both prose and poetry were sung in a peculiar chant by a choir of singers. But his music became so complicated, that a good proficient in music would scarcely master it by diligence and skill in less than ten years. For the cultivation of this style of sacred music, singing schools were established, the leaders of which rose to great distinction. *Instrumental accompaniments* were introduced, and *especially th*at of the organ, which was transferred from the theater to the *church* as an instrument of sacred music. Church music was thus a refined art of difficult attainment and limited to a few professional singers. The congregations were by the exigencies of their condition, *excluded from all participation in it.* The devotional tendency of sacred music was lost in the artistic style of its profane and secular airs. Thus, like *our modern church, the* ancient soon impaired the devotional tendency of sacred music *by raising it above the congregation,* and limiting it to an orchestra or a choir, as they did that of their prayers, by restricting them to the cold and formal rehearsals of a prayer book." *("Coleman's Ancient Christianity Exemplifier",* page 331.)

How do you like the origin of your "instrumental accompaniment" as seen in the light of this historical extract?--transferred *from the theater to the church!*--an origin truly befitting the practice In question. And its tendency, what about it? For this is the matter that concerns us just now. The historian states the effect to have been the banishment of "the devotional tendency of sacred music" from "the congregation" and its limitation "to an or*chestra* or a *choir."* And he adds that as it was in the "ancient," so it has been "in the modern church." For an illustration of this remark of the historian, I refer you to an article taken from the *New York Herald* and republished in the January H*arbinger of* 1868, from which we propose to make one or two extracts: "In public worship New York now absolutely wreaks its religion on music. No amount of puritanic declamation has been sufficient to stay the progress of this instinct, and no pleading on the part of elderly clergymen

for simplicity of form has been of any avail. Today an organist without an elaborate programme of solos, duets, and quartets, would sit as uneasily on his cushioned stool on a Sunday morning as would the leader of a concert under similar circumstances on every evening of the week." How similar to its origin is this practice in its history? "An elaborate programme of solos, duets, and quartets" *substituted for* the heaven-ordained worship of the Most High, *against all entreaty for* simplicity of form by "elderly clergymen." And what is the effect of this as noted by this secular editor? "Practically, the fashionable religion of New York is already a vague theism, which depends upon music for its interpretation, and which expends a tread deal of talk on faith and like topics, without meaning a word of it. There is, in other words, at this day, none of that simplicity of practical faith which formerly prevailed, and which in theory forms the cornerstone of the apostolic system."
With such a history of the practice in question before your eyes, what do you now think of "the distinct issue of fact" between us? (Pages 65-57.)

I will now quote the closing paragraph of Professor Grubbs' article:

Finally you bring forward the Eighty-seventh Psalm, *"to* show that the use of organs is not inconsistent with the requirements of worship." "And of Zion it shall be said, This and that man was born in her; and the Highest himself shall establish her. The Lord shall count, when he writeth up the people, that this man was born there, Selah. A*s well the singers as the players on instruments shall be there: all* my springs are in thee." I had thought that we, as a people, relying on the New Testament as the all-sufficient rule of our religious life, had long since discarded the dangerous practice of basing any part of that life upon doubtful interpretations of the Old Testament prophecies. Two things are here in your way. First, the language does not suit a description of spiritual Zion. Men were "born in" literal Zion; but they must be born again in *order to enter* spiritual Zion. "Except a man be born of *water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God."* Yet you say: "In *the* church, men are born of water and of the Spirit!" Again, if it be spiritual Zion that is meant, the prediction and its fulfillment do not correspond. There were no "players'* in the apostolic church, nor for over five hundred years afterwards. They made their appearance for the first time, as we have already seen, just when the grand apostasy was swelling itself out to its full proportions; and thus spiritual *Babylon,* rather than spiritual Zion. How slender the foundation on which the practice in question reposes. How strong the rock of "faith," on the other hand, on which we as a people have planted ourselves, from which firm

basis we may successfully hurl back the countless innovations and inventions of men] (Pages 69, 70.)

I will close my quotations from the pioneers on the *music question* with a quotation from W. K. Pendleton in the last volume of the *Millennial Harbinger* (1810), page 503:

As requested by Brother "S. A.," we have inserted the foregoing article, that, as he desires, it may be "submitted to the candid examination of our brethren." We have, for some time past, closed, as far as practicable the pages of the H*arbinger* to the "music question." It has gone on a most *ad nauseam*--till the stomachs of many are getting retchy under the frequent "broken doses" with which we have been so professionally drenched. When will we throw it off, and return again to sweet digestion?

I am sure that no one who reads this book will think that Brother Clubb's trouble is in his stomach. He says : "Finally, Brother allen tells us that he and his brethren are standing just where the apostles and the pioneers of the Reformation stood in their opposition to instrumental music and organized missionary work. Our conservative brethren are constantly making this claim. Their position does not agree either with the apostles or the pioneers." *Mirabile dictu.*

CHAPTER VII

I WILL HERE GIVE THE ARGUMENTS of our challenger for instrumental music, from the G*ospel Advocate, J*uly 3, 1930:

What about worship and the use we make of the organ in accompanying the singing? What is worship? It is the adoration and homage of the heart to God, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. It finds expression in certain outward acts, such as singing, prayer, the Lord's Supper, reading the Scriptures, preaching, giving, etc. I know of no stated "form" of church services outlined in the New Testament. Acceptable worship does not involve or demand rigid *adherence to ritual, as it did under the law of Moses.* We know that the early Christians sang, read the Scriptures, prayed, listened to the message, observed the communion: made their offerings, etc.

Where is worship? It is in the heart and nowhere else. It is possible to "honor the Lord with our lips, when our hearts are far from him." Does the New Testament give us any right to use any "helps" or "aids" of any kind, which seem to be necessary in certain acts of worship, as, for instance, the singing? Let us be thoughtful here. Are we doing any violence to the spirit of worship in the use of such "aids" or "helps"? It is my conviction that all such come within the sphere of Christian expediency, and in this realm the only law is: "Let all things be done unto edifying." Both we and our conservative brethren use helps in the singing. There is no question here.

Now, Brother allen, in your churches you have a song leader to lead the congregation in singing. What is the difference between following the lead of a song leader and following the lead of an organ? Both are "helps."

Again, what is the difference between getting the correct pitch from a tuning fork and getting it from an organ or piano? Again, you have hymn books with the notes printed above the words of the song, and you use these notes to enable you to keep the tune throughout the singing of the song. Now, pray tell me, what is the difference in principle between this and our method of using the organ to enable us to keep the tune throughout the song?

In your method you use the *eye* and the *ear, for* you have a leader to hear, and you have notes to look at as you sing.

In our method we use the *eye* and the *ear. W*e use the organ to hear the tune we are singing: and we have the notes to look at while we sing.

Any one that can see any moral difference between your method and mine will be easily able to determine the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee.

If it is wrong to use the tones of the organ to guide the congregation in maintaining the tune throughout the singing of the hymn,

it is equally wrong to use the printed notes above each word of the song to guide the congregation in singing the hymn. The only conceivable difference is: one guides through the eye and the other through the *ear.* Both are equally right, and, therefore, Scriptural. The charge, Brother Alien, that we make instrumental music an integral part of the worship itself is not only untrue, but it is unworthy of those who make it. We no more make the tones of the organ a part of the song than you make the notes of the scale on the printed page a part of the song.

It is far more pleasant to agree with people than to differ from them, and we should accept the truth from whatever source it comes. Therefore, we will analyze the above arguments, agree with them where we can, and give a reason when we differ. The author says: "Worship is the adoration and homage of the heart to God, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. It finds expression in certain outward acts, such as singing, prayer, the Lord's Supper, reading the Scriptures, preaching, giving, etc." I accept the definition of worship as given above, and rejoice to know that the author and I understand alike what it takes to constitute Scriptural worship. Why can't we be satisfied alike with these items of worship? I am. Again, he says: "I know of no stated form of church services outlined in the New Testament. Acceptable worship does not involve or demand rigid adherence to *ritual,* as it did under the law of Moses." I suppose our progressive brethren would agree that there is *some "for*m" of church services outlined in the New Testament. For instance, they would not want to take the "cup" before the "]oaf" in communion. So we are agreed on this. Hear him again: "Where is worship? It is in the heart and nowhere else. It is possible to 'honor the Lord with our lips, when our hearts are far from him.' Does the New Testament give us any right to use any 'helps' or 'aids' of any kind, which seem to be necessary in certain acts of worship, as, for instance, the singing? Let us be thoughtful here. Are we doing any violence to the spirit of worship in the use of such 'aids' or 'helps'? It is my conviction that all such come within the sphere of Christian expediency, and in this realm, the only law is: 'Let all things be done unto edifying.' Both we and our conservative brethren use helps in the singing. There is no question here." If "there is no question here," there can be no argument. So I will pass this up by observing that we are also agreed on the "aids" or "helps" that are *necessary* to singing.

We now come to the milk in the *coconut; it* has been a rather thick

hull, but we have finally bored through. Brother Clubb says: "Now: Brother allen: in your churches you have a song leader to lead the congregation in singing. What is the difference between following the lead of a song leader and following the lead of an organ? Both are 'helps.'" L*et us be thoughtful here. If* this means anything, it means that instead of the digressive people "having a song leader to lead the congregation in singing," they have a player organ or a player piano "to lead the congregation in singing." If this is no true, the question is a subterfuge. The fact is, the "digressives" have song leaders "to lead the congregation in singing" just as we have. That is a *necessary "*helps" and we are agreed on that.

We now notice the editor's next question. "Again, what is the difference between getting the correct pitch from a tuning fork and getting it from an organ or piano?" Absolutely none. But remember, getting the pitch is not singing, any more than starting an automobile is running it. It makes no difference whether you start your auto with a self-starter or crank it, the starter stops when the machine starts. So it makes no difference whether you pitch a song with a "tuning fork" or "*an or*gan," if the *pitcher* stops when the singing starts. The "tuning fork" stops. What about the organ? *"Let us be thoughtful here."* The starting is not the running, and the pitching is not the singing, but both are necessary.

The editor under review says : "Again, you have hymn books with the notes printed above the words of the song, and you use these notes to enable you to keep the tune throughout the singing of the song. Now, pray tell me, what is the difference in principle between this and our method of using the organ to enable us to keep the tune throughout the song?" The difference is simply this: You have "hymn books with the notes printed above the words of the song, and you use these notes to enable you to keep the tune throughout the singing of the song" j*ust as we do. In* addition to this, you have the organ. The difference is therefore between vocal music, that which the Lord requires, and vocal and instrumental music combined, that which the Lord does not require. So, instead of the difference being between "tweedledum and tweedledee," it is the difference between "worshiping God as it is written" and adding to that worship.

Finally, the editor says : "The charge, Brother allen, that we make instrumental music an integral part of the worship itself is not only untrue, but it is unworthy of those who make it. We no more

make the tones of the organ a part of the song than you make the notes of the scale on the printed page a part of the song." I hope the editor under review did not feel that he was sitting in the shadow of Aristotle when he penned the above paragraph. "The notes of the scale on the printed page" never make any kind of music, either vocal or instrumental; but "the tones of the organ" make music, and a different kind of music from what the New Testament requires. Here the editor of the *Tennessee Christian has* sawed the limb off between the tree and himself. One of the contentions that our *progressive* brethren have always made for the use of instruments of music in the worship is that it was used in the temple worship, and the apostles went into the temple to worship, and, therefore, worshiped with the instruments. Any one who has ever read the Old Testament, and is capable of understanding language, knows that the instruments commanded by David were *"an in*tegral part" of the praise to God, and if those instruments were used in the temple worship, they must have been so regarded there. David said: "Praise him with trumpet sound: praise him with psaltery and harp. Praise him with timbrel and dance: praise him with stringed instruments and pipe. Praise him with loud cymbals: praise him with high-sounding cymbals." (Ps. 150:3-5.) Certainly these instruments were "an integral part" of the praise to God. Since the progressive brethren do not use the instruments as praise to God, for which the Psalmist authorized their use, surely they will never make another argument on the temple worship.

I suppose the progressive brethren's instruments--organs, pianos, harps, fiddles, horns, etc.--will come in the class with "washings of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels," especially the fiddles and horns, since their spokesman has made no claim that *they are "aids" or "helps." "*And there are gathered together unto him the Pharisees, and certain of the scribes, who had come from Jerusalem, and had seen that some of his disciples ate their bread with defiled, that is, unwashen, hands. (For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands diligently, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders; and when they come from the market place, except they bathe themselves, they eat not; and many other things there are, which they have received to hold, washings of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels.) And the Pharisees and the scribes ask him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tra-

dition of the elders, but eat their bread with defiled hands? And he said unto them, Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men." (Mark 7:1-7.)

If their organs, pianos, harps, fiddles, horns, etc., *are not "*a part of the songs," f am sure they are as much a part of the *worship as* those "cups, and pots, and brazen vessels" of the Pharisees were, and Jesus Christ said: "But in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men."

"For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith Jehovah. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." (Isa. 55:8, 9.) So it makes no difference what our progressive brethren say about those things, Jesus Christ calls such things "vain worship." If the New Testament does not authorize instruments of music in the worship, they certainly come under the head of "the doctrines and precepts of men." The editor of the *Tennessee Christian* says: "These are the things that have caused the division among us." Will *they put these things away to heal the breach?*

In the C*hristian Standard, January* 31, 1931, page 16, we read: "J. A. McKenzie, minister, and the church at Sioux City, Iowa, have found the 'Church Night' program instructive and entertaining. The twenty-five-piece orchestra presented a program on January 18, 'The Life of Jesus,' in music and pantomime." This program being on Lord's day, I suppose it was offered as worship to God, especially since it presented "'The Life of Jesus,' in music and pantomime." Of course our digressive brethren would say: "They no more made the tones of the twenty-five-piece orchestra a part of the songs than you make the notes of the scale on the printed page a part of the songs." It must be very weak singing, indeed, that calls for a "twenty-five-piece orchestra" as an "aid" or "help." The report says: "The program was instructive and entertaining." I am sure it is more nearly the truth to say that instrumental music is offered as an entertainment than to say it is used as "aids" or "helps" to singing,

CHAPTER VIII

I HAVE SHOWN from the writings of the pioneers that the editor of the *Tennessee Christian* and his people are not standing with them on the music question. I have also shown that the churches of Christ in Tennessee *are standing* with the pioneers in their opposition to instrumental music and organized missionary work.

I will now show that the teaching of the digressive brethren does not agree even with the Old Testament teaching on the music question, much less the New Testament. They claim that they do not use the instruments as praise to God, but as "aids or helps" to the singing. David says he made the instruments "to praise Jehovah therewith." Therefore, they are out of harmony with David; but what difference should that make so long as they have the editor of the *Tennessee Christian* as their leader?

I will correlate what both the Old and New Testaments say about instrumental and vocal music as praise to God. This will help you to see that instrumental music was never used as "aids or helps" to the singing, but was a part of the praise to God.

If I were practicing sprinkling for baptism today, I would insist on using "the blood of the calves and the goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop," as it was done in Old Testament times. (See Hebrews 9:19.) So, if I were using instrumental music, I would insist on its being used as praise to God, as it was used in Old Testament times. I would certainly try to operate under one of the covenants.

There was a distinction made in the Old Testament between the trumpets commanded by Jehovah and "the instruments of David." "And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, Make thee two trumpets of silver; of beaten work shalt thou make them: and thou shalt use them for the calling of the congregation, and for the journeying of the camps. And when they shall blow them, all the congregation shall gather themselves unto thee at the door of the tent of meeting." (Numbersl0:l-3.) In verse 8 we read: "And the sons of Aaron, the priests, shall blow the trumpets; and they shall be to you for a statute forever throughout your generations." Again, inverse 10:"Also in the day of your gladness, and in your set feasts, and in the beginnings of your months, ye shall blow the trumpets over your burnt offer-

ings, and over the sacrifices of your peace offerings; and they shall be to you for a memorial before your God: I am Jehovah your God."

"And in the seventh month, on the first day of the month, ye shall have a holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work: it is a day of blowing of trumpets unto you." (Numbers 29:1.) Here the Lord authorized the trumpets, specified their use, and designated their users. The trumpets were the only instruments God commanded Moses to make, and they are all that Moses ever made. David himself recognized the blowing of trumpets as an ordinance of God. "Blow the trumpet at the new moon, at the full moon, on our feast day. For it is a statute for Israel, an ordinance of the God of Jacob." (Psalms 81: 3, 4.)

GOD COMMANDED SINGING UNDER THE OLD COVENANT.

"Now therefore write ye this song for you, and teach thou it the children of Israel: put it in their mouths, that this song may be a witness for me against the children of Israel" (Deuteronomy 31: 19.) In verse 30 of the same chapter we read: "And Moses spake in the ears of all the assembly of Israel the words of this song, until they were finished." G*od not only commanded Moses to write this* song, but commanded him to *teach it* to the children of Israel.

"And when he had taken counsel with the people, he appointed them that should sing unto Jehovah, and give praise in holy array, as they went out before the army, and say, Give thanks unto Jehovah; for his loving-kindness endureth forever." (2 Chronicles 20: 21.) "And David lamented with this lamentation over Saul and over Jonathan his son (and he bade them teach the children of Judah the song of the bow: behold, it is written in the book of Jasher)." (2 Samuel 1:17, 18.) "And David spake unto Jehovah the words of this song in the day that Jehovah delivered him out of the hand of all his enemies, and out of the hand of Saul." (2 Samuel 22:1.)

VOCAL MUSIC WAS BOTH IN THE TABERNACLE AND TEMPLE WORSHIP

"And these are they whom David set over the service of song in the house of Jehovah: after that the ark had rest. And they ministered with song before the tabernacle of the tent of meeting, until Solomon had built the house of Jehovah in Jerusalem: and they waited on their office according to their order." (1 Chronicles 6:31, 32.) "And without the inner gate were chambers for the singers in the

inner court, which was at the side of the north gate; and their prospect was toward the south; one at the side of the east gate having the prospect toward the north." (Ezekiel 40:44.) "The whole assembly together was forty and two thousand three hundred and threescore, besides their menservants and their maidservants, of whom there were seven thousand three hundred thirty and seven: and they had two hundred singing men and singing women." (Ezra 2:64, 65.)

"So the priests, and the Levites, and the porters, and the singers, and some of the people, and the Nethinim, and all Israel, dwelt in their cities." (Nehemiah7:73.) "For there was a commandment from the king concerning them, and a settled provision for the singers, as every day required." (Nehemiah In 23.) "For in the days of David and Asaph of old there was a chief of the singers, and songs of praise and thanksgiving unto God. And all Israel in the days of Zerubbabel, and in the days of Nehemiah, gave the portions of the singers and the porters, as every day required: and they set apart that which was for the Levites; and the Levites set apart that which was for the sons of Aaron." (Nehemiah 12:46, 47.) They not only had "songs of praise and thanksgiving unto God," but the singers had their portion "as every day required," just as the porters and others who served at the temple.

VOCAL Music AND INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC COMBINED IN THE JEWISH AGE BY DAVID.

"And four thousand were doorkeepers; and four thousand praised Jehovah with the instruments which I made, said David to praise therewith. And David divided them into courses according to the sons of Levi: Gershon, Kohath, and Merari." (1 Chronicles 23:5, 6.) Notice, David said: "*Four thousand praised Jehovah with the instruments which I made to praise therewith."* Here David tells us that he made the instruments, and that he made them "to praise Jehovah therewith."

It is a pity that David did not have the editor of the *Tennessee Christian* to teach him that "worship is in the heart and nowhere else," and that he could not praise Jehovah with his instruments, but he could use them as "aids or helps"! This certainly would have been a revelation to David, because he made the instruments *to praise Jehovah therewith,* and not for "aids or helps" to the singing. However, 1 suppose Brother Clubb's friends would consider him a better-informed man on these things than David!

But we must read some more about praising God under the Old Testament. When Solomon completed the temple in Jerusalem, the ark was brought from the tent "out of the city of David, which is Zion," and placed in the temple with music and thanksgiving. "And it came to pass, when the priests were come out of the holy place (for all the priests that were present had sanctified themselves. and did not keep their courses; also the Levites who were the singers, all of them, even Asaph, Heman, Jeduthun, and their sons and their brethren, arrayed in fine linen, with cymbals and psalteries and harps, stood at the east end of the altar, and with them a hundred and twenty priests sounding with trumpets); it came to pass, when the trumpeters and singers were as one, to make one sound to be heard in praising and thanking Jehovah; and when they lifted up their voice with the trumpets and cymbals and instruments of music, and praised Jehovah, saying, For he is good; for his loving kindness endureth forever; that then the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of Jehovah, so that the priests could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud: For the glory of Jehovah filled the house of God." (2 Chronicles 5:11-14.) A theological surgeon would have to have a very sharp knife to dissect this praise, and separate the instrumental music from the vocal music, and make only the vocal music praise, and the instruments only "aids or helps" to the singing. Of course the editor of the *Tennessee Christian thinks* he can do that--and his people believe him.

"And the priests stood, according to their offices; the Levites also with instruments of music of Jehovah, which David the king had made to give thanks unto Jehovah (for his Loving-kindness endureth forever), when David praised by their ministry: and the priests sounded trumpets before them; and all Israel stood." (2 Chronicles 7:6.) Here the writer tells us that David the king had made the instruments of music to give thanks unto Jehovah --not one word about these instruments being made and used only as "aids or helps" to the singing. Instruments as "aids or helps" to singing is not a Bible idea.

"And David and all Israel played before God with all their might, even with songs, and with harps, and with psalteries, and with timbrels, and with cymbals, and with trumpets." (1 Chronicles 13:8.) Nothing said here about the harps, psalteries, timbrels, and cymbals being "aids or helps" to the singing. That claim is only made by those who want to darken counsel and mislead the uninformed.

"And David spake to the chief of the Levites to appoint their brethren the singers, with instruments of music, psalteries and harps and cymbals, sounding aloud and lifting up the voice with joy." (1 Chronicles 15:16.) In verse 19 of the same chapter we read: "So the singers, Heman, Asaph, and Ethan, were appointed with cymbals of brass to sound aloud." Of course both the vocal and instrumental music were offered as praise to Jehovah.

"And they brought in the ark of God, and set it in the midst of the tent that David had pitched for it: and they offered burnt offerings and peace offerings before God. And when David had made an end of offering the burnt offering and peace offerings, he blessed the people in the name of Jehovah. And he dealt to every one of Israel, both man and woman, to every one a loaf of bread, and a portion of flesh, and a cake of raisins. And he appointed certain of the Levites to minister before the ark of Jehovah, and to celebrate and to thank and praise Jehovah, the God of Israel: Asaph the chief, and second to him Zechariah, Jeiel, and Shemiramoth, and Jehiel, and Mattithiah, and Eliab, and Benaiah, and Obed-edom, and Jeiel, with psalteries and with harps; and Asaph with cymbals, sounding aloud; and Benaiah and Jahaziel the priests with trumpets continually, before the ark of the covenant of God." (1 Chronicles l6:16.) Here David appointed the Levites to use the psalteries, harps, and cymbals; but the priests used the trumpets. David never interfered with the priests and the trumpets. When God commanded Moses to make the trumpets, he said: "And the sons of Aaron, the priests, shall blow the trumpets." David always respected this law of God.

"All these were under the hands of their father for song in the house of Jehovah, with cymbals, psalteries, and harps, for the service of the house of God; Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman being under the order of the king. And the number of them, with their brethren that were instructed in singing unto Jehovah, even all that were skillful, was two hundred fourscore and eight." (1 Chronicles 25: 6, 7.) Notice that the songs, with cymbals, psalteries, and harps, were "in *the* house of Jehovah," and "for the service of the house of God," "being under the order of the *king"--David. C*ertainly David ordered the cymbals, psalteries, and harps as *an integral* part of the service.

Thus far David has taken the credit, and been given the credit by others, for *making the instruments of music to praise Jehovah*

therewith. David neverclaimed, and none of the Old Testament writers ever said, that he made the instruments of music to "aid or help" the singing. The prophet Amos said: "Woe to them . . . that sing idle songs to the sound of the viol; that invent for themselves instruments of music, like David; that drink wine in bowls, and anoint themselves with the chief oils; but they are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph." (Amos 6:1-6.) The prophet here pronounced a woe on those who "invent for themselves instruments of music, like David." Amos understood that David invented the instruments of music, and that they were not pleasing to God.

We now come to the only passage in the Old Testament that seems to teach that God commanded David to make the instruments of tousle. "And he set the Levites in the house of Jehovah with cymbals, with psalteries, and with harps, according to the commandment of David, and of Gad the king's seer, and Nathan the prophet; for the commandment was of Jehovah by his prophets. And the Levites stood with the instruments of David, and the priests with the trumpets. And Hezekiah commanded to offer the burnt offering upon the altar. And when the burnt offering began, the song of Jehovah began also, and the trumpets, together with the instruments of David king of Israel. And all the assembly worshiped, and the singers sang, and the trumpeters sounded; all this continued until the burnt offering was finished." (2 Chronicles 29:25-28.) Here the writer says: "The commandment was of Jehovah by his prophets." However, he goes right on and makes a distinction between "the instruments of David," and "the trum*pets," and "the song of Jehovah." He* says : "And the Levites stood with the instruments of David, and the priests with the trumpets." Again, he says: "And when the burnt offering began, the song of Jehovah began also, and the trumpets, together with the instruments of David king of Israel."

I will now let you read what Adam Clarke says about this passage of Scripture:

Verse 25. *With cymbals, with psalteries. M*oses had not appointed any musical instruments to be used in the Divine worship; there was nothing of the kind under the first tabernacle. The *trumpets* or *horns the*n used were not for song nor for praise, but as we use bells, i. e., to give notice to the congregation of what they were called to perform, etc. But David did certainly introduce many *instruments of* music into God's worship, for which we have already seen he was solemnly reproved by the prophet Amos. (Chapter 6:

1-6.) Here, however, the author of this book states he had the commandment of the prophet Nathan, and Gad the king's seer; and this is stated to have been the *commandment of the Lord by his prophets: but* the *Syriac* and A*rabic* give this a different turn-"Hezekiah appointed the Levites in the house of the Lord, with instruments of music, and the sound of harps, and with the H*ymns* of *David,* and the H*ymns of* G*ad, the* king's prophet, and of *Nathan, the* king's prophet: for David *sang the praise for the Lord his God, as from the mouth of the prophet." It* was by the hand or *commandment of* the L*ord* and his *prophets* that the *Levites should praise the Lord; for* so the Hebrew text may be understood: and it was by the or*der of David th*at so many instruments of music should be introduced into the Divine service. But were it even evident, which it is not either from this or any other place in the sacred writings, that instruments of music were prescribed by Divine authority *under the law,* could this be adduced with any semblance of reason, that they ought to be used in C*hristian worship? No; the* whole spirit, soul, and genius of the Christian religion are against this; and those who know the Church of God best, and what *constitutes its genuine spiritual state,* know that these things have been introduced as a substitute for the *life* and *power of* religion; and that where they prevail most, there is least of the *power of* Christianity. Away with such portentous baubles from the worship of that infinite Spirit who requires his followers to worship him in *spirit and in truth, for* to no such worship are those instruments friendly. (Cl*arke's Commentary,* Vol. 2, pages 690, 691, published in 1856, by Carlton & Porter, New York, 200 Mulberry Street.)

I know nothing about the Syriac, the Arabic, or the Hebrew text, so I give yon what this great Methodist scholar says for whatever it is worth. I have never heard of his statements being challenged by other scholars.

Mr. Clarke very correctly observes, th*at if instruments of music were prescribed by Divine authority under the law, that would be no semblance of reason that they ought to be used in Christian worship.*

There is at least a doubt whether God ever commanded David to make instruments of music; he never commanded Moses to make them at the beginning of the Jewish worship; but there can be no doubt about God tolerating instrumental music as praise under the law. God tolerated many things under the law that were not his will. Because of the hardness of the Jews' heart, God suffered, or tolerated, divorce; but he did not command it, neither was he pleased with it. He tolerated a king, but that was not his will "It is thy destruction, O Israel, that thou art against me, against thy help. Where now is thy king, that he may save thee in all thy cities? and thy judges, of whom thou saidst, Give me a king and princes? I

have given thee a king in mine anger, and have taken him away in my wrath." (Hosea 13:9-11.) Therefore, because God permitted certain things under the Jewish age is no evidence that he was pleased with them, and certainly it is no authority for their use in New Testament times.

This finishes our study in the Old Testament on the *music question*, and I hope all who read this will be benefitted by the study. Our next lesson will be in the New Testament.

CHAPTER IX

BOTH VOCAL AND INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC were used in praise to God under the old law, and when so used both were mentioned, even the kind of instruments that were used. Therefore, lf both kinds of music are to be used in New Testament worship, surely the New Testament will mention both kinds, and designate the kind of instruments to be used.

The New Testament is final, and our last appeal in faith and practice--in all matters of religion. Therefore, if we can find either precept or example for vocal and instrumental music in the New Testament, the question will be settled. Whatever we have a command or an example for doing, in the New Testament, we can do by faith. Paul says:"For we walk by faith, not by sight." (2 Cor. 5:7.) *A*gain, he says: "So belief cometh of hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ." (Romans f0:17.) We now come to the New Testament to see what kind of music they used in the apostolic age. "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it; and he gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it ; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins. But I say unto you, I shall not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom. And when they had sung a hymn, they went out into the mount of Olives." (Matthew 26:26 30.)

"And as they were eating, he took bread, and when he had blessed, he brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take ye: this is my body. And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them: and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many. Verily I say unto you, I shall no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God. And when they had sung a hymn, they went out unto the Mount of Olives." (Mark 14:22-26.) This was the last passover feast Jesus Christ ever ate with his apostles. During this feast Jesus instituted his supper, and commanded his disciples to eat in memory of him. After eating the supper with his apostles, they sang a hymn and went out. Here we have an example for singing, but nothing about instrumental music. However, some of Brother

Clubb's "million and five hundred thousand other brethren" have instrumental music when they are passing the emblems and eating the Lord's Supper.

They may tell us that this is done to break the monotony or silence of the occasion. That would make it a double offense. I do not believe there should ever be more solemn or reverential moments in our life than when we are observing the Lord's Supper. Singing is all right; but we would not want the singing going on while we are eating the Lord's Supper. Praying is a privilege, as well as a duty; but we would not want one to pray audibly while we were taking the emblems. Reading the Scriptures is good; but we would not want one standing up reading when we were trying to discern the body. Paul says: "But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the bread, and drink of the cup. For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern not the body." (1 Corinthians 11:28, 29.) Therefore, *nothing* should be done that would attract our attention, or call our minds from the purpose of the Supper, while we are observing it. But we must go on with our music question.

"But about midnight Paul and Silas were praying and singing hymns unto God, and the prisoners were listening to them." (Acts 16:25.) Another example for "singing hymns unto God," but nothing about instruments of music as "aids or helps."

The propriety of Jews and Gentiles worshiping God together frequently came up in the apostolic age. This question was before Paul when he wrote Romans 15:5-12: "Now the God of patience and of comfort grant you to be of the same mind one with another according to Christ Jesus: that with one accord ye may with one mouth glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Wherefore receive ye one another, even as Christ also received you, to the glory of God. For I say that Christ hath been made a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, that he might confirm the promises given unto the fathers, and that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy; as it is written, Therefore will I give praise unto thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy name. And again he saith, Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people. And again, Praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles; and let all the peoples praise him. And again, Isaiah saith, There shall be the root of Jesse, And he that ariseth to rule over the Gentiles; On him shall the Gentiles hope."

In the above Scripture Paul quotes from Moses, David, and Isaiah to show that those great leaders in Israel had foretold that under the reign of the Messiah--"the root of Jesse"--Jews and Gentiles would "with one accord" and "with one mouth glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," and would *sing* unto his name. Paul quotes Deuteronomy 32:43. This is from the *song th*at God commanded Moses to write and to teach it to the children of Israel. I am sure no intelligent man would have the audacity to claim that Moses used in*struments of music* as "aids or helps" to this song.

Paul also quoted 2 Samuel 22:50 and Psalms 18:49. This is from the *song th*at David *sang* unto Jehovah the day he delivered him out of the hands of all his enemies. David used no in*struments of music* as "aids or helps" when he sang this song. In quoting from these songs of Moses and David, in which instrumental music was not used, Paul makes them typical of the kind of music that should he used under the reign of Christ.

Paul knew that "David and all Israel played before God with all their might, even with songs, and with harps, and with psalteries, and with timbrels, and with cymbals, and with trumpets." (1 Chronicles 13 : 8.) Again: "David spake to the chief of the Levites to appoint their brethren the singers, with instruments of music, psalteries and harps and cymbals, sounding aloud and lifting up the voice with joy." (1 Chronicles 15:16.) We read again: "And four thousand were doorkeepers: and four thousand praised Jehovah with the instruments which I made, said David, to praise therewith." (1 Chronicles 23:5.) With these Scriptures before him, and all others in which the in*struments of David, or* in*strumental music,* were mentioned, when Paul quoted that which was typical of New Testament worship, he made no reference to any passage in the Old Testament in which instrumental music was mentioned. Could that have been just an oversight on Paul's part?

In I Corinthians 14:15 we read: "What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also." Nothing to suggest instrumental music here, as praise or as "aids or helps." In verse 26 of the same chapter Paul says: "What is it then, brethren? When ye come together, each one hath a psalm, hath a teaching, hath a revelation, hath a tongue, hath an interpre-

tation. Let all things be done unto edifying." This was in the miraculous age of the church, when different ones had different gifts; but if any one had a fiddle or a horn, Paul deliberately ignored him.

In Ephesians 5:18, 19, Paul says: "And be not drunken with wine, wherein is riot, but be filled with the Spirit; speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord." I was astounded recently to hear a gospel preacher declare from the pulpit, before an intelligent audience, that there was no authority in the New Testament for congregational singing. People cannot speak "one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord," unless they are congregated together; and when thus assembled, "singing and making melody with "our heart to the Lord," it must be congregational singing. Such statements are made only by those who are Looking for an *excuse for* choir or solo singing. We stultify ourselves sometimes, trying to appear "learned or studious," in our efforts to get away from the "old paths." In the above Scripture we certainly have an example, or authority, for congregational singing, but no authority for instrumental music.

In Colossians 3:16, Paul says: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly; in all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto God." Here again we have authority for singing, but no authority for organs, pianos, fiddles, horns, or orchestras.

Therefore, when we come together to worship God, we can sing with grace in our hearts, and do it by faith; but we cannot play organs, pianos, or fiddles, and do it by faith. "So belief cometh of hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ." "The word of Christ" says nothing about instrumental music.

Some of the pseudo-theologians among our progressive brethren claim that they have "burnt midnight oil" and discovered that Paul commanded the use of musical instruments when he enjoined the singing of psalms. I think, instead of making the discovery at midnight, "they all slumbered and slept."

In the C*hristian Standard,* 1895, page 1149, J. W. McGarvey says: "If any man who is a preacher believes that the apostle teaches the use of instrumental music in the church by enjoining the singing of psalms, he is one of those smatterers in Greek who can be-

lieve anything that he wishes to believe. When the wish is father of the thought, correct exegesis is like water on a duck's back." Now let some two-by-four preacher, who possibly has learned the Greek alphabet, stultify himself by questioning the scholarship of J. W. McGarvey in this matter.

In Hebrews 2:12, Paul quotes Psalms 22:22, "saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the congregation will I sing thy praise." Paul quotes this Psalm as referring to Christ, and his singing God's praise in the midst of the church. Another quotation from David in which no reference is made to his instruments of music. If I were advocating instrumental music in the worship, I would be at a loss to explain why Paul, with all the writings of David, *both on vocal and instrumental music,* before him, passed over every passage in which David mentioned or commanded instrumental music, and quoted on*ly the* passages in which *singing,* without the instruments, is mentioned, especially since Paul used those quotations as types of the music that should be used in New Testament worship.

In James 5 :13 we read: "Is any among you suffering? let him pray. Is any cheerful? let him sing praise." You now have before you all the New Testament says about singing praise to God. The inspired writers of the Old Testament tell us that instrumental music was offered as praise to God under the old law. They also tell us the kind of instruments that were used. The inspired writers of the New Testament tell us *to sing hymns and spiritual songs, with grace in our hearts unto God.* But not one single time do they mention instrumental music.

Out of this profound silence of the New Testament the editor of the *Tennessee Christian* and his "million and five hundred thousand other brethren" have evolved organs, pianos, fiddles, horns, yea, twenty-five-piece orchestras, and the editor under review says *they use them only as "aids or helps" to the singing.* If you object to these things being used in the worship, you are challenged, with all the effrontery of His Satanic Majesty, to show where God says you could not have them.

God says you cannot have those things by the law of exclusion and inclusion--the only way you can understand the Bible--that is, when God gives a command, he includes everything that is necessary to obey the command, and he excludes everything else. For instance, when God told Noah to build the "ark of gopher

wood," he included the kind of wood that was to go into the ark, he excluded all other kinds of wood.

When Jesus Christ took the loaf and the fruit of the vine and instituted his supper, he included the elements that are to be used in the Lord's Supper--he excluded all other elements. Therefore, we cannot use water, coffee, milk, or tea, in taking the Supper, and justify it on the ground that God did not tell us we could not use those things. He did tell us we could not use those things when he took the *fruit of the vine.*

The early disciples came together on the first day of the week to break bread; but the Lord did not tell us we could not take his Supper on Thursday night, so the progressive people do that occasionally--thus they go *ad infinitum.* To those who thus reason, or act, the New Testament is nothing more than a "scrap of paper." We will notice another argument (?) that some of the digressive people make. They claim, but *cannot prove it, that* instrumental music was used in the synagogue worship, and that Jesus Christ and his apostles worshiped in the synagogues with the instruments, and thereby gave us an example for using the instruments of music in worship. Grant that for argument's sake, then let us look at some Old Testament examples, "which were written for our learning." In Exodus 17:2-6, we read: "Wherefore the people strove with Moses, and said, Give us water that we may drink. And Moses said unto them, Why strive ye with me? wherefore do ye tempt Jehovah? And the people thirsted there for water; and the people murmured against Moses, and said, Wherefore hast thou brought us up out of Egypt, to kill us and our children and our cattle with thirst? And Moses cried unto Jehovah, saying, What shall I do unto this people? they are almost ready to stone me. And Jehovah said unto Moses, Pass on before the people, and take with thee of the elders of Israel; and thy rod, wherewith thou smotest the river, take in thy hand, and go. Behold, I will stand before thee there upon the rock in Horeb; and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it, that the people may drink. And Moses did so in the sight of the elders of Israel."

We read again, in Numbers 20:7-13, "And Jehovah spoke unto Moses, saying, Take the rod, and assemble the congregation, thou, and Aaron thy brother, and speak ye unto the rock before their eyes, that it give forth its water; and thou shalt bring forth to them water out of the rock; so thou shall give the congregation and

their cattle drink. And Moses took the rod from before Jehovah, as he commanded him. And Moses and Aaron gathered the assembly together before the rock, and he said unto them, Hear now, ye rebels; shall we bring you forth water out of this rock? And Moses lifted up his hand, and smote the rock with his rod twice; and water came forth abundantly, and the congregation drank, and their cattle. And Jehovah said unto Moses and Aaron, Because ye believed not in me, to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this assembly into the land which I have given them."

In the first instance God told Moses to take his rod and *smite* the rock. In the second example God told Moses to assemble the people, take his rod, and *speak* to the rock. God did not tell Moses he *could not smite the rock, but* he told him to *speak* to the rock. Moses took his rod, assembled the people, as God commanded him; but he *smote the* rock, and said : "Hear now, ye rebels; shall we bring you forth water out of this rock?" A small matter, indeed, but it kept Moses and Aaron both out of the land of Canaan.

Now let us surmise a parallel case. Jesus Christ assembled with his disciples in the synagogue; he told them to take instruments of music, and *play. L*ater he assembles with his disciples, tells them 10 take instruments of music, and *sing.* The one who strikes the instruments would be just as guilty before God as Moses was when he *smote the* rock after God said *speak* to it. Do you say if Christ told his disciples to play the first time, it would be all right for them the second time? It was nil right for Moses to smite the rock the first time, but it was all wrong the second time.

We have no such examples in the New Testament. If Jesus Christ and his apostles ever worshiped with instruments of music, we don't know it; they did not tell us of it. But they do tell us to *sing.* Therefore, Moses had far more excuse for *smiting the* rock than the music people have for *striking the* instruments of music in the worship. The example of Moses ought to teach us exactness in the observance of that worship which owes its origin to divine authority.

There is no way by which we can connect instrumental music in worship with a divine command in the New Testament. Therefore, we should have absolutely nothing to do with those who introduce these things into the divine service. No doubt there are thousands of good, conscientious people worshiping where instru-

mental music is used; because all they have ever heard on the subject arc such insubstantial statements of a digressive editor that the position of the "conservative" brethren "does not agree either with the apostles or the pioneers," that "our brethren (the pioneers) have always been committed to organized mission agencies," and that he (this editor) and "about one million five hundred thousand others" of his digressive brethren are, today, standing with the pioneers. And he challenges "any man to prove that this is not true." We have an example of such camouflage gall, and its effect on the people, in Acts 8:9, 10: "But there was a certain man, Simon by name, who beforetime in the city used sorcery, and amazed the people of Samaria, giving out that himself was some great one: to whom they all gave heed, from the least to the greatest, saying, This man is that power of God which is called Great." The only difference is, Simon used his sorceries, M. D. Clubb uses his audacity.

You who have read my articles know, if you did not know before, that Brother Clubb's statements and the facts are antipodes. I pray that these articles may have the same effect upon Brother Clubb and his people that Philip's teaching had on Simon and the Samaritans. I accepted Brother Clubb's challenge, and my efforts are before you. If I have helped anybody, I thank God for the privilege. If I have unnecessarily offended any one, it is a mistake of the head and not of the heart.