THE LIFE AND TIMES OF DAVID LIPSCOMB

by

EARL IRVIN WEST

GOSPEL LIGHT PUBLISHING CO.
P.O. Box 38 -- 431 East Antioch
Delight, AR 71940
(870) 379-2412

GOSPEL LIGHT PUBLISHING CO.
P.O. Box 38 - 431 East Antioch
Delight, AR 71940
(870) 379-2412

Printed in U.S.A.

CONTENTS

"DAVID LIPSCOMB AS I KNEW HIM"

John T. Lewis

On September 28, 1898 I entered the Nashville Bible School, then located on South Spruce Street, Nashville, Tennessee. That was the opening of the seventh session of the school, it was then that I saw Brother Lipscomb for the first time. His old horse and buggy hitched to a fence post on the old campus was a familiar sight every school day for the following five years. In 1903 the school was moved to the present location of the David Lipscomb College. The first year I was there I had two classes under him, one in the Old Testament and one in the New Testament, the next four years I had only his Old Testament class. During those five years, he drove the five miles from his home every day, hot or cold, rain or shine, and if he was ever late or ever missed a class I do not remember it. Brother Lipscomb taught only the Bible in the school, and he taught only two classes a day, one in the Old Testament and one in the New Testament. This he did from the beginning of the school until the infirmities of old age forced him to relinquish his teaching. The end of his earthly pilgrimage came in 1917; but I do not know what year he had to give up his teaching. I finished my schooling there on May 24, 1906, and he was still teaching his classes with interest and vigor that he was the day *I* entered the school. During all those years of teaching he never received one penny for his services.

During those years Brother Daniel Sommer was going over the country teaching what he called "Bible' readings" and charging so much per. In 1905 I was in Medford Ont., Canada, and while there I read a long article in the Octographic Review, from Daniel Sommer, lambasting the Bible school. I wrote and asked him what he would advise; a young man to do that had to work his way through school. If he would advise him to go to a school where, while getting his literary training, he could get his Bible free under teachers like David Lipscomb or, would he advise him to first get his literary education, then take Bible readings for so much per? He replied that David Lipscomb did not know as much about the Bible as some people thought he knew, that if I had read his article on "Horrible Revelations"; he was talking about David Lipscomb. Brother Lipscomb had written an article' saying that the Great Commission gave Christians the right to teach the Bible anywhere. Brother Sommer said that was a "Horrible Revelation." We had quite a correspondence' but I never could get Brother Sommer to give me a clear cut answer to my questions. He would say answer privately and be' careful. However, soon after our correspondence Brother Sommer was advertising his Bible readings free. So, whatever Brother Sommer may have thought of Brother Lipscomb's teaching, his example in teaching the Bible Free must have had its influence on Brother Sommer.

I have heard Brother Lipscomb say many times that he did not want a college, that it took money to run a college, he wanted a school where boys and girls, whose parents were not able to send them to college, could come and be taught the word of

God daily to make better citizens out of them. His classes were always orderly, each student would read a verse then Brother Lipscomb would ask questions or comment on the same, and any student could ask a question; but the students could not discuss anything among themselves in his class.

Brother Lipscomb was an elder of the South College Street church for many years. In teaching on the church's responsibility of caring for its needy, he said the College Street church once had an elderly Sister that was destitute, the church cared for her a while and then sent her off to the county farm or poor house. His comment was: "The church has never been what it was before." His idea was when ever a local congregation turns its responsibilities over to others, it loses its power. Dr. W. A. Bryan told me that he heard Brother Lipscomb preach on the blood of Christ, he said it was the greatest sermon he had ever heard, he went up to compliment Brother Lipscomb; he said Brother Lipscomb just sorter grunted, turned and walked off. That insulted the doctor's dignity; but that was Brother Lipscomb, he cared but little for the praise of men. Nobody ever heard or read of David Lipscomb telling about what he had done. I never heard Brother Lipscomb make a statement about anything he had ever done that even sounded like he was bragging about it, not even in a jocular vain. I heard Brother Lipscomb say that after the close of the Civil War, Bishop McFerrin, of the Northern Methodist Church, told him that he knew the Lord was on the side of the North because they whipped the South. Brother Lipscomb said he replied, "We get our comfort from Heb. 12:6, 'For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth'."

If any one had gone out shooting preachers he would have never shot Brother Lipscomb. Brother Lipscomb was not only a gospel preacher and mighty with the pen; but he was also a successful farmer, and he always looked more like a farmer than he did a preacher. When I was in school the Lipscomb debating society wanted to get his picture to hang in the hall. I went to talk to Sister Lipscomb about it, she said, "Brother Lewis, let me handle that; I think I can get Mr. Lipscomb to sit for the picture." She did, and when it was finished I went to town and got it, and carried it by to let Sister Lipscomb see it. She looked at it, and then said, "Brother Lewis it may be interesting to you to know that everything Mr. Lipscomb has on I made, except his shoes and suspenders." He said the padding in tailored clothes hurt his shoulders. That did not mean that he was slouchy in his dress, he was for comfort, and wore the same kind of clothes that his forefathers wore—home made, if not home spun. In many respects they lived as their forefathers lived. I was in Nashville after I left school and went out to see Brother and bister Lipscomb, they would have me to stay for dinner. Sister Lipscomb had a small hand mill, she ground the wheat and made bread out of the whole wheat. Their idea was that the strength was taken out of bolted wheat or flour. That was their home life.

David Lipscomb stood as a giant oak in the wilderness when the wolves of digression were almost sweeping the church back into the swamps of denominationalism, from which the early Pioneers had rescued it. J. B. Briney, in those days, cartooned brother Lipscomb as an old woman, in a Mother Hubbard dress

with broom, trying to sweep back the tide of the sea, and I suspect that Briney, deep down in his heart, knew that the old sister had turned the tide. I have heard Brother Lipscomb say that the smallest departure from God's word would open the flood gate to digression. He said that when preachers and elders got to calling meetings to discuss plans for carrying out the work of the church there was always the danger of some one suggesting an unscriptural plan. Any one that knows anything about the digressive movement, knows that every missionary society that has ever been organized, in the Restoration Movement, had its beginning that way.

In 1910 the church in Henderson, Tennessee called a meeting of the preachers and elders of that area to discuss plans for putting a preacher in that field. Their plan called for the congregations, in that area, to send their contributions to the Henderson church and the elders of that congregation would hire the preacher and put him in the field. The only responsibility that the contributing churches had in the matter was to send their contributions to the Henderson church. When Brother Lipscomb heard of the plan he wrote an article pointing out the danger and the unscripturalness of the plan. His article caused quite a furor among some brethren. In June of that year, on my way to Canada, I stopped off in Cincinnati, Ohio and spent the night with Brother Fred Rowe, editor of the Christian Leader. He was fuming about Brother Lipscomb's article. He said David Lipscomb went about with a chip on his shoulder, criticizing everything brethren wanted to do that was not started in Nashville. The Henderson plan mis-carried; it was never put in operation.

Maybe Brother Lipscomb was wrong (?), the Henderson plan had been operating among the digressives for more than sixty years, at that time, and it would go over with a bang among the "loyal" brethren of today.

The last time I saw Brother Lipscomb his mind was almost a blank, he was sitting in his large arm chair with his Bible open in his lap. Sister Lipscomb talked before him about his going as though he was going off on a vacation. She said, "Brother Lewis, Mr. Lipscomb is just waiting for the end to come." She said, "I have already selected his pallbearers." At this time I can only recall four that she named: John E. Dunn, John T. Lewis, S. H. Hall and H. Leo Boles. Her wishes were not carried out in this respect. Brother Lipscomb was dead and buried before I heard of his passing.

Brother Boles told me that when the end came, Sister Lipscomb came in, and kneeling by his bed said, "Lord receive his spirit," got up and went on out of the room. She knew that his suffering was over, and that her going would soon follow. Therefore, instead of weeping and wondering what would become of her, she was rejoicing in the "precious and exceeding great promises" of the God they had faithfully served together for so many years. Surely the world was made better for them having lived in it.

INTRODUCTION

Why write a biography of David Lipscomb? This question naturally is asked by every interested reader. Of course the author asked himself this many times before beginning the research necessary to complete the project. Having satisfied himself that there is a need for such a work, he has spent the necessary time in preparation of the material.

David Lipscomb filled a unique and important role among the people claiming to restore New Testament Christianity in the half century that followed the Civil War. The **Gospel Advocate,** although started by Tolbert Fanning and William Lipscomb in 1855, died at the beginning of the war. No doubt it would have remained so were it not for David Lipscomb's vision and tireless labors. Realizing what a great role the paper would play for the church in the South during the reconstruction era, Lipscomb worked hard to revive it. He worked equally hard to keep it going during days of financial reverses, so that largely through his sacrifices the **Gospel Advocate** has taken its place among the leading religious journals of the South. Lipscomb's teaching through the paper for fifty years consolidated a large portion of the brotherhood around his position. Today, the **Gospel Advocate** stands as a worthy monument to David Lipscomb.

Likewise, Lipscomb played a major role in the establishment of both the Fanning Orphan School and the Nashville Bible School. The former of these no longer exists, but the latter is now David Lipscomb College, one of Nashville, Tennessee's leading educational institutions. Indirectly, Lipscomb influenced the establishment of other colleges by not only encouraging their founding but influenced the men who did.

In his day the name of Lipscomb was familiar in religious circles over the South. This is nothing short of amazing when one considers that he was neither a great speaker or debater. Lipscomb's simple faith in the Bible as the inspired word of God was set off by his aggressiveness for this principle. In a unique way this was more largely embodied in Lipscomb than in others of his generation.

Still, in the writing of Lipscomb's biography there are many problems. A paucity of material in some areas of his life makes it necessary to give these less attention than one would desire. Only a few scattered comments enlighten us about his childhood and youth. The same is true of his home life, places of residence, and general domestic relations. In editing a paper Lipscomb felt it unwise to say too much about himself, his life and experiences. While this modesty is admirable, it is hard on a historian.

A greater problem arises in placing the proper evaluation upon certain types of material. The few elderly people today who remember Lipscomb pass on stories of his life. Sometimes the memory of these people is inaccurate. How far one is justified in recording these reminiscences as authentic history is not an easy matter to decide.

Finally, the author has felt a problem in the presenting of background material. His two volumes, **THE SEARCH FOR THE ANCIENT ORDER,** touches frequently on the life of Lipscomb, and goes into great detail on brotherhood background. In writing Lipscomb's biography the author has tried to avoid too much repetition of this material already presented in these two volumes. Still he recognizes that many who read this biography will not have access to the other work. He has, therefore, constantly wrestled with the problem of how much of this background to include. Whether he has included too much or too little is largely a matter of opinion.

At any rate, **t**he collection of the material and the task of putting it into the form of a biography has been enjoyable in the extreme.

June 29, 1953 —EARL WEST

CHAPTER I

THE NESTOR OF THE BROTHERHOOD

On a late summer day Franklin County, Tennessee, could be as balmy as anywhere else in the world, the warm sunlight early on a Lord's Day morning as pleasant and the southern breeze as redolent as one could ever desire. Normally the few citizens of Huntland, in the southern part of the county, would welcome a Sunday morning at this time of the year. The nearby farmers would go slowly about their chores as though they had no care in the world. Later in the morning church bells would announce the time for worship, and the citizens, neatly but simply attired, would move slowly toward the places of meeting. Almost nothing ever happened around Huntland to cause excitement. **Almost.** that is, for on this first Sunday of September in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and one, things were happening.

Tragedy had struck the town with lightning swiftness early in the preceding week, and the shock from it had not yet fully subsided. People were bolting their doors with unusual care before retiring at night. A knock would cause an anxious house-wife to peer fearfully around the edge of the curtain to identify the caller before opening the door. Women whose husbands happened to be gone walked the' floor at night, jumping at every unusual sound. Perhaps so late in the week there was no need for this nervousness. The Negro who had brutally murdered a woman in the presence of her two children had been caught, and a frenzied mob had burned the culprit alive. By Sunday morning the event was still the chief topic of conversation.

Moreover, the brethren in the town were to begin a meeting in their new building. Although it was to be short, lasting only from September first through the eighth, it was in no sense of the term just another meeting with the congregation. For weeks they had worked toward it, and for days had talked of it. The tragedy of the week struck closer to home for the brethren than for others. Not only were they saddened over the misfortune to the woman and her family, but they knew the excitement would hurt the meeting.[1]

[1] **Gospel Advocate, 1901, p. 616.**

But in spite of the excitement the brethren went ahead with their plans. A few of them had been meeting in the town for some time, but they had never possessed a building. The Old Salem congregation three miles out in the country had sensed their need and had gone to work to build them a simple but commodious little meeting house, only recently completed. No services had yet been held in it. The brethren were understandably proud of their building and determined to start off their work with a meeting. In this case there was no question at all who should do the preaching.

"Old Salem" was the home congregation for the Lipscomb family since back before the Civil War. Most of the members were either directly or indirectly connected with the family. There were John Lipscomb and wife, Jim Breeden and wife, Ike Vanzant, T. T. Mosley and their wives, cultured Jane Lipscomb and her daughter, Ellen Gardner, and Simon Perry, who for years was the treasurer of the congregation. Then there was the aged Mrs. Tahpenes Hunt, along with her only daughter and her husband, Mr. and Mrs. H. R. Moore. These three were among the number who had gone to Huntland and had worked to establish the congregation. They also were related to the Lipscomb family. So, when it came to considering a preacher for the opening meeting, they were all settled on that. They would ask David Lipscomb to come down from Nashville.

The only question that concerned them was, "Can he come?" For two years he had refused to hold any meetings. Now in his seventieth year, there was the grim possibility that Lipscomb's health had broken too much for him to conduct any more evangelistic meetings. Most of his preaching for the past two years had been done sitting down. Also, there was his school work to be considered. The fall term of the Nashville Bible School would be opening the latter part of September, and Lipscomb would be busy teaching two classes every day. So, it was agreed that if he should come, he could do so early in the month to give him time to get back for his classes. Under such circumstances David Lipscomb could hardly refuse the urgent request to conduct this meeting.

As he walked amidst these nostalgic scenes, Lipscomb's emotions gave way to a certain melancholy. In this neighborhood he had been reared as a child. But Time, the great artist, with ceaseless brush was forever changing her portraits. The picture was vastly different than it had been nearly seventy years before. Many of his relatives were gone, and those remaining were showing their age. The landscape had changed and scientific progress had left its mark even here. Lipscomb brooded, too, over the tragedy of the previous week, and his mind returned to the plight of the Negro, a concern that had frequently occupied his attention in his earlier years.

At the appointed time the meeting ended, and Lipscomb returned *to* Nashville to take up his classes at the Bible School and continue his editorial work with the **Gospel Advocate.** The feeling of nostalgia left, and although David Lipscomb could not have known it then, he had sixteen more years "to follow the will of God, as expressed in precept or by approved example; to stand on safe ground, and to be sure of the approval and blessing of God."[2]

If in the sweep of seventy years, one can see changes in the physical landscape, *one* as discerning as David Lipscomb could see them even more among the people who had started out advocating a restoration of New Testament Christianity. As he grew older and looked back upon his life's work, Lipscomb felt that his greatest contribution was to stand solidly between two opposing parties that had developed in the movement.

> Our position (he wrote) has been a peculiar one. We have been identified with a people that started out to return to unsectarian, Bible Christianity. They have divided into two parties, each turning in different directions. We have stood between them. It is part of human nature to form parties, become sectarian, and reject the oneness of the people and church of God. We have tried to stand between the two parties on the foundation of truth.[3]

[2]**Gospel Advocate,** 1896, p. 4.
[3]**Gospel Advocate,** 1908, p. 9.

The two parties to which Lipscomb had reference were those represented by the **Christian Standard** and **Christian-Evangelist** on the one side and the **Octographic Review** on the other. The former was more liberal or "digressive"—a term so distasteful to Lipscomb that he seldom used it. The latter was so ultra-conservative that it magnified small matters to the point of losing sight of the gospel.

> When a man makes a hobby of the order of worship, (he wrote) he has lost interest in the more important question that all should be taught to worship God. When a man begins to insist this one should not teach here and there, this class of people or that, it means he has lost interest in the great commission of the Master, "Teach all nations," "Preach the gospel to every creature." Usually when a man mounts a hobby, it is useless to argue with him. The leaner the hobby, the harder the hobbyist will ride it.[4]

It was quite naturally Lipscomb's wish that both of these extremes would die out. "My proposition is," he continued, "that we turn all our hobbies out to graze where they can, let all the disputes over the 'anise and cummin' of religion have a year's rest, and let us devote ourselves to preaching the gospel of Christ, to saving sinners and building up the kingdom of God on earth."[5]

Lipscomb's self-appraisal of his own life's work may not readily be appreciated by many. Usually he that walks down the middle of the road will have mud thrown on him from both sides. Lipscomb's ceaseless attacks against the missionary society and instrumental music produced few admirers from the opposition, and his earnest advocacy of teaching the Bible in schools produced him equally few from the **Octographic Review.** But still, it is nothing short of amazing that David Lipscomb could see that the major problem underlying many of the issues that would face his brethren in the future would be the tendency to drift into one or the other of these extremes. Extremes play against each other, and in a measure, each promotes the cause of the other.

[4]**Gospel Advocate**, 1908, p. 9.
[5]**Gospel Advocate**, 1908, p. 9.

Whatever may be the estimate placed upon David Lipscomb's work, no impartial witness can fail to recognize the greatness in the man. It was a thoughtful James A. Harding who, upon seeing Lipscomb when he was seventy-five, wrote:

> In my judgment, since Campbell died, no man among us has been so powerful with the pen. At seventy-five he is still an intellectual giant. He is not an orator; but no orator has ever moved me as he does. Had I not clinched my teeth and pressed my lips together, I would have sobbed aloud; and in spite of me, the tears would flow. It is said that when Pitt spoke at his best, a torrent of logic, red-hot with passion, flowed like a rushing river. But when David Lipscomb speaks at his best, a great, calm, clear stream drawn from the Bible and from nature, a stream of truth that enlightens the mind, warms the heart and mightily moves the will, fills me. He is the Nestor of the brotherhood, the sage of Nashville, one of the greatest of the great men of the ages.[6]

An anonymous person, writing in the **Apostolic Guide** in 1896 declared that in terms of "direct personal influence" he was **the** most remarkable man in the brotherhood since the days of Alexander Campbell and Benjamin Franklin "if we except **perhaps** Isaac Errett."

One who would look for the secret of Lipscomb's greatness would find the answer curiously simple and yet complex. There was certainly nothing in his looks to indicate greatness. He was a little above the average height but stocky in his build, a curious fact when it is recalled that he was never a hearty eater. He wore a full beard of only moderate length, a fully round head set on a short neck. In his mature life he had **iron-gray hair** which gradually whitened as he grew older.

His dress was extremely plain. Most of his clothes were made by his wife. Although his dress was always clean, **he** spent little concern upon the fashions of the day. A few pernickety folk were sometimes amazed by what seemed to them carelessness In his attire, but in Lipscomb's estimation there were too many more important things in life than fashions in clothing. At no time in his life did anybody ever accuse him of being even slightly handsome. As a matter of fact some of his

[6]**Gospel Advocate,** 1906, p. 369.

closest admirers conceded that he was the ugliest man they ever saw.

Like his dress, his life also was simple. One of his mottoes was, "Let your moderation be known to all men," and this he tried to do. He used tobacco in no form, but because he liked its smell he frequently carried some in his pocket so that he could occasionally take it out and enjoy its odor. He drank nothing stronger than tea, and that only seldom. He participated little in sports, particularly hunting. He never fired a gun in his life.

In terms of personal disposition he ran between the sedate and somber. Seldom did anything upset him. He could take the most vitriolic criticisms in full stride. Life to him was serious, but in his own way, he squeezed from it the last full measure of enjoyment. Life with him was serious but never dull. There was no ring of hypocrisy anywhere in his make-up. He could never for the sake of courtesy tell a falsehood. He spoke what he believed to be the truth in blunt frankness at all times. This frankness was offensive to many people, but those who knew Lipscomb intimately knew that he meant no unkindness.

David Lipscomb's charitableness was at times amazing. His own independent way of thinking led him to certain convictions that he would compromise for no man. But he never expected other men to think as he did on all points. He would assail another man's position mercilessly but there was no vindictiveness in his spirit. It was his nature to be pointed in his barbs and ruthless in his attacks. But he did not expect everybody to do things his way. He realized that men's dispositions were different. He knew that all men had personal weaknesses and toward these he attempted to show the strongest spirit of forbearance.

"The sage of Nashville," to use Harding's sobriquet, was by no means the most eloquent preacher in the South in his day. He could never move an audience like T. B. Larimore or E. A. Elam. In the pulpit his manner was direct, kindly, sincere and earnest. He used the plainest of language. There were no big words to show off his erudition, and no stilted phrases to display his ability at rhetoric. There was nothing rough or dogmatic,

nor anything offensive or polemic. He spoke as a man who had a message from God to give to men, and his only concern was that they should understand the sermon. He never told stories to arouse the emotions. His distaste for stories can be seen in the fact that he looked upon preachers' yarns as manufactured lies to build up emotionalism. He was no master at homiletics. Very often, he would read a whole chapter, and comment upon it, and that would constitute his sermon. But because his comments were always revealing, showing thought and originality, the fact that he was going to preach at any place at a certain time was enough to insure the presence of a good audience.

David Lipscomb's greatness did not lie in his polemic ability. In an age when debating was extremely popular he conducted only two debates in his life. "I tried in both instances," he wrote, "to be kind and gentle in manner, but firm and steadfast for the truth." He made no attempt to make a name for himself in this particular kind of pugilism, saying, "I still much prefer a discussion that will magnify the points of agreement and emphasize kindly the points of disagreement."[7]

The keynote in Lipscomb's greatness lies in the strong passion he possessed to do the will of God. He believed in the most passionate manner that the Bible is the word of God, God's revelation of His will to man. By ardently studying this Bible men could know the way God would have them live. He had no patience with any movement or teaching that would tend to keep man from relying wholeheartedly upon the Scriptures. His life's work, as he conceived it, was to preach the gospel faithfully, and to oppose vigorously any influence that would encourage man to think he could be saved by a failure to follow the teachings of the Bible. David Lipscomb was a man of courage, of deep and undying faith, of kindness and charity.

> The cardinal thought in my religion (he wrote) has ever been to follow the will of God, as expressed in precept or by approved example; to stand on safe ground; to be sure of the approval and blessing of God. Guided by this principle, we took our position in favor of following the approved examples of scriptures in spreading the gospel—and urged it.[8]

[7] **Gospel Advocate,** 1912, p. 1261.
[8] **Gospel Advocate,** 1896, p. 4.

CHAPTER II

THE LIPSCOMB FAMILY

Many have undertaken to write the history of the Lipscomb family, and too often their accounts are filled with inaccuracies. One of the chief difficulties lies in the fondness of the Lipscomb family for the names, David, William, Granville, Dabney and John. It is not always easy to know whether William, for instance, is meant to refer to the uncle, the grandson, or the grandfather of David Lipscomb. Only by extreme care can the family history be fully and accurately traced.

David Lipscomb's line runs back to the Lipscomb family of Louisa County, Virginia, coming from Thomas Lipscomb, a soldier of the Revolutionary War. Back of Thomas Lipscomb the family records are fond of saying that his father, Joel, a soldier in the army of the Duke of Monmouth, landed in Jamestown, Virginia in 1690. The Duke, revolting against the Roman Catholic government of James II was overthrown in the Battle of Sedgemore, near Bridgewater, England on July 13, 1685. The Duke was executed in London for high treason, but Joel Lipscomb fled for his life to America, settling finally in Spottsylvania County, Virginia. Joel Lipscomb had two sons, John and Thomas. John drifted to Kentucky and was killed by the Indians. The Lipscomb family, then, descended from Thomas.

Thomas Lipscomb was born in King William County in the year 1730. In 1755 he married Mary Smith of Green Bay, Virginia, who was a near relative of "Extra Billy" Smith, one of Virginia's early governors. At the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, Thomas enlisted as an ensign in Captain Reuben Lipscomb's Company of the Seventh Virginia Regiment which was commanded by Col. Alexander McClanahan. The record shows that he was commissioned a captain on November 28, 1776. His enlistment occurred only a month earlier to the day.

When Thomas Lipscomb was released from the service on May 20, 1778, he was awarded 2,666 acres of land. And even though he appointed William Bird, Jr. and John Piemont as his attorneys, he was to be involved in considerable legal trouble

over this land grant. However, judging from the records of land transactions, Thomas Lipscomb must have become a wealthy man. The records show that on October 21, 1773, he secured for 205 pounds currency from Clayton Coleman and wife, Mary, 670 acres on the branches of East North East River in Spottsylvania County. On August 16, 1781 he and his wife sold 400 acres in Spottsylvania County for 4,000 pounds to Francis King of Maryland. On January 6, 1795, Thomas and Mary Lipscomb sold to the same man a hundred acres for 74 pounds and ten shillings. This land was located in Berkeley Parish in Spottsylvania County. The next year, however, he purchased 305 acres nearby. That same fall of 1796 he sold 685 acres for 275 pounds to Allen Billingsby of Maryland.

A further indication of his wealth may be seen in the fact that when his daughter, Elizabeth, married Benjamin Waller, Jr., Thomas gave Elizabeth two Negro girls for a wedding present. Elizabeth died shortly before 1791, and the two girls were given to her son, Granville Waller. The paucity of material will allow no further pursuit of either Thomas Lipscomb's wealth or of the facts of his life, except to say that his death occurred in the year, 1799.[1] From here the story of the Lipscomb family follows through the lives of his children.

Thomas and Mary Lipscomb were parents of seven sons and one daughter. The daughter, Elizabeth, as has already been seen, married Benjamin Waller of Spottsylvania County. The exact date of her death is unknown although the records indicate she died before 1791. The seven sons were Thomas, Nathan, Joel, David, Dabney, John and William. For purposes of clarification it may be well to state at this point that David Lipscomb, the subject of this book, was the grandson of both the William and David mentioned here. His father, Granville, was the son of William, and his mother, Nancy, was the daughter of David. It is possible to give only a brief sketch in some cases of the lives of each of the seven sons.[2]

[1]Heitman, **Historical Register of Officers of The Continental Army** (1775-83) p. 266.
[2]From **a manuscript written by Dr. Thomas** Lipscomb in 1877.

Joel was born in 1760 in Spottsylvania County. He married Elizabeth Chiles and moved to South Carolina. His brother, Nathan, married about the same time and also moved to South Carolina with him. They lived in Abbeyville district. Joel received a deed of land from his father in 1793. He reared seven sons and three daughters. The daughters were Elizabeth, Mary and Sally. Elizabeth married a man by the name of McMinn. She died about the close of the Civil War at Enterprise, Mississippi. Joel Lipscomb's sons were named Nathan, Joel, Elihu, Abner, Dabney, William and Thomas. Abner became a noted southern lawyer. Dabney studied medicine and moved to Columbus, Mississippi. Joel Lipscomb died in 1836 in Green County, Alabama.

Nathan, the third child of Thomas Lipscomb, married Tahpenes Bullock in Virginia, and moved to South Carolina. They had three sons—John, Granville, and Thomas. Of his later life and death nothing is known.

John was the sixth child of Thomas Lipscomb. He was born in 1756 in Spottsylvania County, and died in 1824. He married Judith Day, a sister to Martha Day who had married his brother, David. John spent his life in Spottsylvania County. [3] He was elected to the Virginia State Legislature from 1822-24. John reared a large family—five sons and eight daughters. The sons were, Ira Ellis, Thomas Harris, Dabney, Benjamin, and John. The daughters were, Jane Duerson, Emily Lewis, Judith Day, Martha Ellen, Sallie, Betsy, Lucy Ann, and Molly. Concerning the daughters, it may be said that Sallie married James Barclay; Martha Ellen never married. She was born on April 13, 1820. Early in life she belonged to the New Hope Baptist Church in Spottsylvania County. Later in life she became a member of the Corinth congregation in Todd County, Kentucky. She died in Franklin County, Tennessee, July 16, 1895.3 Thomas Harris married his first cousin, Mary Lipscomb, sister to Granville Lipscomb, David Lipscomb's father. Mary died very early in Virginia.

[3]**Gospel Advocate,** 1896, p. 61

Dabney Lipscomb, another son of Thomas, died very early in life never having married.

The two remaining sons of Thomas Lipscomb, David and William must be given more attention. It has already been suggested that David Lipscomb, the subject of this volume, was the son of Granville and Nancy Lipscomb. Granville and Nancy were first cousins. Nancy was the daughter of David, son of Thomas; and Granville was the son of William. Thus, David Lipscomb's maternal grandfather was also named David Lipscomb, and from every indication was quite an illustrious character.

David was the fourth son of Thomas Lipscomb. He married Martha Day and settled in Louisa County. He had only two sons, Nathan and Thomas. Both sons married, moved to Georgia and settled near Lagrange, Georgia. There were also four daughters born to David. Martha never married. Elizabeth married Dr. Lunsford Lindsey, who was partially instrumental in converting the Lipscomb family from the Baptists. Dr. Lindsey and wife moved to Hopkinsville, Kentucky. They began to read Alexander Campbell's **Christian Baptist.** Shortly after Granville and Nancy Lipscomb married they made a trip to Hopkinsville to visit the Lindseys, and here Granville saw a copy of the paper for the first time. He then subscribed to it, and was later converted. Mrs. Lindsey and Nancy Lipscomb were the only children in the elder David Lipscomb's family to leave the Baptists.[4]

Grandfather David Lipscomb was earnestly religious despite the fact he never became a member of the church of Christ. He was a deacon in the Lower Gold Mine Baptist Church in Louisa County. This was the first Baptist Church constituted in the county. It was established in 1770, and was known at first as Thompson's Meetinghouse after David Thompson, the first preacher. In 1791 George Morris, then the preacher for the congregation, led the church in a division. But Morris, along with the majority, held to Thompson's Meetinghouse. A church building was erected in 1805. William Waller preached here

[4]David Lipscomb, "Dr. Lunsford Lindsay," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXII - No. 30, Sept. 23, 1880, p. 619.

from 1807 to 1818, and William Y. Hiter from 1818 to 1848. Andrew Broadus and Robert Semple, familiar names in Virginia Baptist circles in those days, often visited the Lower Gold Mine congregations Grandfather David Lipscomb's home was their home while in Louisa County. He lived to be a very old man. He had a favorite son in his old age whom he had not seen for many years. Young David Lipscomb was only a boy when that son committed suicide, but he nevertheless received the job of telling Grandfather David the news. He waited a long time to break the news for fear the shock would be too great for the old man, but finally told him. But the old man was not moved, and simply said: "Well, well, I am beyond the age when these things trouble me much." So there is hardly any doubt that he partook of the same prejudices against the "Campbellites" as these intrepid Virginia Baptists.

But if Grandfather David never changed from the Baptists, the restoration movement was still not unknown in his vicinity. W. K. Pendleton came from Louisa County. The Gilboa congregation of which he was a member was established in 1834. It was sometime later before the word of the Lord was planted nearer the home of Grandfather David. In 1866 J. M. Baker wrote to the **Gospel Advocate** that he was then living in the home of Grandfather David, and that eight or nine years before he had established a congregation called "Enon" on Grandfather David's land in Louisa County. The congregation had met "fairly regularly" through the Civil War. After the war, in August, 1866, R. L. Coleman had conducted a meeting here with ten additions. The aged Silas Shelburne was on hand often to encourage the new congregation.[6]

On the paternal side, David Lipscomb's grandparents were William Lipscomb and Ann Day Cook Lipscomb. In Louisa County, William lived not far from his brother David, on Lower Gold Mine Creek near the farm of Moses White. William was the fifth child of Thomas. He was born in 1779. William died in

[5]Malcolm H. Harris, **History of Louisa County, Virginia,** (Richmond, The
Dietz Press, 1936).
[6]**Gospel Advocate,** 1866, pp. 608, 605.

1829 in Franklin County, Tennessee as a result of a tree falling on his head. His widow lived on until 1867.

Ann Day Cooke was born on August 8, 1778. She was the daughter of Elder William Cooke, a Virginia Baptist preacher. Her father performed the ceremony that united her with William Lipscomb on December 22, 1796.[7] Elder Cooke was born in Orange about 1740 and was reared in Spottsylvania County by an uncle John Day. He lived in Louisa County, near Little River, close to Buckner. He preached for the Little River Baptist Church for many years. He was married three times. Ann Day was his first daughter by his second wife, Ann Nelson. Ann Day was the niece of Thomas Nelson of Hanover County, Virginia.

In early life Ann Day became a member of the Little River Baptist Church in Virginia where her father preached. When she and her family moved to Franklin County, Tennessee in 1826, she united with the Baptist Church on Bean's Creek. It was not until 1842 that she left the Baptists and united with the church of Christ meeting near Salem.

In some respects she was an eccentric old lady. "She stamped her own unpretending, laborious character and impatient temperament very largely upon her family" was the way David Lipscomb summarized her life.[8] She seldom rode to worship services, but generally insisted on walking the two or three miles to the building. In later life she made her home with her daughter, Mrs. Tahpenes Hunt. Her home was in the line of Sherman's march and was stripped of every possession.

William and Ann Day Cooke Lipscomb were parents of six boys and five girls. The girls were, Mary, Elizabeth, Ann, Frances, and Tahpenes. Mary, as has already been stated, married her cousin, Thomas Harris Lipscomb, and died very early in Virginia. Elizabeth married James Collins. Francis Cook Lipscomb married Isaac Van Zandt, and died in 1909. This was "Aunt Fanny" to David Lipscomb, a woman much endeared to him.

Isaac Van Zandt lost considerable wealth in the panic of 1837, so two years later, in quest of a new beginning moved to

[7]Heitman, op. cit. p. 266.
[8]**Gospel Advocate,** 1870, pp. 401, 2.

Texas. His previous studies in law now served him well, and before long he was elected to the Texas Congress. He was also sent to the United States as a minister from the Republic of Texas and was one of the individuals that helped negotiate the treaty of annexation. He died in 1847 while a candidate for governor.

"Aunt Fanny" was born in Louisa County, on March 4, 1816. She married Isaac Van Zandt in 1833. She died at the home of a daughter, Mrs. I. V. Jarvis, near Fort Worth, Texas in the spring of 1909.

"Aunt Tappie" was another favorite aunt of David Lipscomb's. She spent her life in Franklin County. She married C. A. Hunt, and had one daughter who married H. R. Moore.

Of the sons Granville, David Lipscomb's father, was the eldest. He was born close to the year 1800. Granville married three times. His first wife was Ellen Duerson. A daughter, Kenen was the only child from this union. Kenen married Prof. N. B. Smith, the professor of mathematics at Franklin College about 1849.

Granville's second wife was Nancy Lipscomb, his first cousin, daughter of David. Nancy, five years older than Granville, so the *story* goes, refused to marry Granville at first so he married a rich young heiress, Ellen Duesan. After her death, Granville went back to Virginia and wooed his cousin again, and she accepted. Two sons were born to them—William and David. Nancy died in 1836 in Illinois. Three other children died in infancy about the same time. Granville returned to Franklin County, Tennessee, in 1836, courted Miss Jane Breeden, who had only recently moved from Fredricksburg, Virginia to teach school, Miss Jane refused, and Granville succeeded in winning her only after getting the help of an old Mr. Simmons who insisted that Granville Lipscomb was the smartest man in the county, and that Miss Jane could not afford to pass up the chance to marry him. They were married August 11, 1837. Three sons were born to them, Granville, John, and Horace G. Granville was one of the fine preachers of middle Tennessee. His death occurred in

[9] Gospel Advocate, 1906, p. 201.

1910. John married Annie Smith. Annie attended the school at Fayetteville, Arkansas, of which Robert Graham was president. She was married by T. F. Moseley about the beginning of the Civil War to John Lipscomb when she was very young. She lived in Franklin County. During the war, her father was taken from his house, blindfolded, and shot by Federal soldiers. She never recovered from the shock.

Horace G. Lipscomb stayed with his half-brother, David, near Nashville during a part of his young manhood. He worked for awhile on the **Gospel Advocate** but for the most part was in the hardware business in the city.

William Lipscomb's second son, next to Granville, was also named William. He was born in 1802 and died in December, 1877. He also lived in Franklin County, David Lipscomb described him as "an honorable, high-toned man, hospitable after the old Virginia style, a zealous member of the Baptist Church."[10] Unlike the other Lipscombs in Franklin County, he would never leave the Bean's Creek Baptist Church.

Dabney was another son of William and Ann Day Cooke Lipscomb. He was born in Louisa County, May 10, 1805. He was the fifth child born to the family. Dabney in early life was a leader among the family of boys. Later in life he studied medicine, moved to Middleton in Carroll County, Mississippi, and there married Milliscent Scrivener. To them were born ten children. Dr. Dabney M. Lipscomb moved to Texas. For a time he lost some of his interest in the church, but later revived it. He helped build up the church in Grapevine, Texas. He died there in April, 1885.[11]

Ira, another son of William and Ann Lipscomb, died early in life. John died at the age of forty. But little has been left of the lives of either.

In the story that follows references will be frequently made to the family as the individuals touched the life of David Lipscomb.

[10] **Gospel Advocate,** 1878, pp. 11, 105

[11] David Lipscomb, "Dr. D. M. Lipscomb," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXVII, **No. 22, (June** 3, 1885) p. 339.

CHAPTER III

"... SOWING SEED FROM WHICH ONE DAY A RICH HARVEST WILL BE GATHERED ..."

There is something strange about man's restless ways, but for William Lipscomb in the fall of 1826 there was nothing strange about the desire to move from Louisa County, Virginia, to the lower part of middle Tennessee. What if some of his brothers and their families did still live in Virginia! Others had scattered to South Carolina, Georgia, and on to Alabama or Mississippi. This land on Lower Gold Mine Creek positively was not what it used to be! It was all a man could do to scratch out a living for a wife and eleven children. Out to the west, the land was new, and rich, and fertile. With only a few dollars he could buy himself a good farm, make twice the money there that he was making here in Virginia, and besides that, he could sit back and wait for the price of that land to go up. Who knows what William Lipscomb might be worth some day! No sir, it was time to load up the wife and children and the few belongings, and be away from Louisa County.

Besides, going to Franklin County in Tennessee was not nearly so dangerous as it ur=d to be—General Andrew Jackson had seen to that. There might have been a time fifteen years ago when a man would be taking his own life in his hands. The Cherokee and the Creek, growing tired of the white man's attempt to swallow up their lands, were almost continually on the war path. But "Old Hickory" had stopped them. Treaties had been signed, and the Indians, however reluctantly, had moved on west across the Mississippi River.

Franklin County was new and challenging. The plows of only a few white men had ever turned the soil. Established on December 3, 1807 the county was formed from parts of Warren and Bedford Counties. It was located on the eastern fringe of Middle Tennessee with Winchester as the county seat. Most of the old land grants in the county had been made by North Carolina to her Revolutionary War soldiers while the county was

a part of that state. Jacob Van Zandt had come from Rutherford County, North Carolina in 1817 and settled near Winchester. His son, Isaac, later won the fair heart of Francis Lipscomb. Even the very earliest of settlers had not been there too long when William Lipscomb's wagon crossed the county line in the fall of 1826.

There had been Major Russell who settled on Boiling Fork near what later became known as Cowan. Then came Jesse Bean, who built his cabin down on the creek, and for a permanent legacy, gave his name to the stream. In 1806 the families of Larkin and Hunt came along. Tahpenes Lipscomb was wooed by one of the Hunt boys later, so "Aunt Tappie" became Mrs. C. A. Hunt.

The early settlers knew they had to make a living, so they spent their time farming. The sparsely inhabited county was largely an unbroken, primeval forest. In this fresh and productive land the farmers raised good crops, mostly cotton. They also raised hogs and mules, and traded the mules to the buyers that would come up from the deep south to take the mules on down to the large plantation owners. Business and social life centered around the little community of Salem, near the Lipscomb home. An old stage coach road, running from Nashville to Huntsville in Alabama, ran through here. Coming into Salem, a mile above or below the community, the driver would blow his horn as a signal for the others to have the horses ready. In the monotony of the early days, this was a big event.[1]

By 1810 Franklin County was well on its way to becoming a leading cotton producer. It was time now to lay out the site for the county seat. If the county had been named for the great statesman, Benjamin Franklin, why not name the county seat for Colonel James Winchester! The idea seemed to take, so the twenty-six acres of land which the commissioners had purchased from Christopher Bullard for the price of one dollar, now became the county seat of Winchester. Watching the development of the county with a casual interest, was "the quaintest, most striking,

[1]F. D. Srygley, **Biographies and Sermons,** (Nashville, Tenn., McQuiddy Prt. Co. 1899) pp. 160-62.

most original figure in southwestern history"—David Crockett. Moving to the county two years before the county seat was laid cut with his wife and two children, Crockett spent his time with his trusty rifle, and good friend, James Hatchett. Their initials, carved in many a tree along Bean's Creek and near Salem, were long a memorial of the exploits of these two nimrods.

Once settled in the County, William Lipscomb lost little time in selecting a farm site. It was to be January, 1828, before the land grant was completed, but the transaction was worth it. For the sum of three thousand seven hundred and forty dollars he had purchased four hundred and sixty acres. Whatever dreams he may have cherished in the way of future profit from the land were cut short. The records succinctly say that he died when a falling tree hit him on the head in 1826.

There were trying days indeed for the family that was left. At first there was the problem of getting located, then of building the cabin, and then of planting the crops or looking after the many other difficult details of earning a living. Then suddenly Granville's first wife died, leaving him with an infant, daughter. Of course there would be plenty of help, but Granville wanted a mother for his girl. His thoughts turned back to Louisa County, and to the home of his uncle, David. Once before, he had been interested in marrying Nancy, his cousin. But she had refused. After all, she was five years older than he. Besides, they were cousins, and Nancy preferred not to marry so close a relative. But Granville decided to ask her once more. So, leaving his family in Franklin County, he returned to Louisa County in the hope of having better success. This time, he was the victor, so in the spring of 1828, he returned to Franklin County with his wife, Nancy Lipscomb.

June 20, 1829 their first child, a son, was born. There was no argument but that he should be called, William, after Granville's father, the babe's grandfather, who so recently had been killed. True to the style through the years, Granville chose to call him "Billy."

Modes of conveyance may not have been the most comfortable or the fastest, but then as now, when people wanted to travel to visit their relatives, they usually found a way to go. Nancy's sister, Elizabeth, a quiet and meek girl had married Dr. Lunsford Lindsey, and they had moved from Louisa County to Hopkinsville, Kentucky. The fact that Keren was still a small girl, and Billy was only a baby need not interfere with their plans. They would go to Hopkinsville and visit Elizabeth and her husband.

The diffident Dr. Lindsey surprised Granville completely. He was reading a paper, the **Christian Baptist,** edited by one Alexander Campbell of Bethany, Virginia. The fact that the unassuming, quiet Dr. Lindsey would read the writings of the truculent Campbell must indicate that Campbell had something worthwhile to say. This man, Campbell, was saying something that all should ponder. Granville read and liked it. Upon returning to Franklin County, he, too, subscribed to the paper.

Granville was slow of speech, and even stammered a little. Maybe he could not preach very effectively, but he would do the best he could. The **Christian Baptist** was turned over to John and Dabney, two of Granville's favorite brothers. They read, and they too, liked what they read. They learned, however, very shortly that not everybody approved. They found the people at the Bean's Creek Baptist Church where they attended reluctant to accept the Bible only as the all sufficient rule of faith and practice. Curious eyes looked in their direction. This look soon changed from one of curiosity to dislike and. finally to heated rejection. Granville, Dabney and John, for advocating the New Testament as the only rule of faith and practice, were expelled from the Church. So then, in 1830 the three brothers and their families united with a "Newlight"—Barton W. Stone type—congregation near Owl Hollow in Franklin County.

January 21, 1831 another son was born. If Billy had been named after his paternal grandfather, it was only fair and right that this son should be named after his maternal one. So, he was called David Lipscomb. Three other children were born to the union but they were destined to die in their infancy.

Religious Life

Meanwhile, Granville continued to work on the farm. His crops made him money; the price of land was increasing, so he was able to own a few slaves. No day was too long or too busy to prevent his studying the Bible. He loved it, and read the Bible morning, noon and night. Upon accepting it as his only authority in religion, he determined to know what it taught, and then teach it to others. With his broken speech and stammering tongue, he taught the Scriptures to his household, white and black alike.

The Old Salem congregation began in May, 1834 with two white male members and two female. Also, five colored people belonged. By Christmas of that year the number had grown to thirty-four whites and twelve blacks. Preachers were scarce commodities, but occasionally one would come to Franklin County. B. F. Hall came down from Georgetown, Kentucky, in the fall of 1834. Absalom Adams, then evangelizing in Middle Tennessee with Tolbert Fanning, came by the same year. Alexander Graham, "an able defender of the ancient faith" was the only elder of the congregation.

Yet, all was not well with Granville Lipscomb's conscience. He owned slaves. Was it right for a Christian to do so? The question was by no means an easy one to answer, but Granville's conscience would be easier if he had none. He found his wife, Nancy, very sympathetic, and even his brothers, John and Dabney were feeling much the same way. Much as they disliked moving from their friends in Franklin County, if the word of God compelled them to do so, they would move north and free their slaves.

Life in Illinois

Sangamon County, in the rich fertile valley of the' Sangamon River, was a new and inviting country. Land was cheap, and while the slaves could not be freed according to law in Illinois, it would be no bother to free them in Indiana. David Lipscomb had barely passed his fourth birthday when Granville went to the court house in Springfield, the county seat, with William and

Rebecca Benefield to make out a deed for a nice rivet bottom farm. There were eighty acres on one side of the south fork of the Sangamon River and two hundred forty on the other. On a hill overlooking the river bottom Granville built himself a log cabin. Some morning if Granville Lipscomb ever took the time to look up, he would have probably noticed a flat boat, floating down the river toward Springfield. If he took the time to look more closely, he might have noticed a tall, gaunt country boy going to the city to practice law. In these days Abe Lincoln often traveled the river in his law practice.

Even though it had been twenty years since Robert Pulliam built the first log cabin in the county, Sangamon was still a new county.[2] Officially, it had not been organized until January 30, 1821. Even by 1835 merchants and drummers were almost unknown in the wild frontier. The popular cabin in the county then was the "three faced camp"—three walls with one side open. The walls were generally seven feet high, with poles three feet apart laid across them, and the clapboard roof laid on these. Clapboards were usually four feet long, eight to twelve inches wide and made of white oak. Usually the cabins had no floor, and no windows or chimneys. A big fire was generally made on the open side of the house. Sometimes, however, cabins were made with "puncheon" floors, or split logs. A Dutch oven, a long-handled skillet, and a coffee pot were the usual cooking utensils. Flour was simply corn meal made into "hoe cakes." In the fall the people ate cooked pumpkin and in the winter, hominy. The woods abounded with honey to add a delicacy to the table.

Boys as a rule went barefooted except for two or three months out of the year. The farmers raised sheep for wool, but one of their major problems was to keep the sheep away from the prairie wolves who liked lamb chops as well as anybody. The wool that went into the making of jeans was colored from the bark of a walnut tree. Every woman knew how to use the big spinning wheel. The men made the shoes, while the women spun the clothing, and the boys shelled the corn for more "hoe cakes."

[2]**History of Sangamon County, Illinois,** (Chicago, Interstate Publishing Co. 1881) **p. 66ff.**

But life was hard in Sangamon County in the year 1835, especially for newcomers. The incessant barking of prairie wolves all night every night was monotonous. The chief worry to the newcomer was the dread of "fever and ague." In the fall of the year almost everyone would come down with it. People would look pale and sallow as though they were frostbitten. The disease was not contagious, coming from impure water and air, but the rugged frontiersman could hardly know that. These impurities would fill the body until finally it would seem that the body would explode in one great shock, and a fit of uncontrollable shaking would strike the victim. During the illness, the shakes would come every other day, and this would be followed by a burning hot fever that would last for hours. The fortunate ones who recovered felt weak, often had a headache, and no appetite. The victim's eyes would be white and his ears, especially after he had taken too much quinine, would roar. A newcomer, down with "fever and ague" would explain his feeling by saying,

> You didn't quite make up your mind to commit suicide, but sometimes wished some' accident would happen to knock either the malady or yourself out of existence. . . . You thought the sun had sort of a sickly shine about it. About this time you came to the conclusion that you would not take the whole state as a gift; and if you had the strength and the means you would pick up Hannah and the baby, and your traps, and go back "yander" to "Old Virginny" the "Jarseys," Maryland or Pennsylvania.[3]

Granville Lipscomb was in no sense of the term deficient in strength, but the sorrows that piled on him that winter of 1835-36 were too much. The fall came, and the fever and ague struck his cabin. Before he could realize it, three infant children were gone, and then Nancy, too, was laid beside her babies on the crest of the hillside overlooking the river bottom. Dabney's wife also died, and by this time Granville had concluded "he would not have the whole state as a gift." The whole experiment had been bad. A week after he had bought the farm, the temperature dropped to nineteen below zero. That spring it rained continuously. The river overflowed its banks and the farmers were

[3]**History of Sangamon County, Illinois,** (Chicago, Interstate Publishing Co., 1881) p. 66.

all behind in their work. Winter set in that fall with three inches of snowfall on Sunday, November 22. By the first week of January, the weather was milder, but the thick mud made travelling difficult.

At any rate, Granville was ready to return to Tennessee. He ran across Alexander Jones, who was interested in buying the farm. So, for the exact amount he paid for it—eight hundred dollars—he sold out. The deed was dated December 1, 1836. With only two sons, Billy and David, and his little girl, Keren, yet alive, Granville Lipscomb returned to Franklin County.

The first memories David Lipscomb retained were of these cheerless experiences of the return to Franklin County.[4] He and Billy "were as much dead as alive." He remembered as long as he lived how "Aunt Fanny" had lovingly smothered him to her bosom, and how affectionately she had cared for his every need. In later years David considered no inconvenience too much to help "Aunt Fanny" in whatever hour of need she passed. He remembered also that this tragedy had struck their home because of his parents' uneasy consciences over slavery. In his own somber way David Lipscomb reflected upon the whole question. After much thought, he finally concluded that slavery was neither right nor wrong in itself, but a necessary evil. Without defending slavery, he considered a war to overthrow it a great wrong in itself.

Franklin County Days

Having returned to Franklin County, Granville Lipscomb once again turned his thoughts toward finding a wife and a mother for his three children. His attention centered on Jane L. Breeden, a school teacher living near Owl Hollow. But Miss Jane was hardly more interested than Nancy had been. Granville won out with the help of a neighbor, Mr. Simmons, who finally convinced the young school teacher that Granville' Lipscomb was the smartest man in the county.

Jane, born on September 15, 1807, in Spottsylvania County, Virginia, was the daughter of Ann and Enoch Breeden. Enoch

[4]**Gospel Advocate,** 1867, p. 584.

Breeden, a veteran of the Revolutionary War, was born Jan. 3, 1758. Breeden's father went to the army and never returned. So his mother and he moved to King William County to live with two of his married brothers, Moody and Daleb. Enoch substituted for his brothers, serving several short hitches in the Continental army between 1776 and 1781. In January, 1781 he was in Col. Charles Dabney's First Regiment. The Regiment joined Gen. Stevens at Four Mile Creek in Henrico. The regiment retreated into Culpeper, crossing the Rappahannock at Ely's Ford and recrossing at Raccoon Ford. Then, marching by Pogue's Mill, the army took the Marquis Road to Mechunk Creek in Albemarle. Breeden spent some time in camp at Sim's Neck in Pamunky, and then joined Gen. Weedon at White House Ferry. During the siege of Yorktown, he was stationed at Ware Church near Gloucester. His company was discharged only a few days before the surrender.[5] Enoch Breeden died on August 1, 1841, and his body was placed in the family cemetery on the farm of Granville Lipscomb.

Jane Breeden, a woman of pensive moods, was a prolific reader, which fact probably contributed some to her decision to be a teacher. Like Granville she was especially fond of reading the Bible. On June 18, 1825, she wrote in her diary, "I have been employed today in getting Scripture by heart. O, may I by the help of God be enabled not only to retain it in memory, but to let its sacred truths sink deep into my heart." On July 4, 1834, she recorded, "I have had the pleasure of hearing a discourse delivered by Bro. L. Battail, from Rom. 3rd chapter, 31st verse. Some parts of this sermon I considered in perfect coincidence with the word of God; other parts were rather obscure and mysterious to my mind. . ." Her remarks in her diary of July 18, 1835, show a determination to live closer to her God.[6] She wrote, "Just finished reading the New Testament through. I intend for the future to number every time I peruse it, and strive with the assistance of God to study the Scriptures with more diligence than I have heretofore done." In David Lipscomb's customarily kind and

[5] **J. T. McAllister, Virginia Militia In The Revolutionary War,** (Hot Springs, Va., McAllister Publishing Co., 1913) p. 169.
[6] **Gospel Advocate,** 1885, p. 759.

frank way in later years he recalled that his stepmother was a good woman, but that at times she lacked in tact, using poor judgment.[7]

On August 11, 1837, Granville Lipscomb married Jane Breeden. Seven children in all were born to them, but two died in infancy.

Childhood Days

January 21, 1837, David Lipscomb passed his sixth birthday. Billy was seventeen months older. The childhood of the two boys was spent on their father's farm. Billy was a quiet boy and in poor health. Asthma and bronchial trouble bothered him continually; he frequently fainted at the sight of blood. Never fond of sports, he usually could be depended upon to avoid mischief. Billy was fond of books, especially of mathematics. By the time he was fifteen years old he could accurately survey any plot of ground in the community.[8]

David, meanwhile, manifested an entirely different type of character. Billy, by far the better student, shunned conflict. David studied less, although he did more thinking as a child than he was given credit. Unlike Billy, David enjoyed a squabble. Nothing embarrassed him. Granville, like any observing father, saw the two dispositions in the boys. Not far from the farm was a water mill. Farmers would send their grain to the mill and have it ground into meal. Generally this was the job for the boys. The neighborhood farm boys, while waiting for the meal to be ground, would almost invariably get into some rough fights. When Granville wanted a boy to go to the mill, David always sought the job, but Billy was always sent. When David got a little older, Granville explained that he knew if he sent David, he would get into mischief; but Billy would never do so.

Opportunities for an education were very scarce, since schools were very irregular. The rule was that the boys would work in the fields awhile and then attend classes. Granville Lipscomb, accepting slavery as a necessary evil, owned a few blacks. Billy

[7]David Lipscomb, "A Religious Life," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. **XXVII** - No. 48 (Dec. **2,** 1885) p. 759.
[8]**Gospel Advocate,** 1898, p. **120.**

and David worked away their early childhood in the fields with the colored servants, attending school as the opportunities presented.

Home life, in full accordance with the Lipscomb code of ethics, was simple and devout. Coffee and "wheaten bread" were luxuries on the table. David would jump with glee when a visitor came in for a meal "because we would have wheaten bread and preserves or honey for supper." The hospitality of the home was generous and free. For several years during David's boyhood, Miss Jane kept her niece, Martha Elizabeth Potts in her home. When David was thirteen years old, Calvin Curlee of Cannon County spent most of the year evangelizing in Franklin County. Martha Elizabeth, then nineteen, was baptized. In later years Martha Elizabeth married J. J. Manire, moved to Texas where she reared eight sons and three daughters. She proudly confessed to all who would listen that she had an "undying affection for David Lipscomb and his father."[9]

Granville Lipscomb's home was one of the few Christian families in the neighborhood. Viewing the Bible as the all sufficient rule of faith and practice, Granville Lipscomb reasoned that if men could be taught the Bible, they would know the will of God. If they could be induced to follow that way, it would mean the betterment of the world and their eternal salvation. This thought captivated the mind of Granville Lipscomb and later, of his son, David. Granville's only ambition was to see that his family knew the Bible and followed it. When someone, desiring to make David a more polished character, gave him a copy of Lord Chesterfield's writings and asked him to read them, Granville promptly took it away from his son,[10] not wanting his son's mind filled with "foolish notions" of modern society. It was enough that he should know the Bible, and live a simple life of absolute trust in its teachings.

Granville Lipscomb not merely read the Bible himself "morning, noon and night" but insisted upon reading it to his family,

[9]**Gospel Advocate,** 1891, p. 343.
[10]**Gospel Advocate,** 1866, p. 425.

and to anyone else who would listen. Every evening before the children went to bed they were called to the family circle and a portion of the Scripture was read. On Sunday morning before they went out to play or to leave for the church services some of the Bible was read to them. If a boy was hired to help with the plowing, that boy had to read the Bible with the rest of the family. The slaves were treated as a part of the family in this respect.

It was strange how these slaves could become such an intimate part of the whole household. They were loved with the same devotion as any member of the family. Beside the body of Enoch Breeden in the family cemetery of Granville Lipscomb's farm lie the graves of "Aunt Milly," and beside her, the bodies of Jennie, George, Stephen and Rice. All were the Negro slaves of Granville Lipscomb. The inscription that Granville put on the tomb of Aunt Milly reads,

The good in every station
Shall be rewarded
God is no respector
Of persons
Eph. vi - 8

David Lipscomb often said in later life that some of the finest religious impressions he ever received in his childhood were from a Negro mammy, one of his father's servants. He never recorded the name of this colored servant, but in the absence of more positive evidence, it is not too much to suppose it was "Aunt Milly." And if that be so, who knows of the eternal inheritance that God has reserved for Aunt Milly!

January 21, 1844 David Lipscomb passed his thirteenth birthday, it was time for Granville to be concerned about his sons' education. David and Billy were getting to be grown boys now. If the schools in Franklin County were inadequate, a year in Louisa County with the boys' grandfather would help. They had taken the trip before, and they could take it again, and this time they could stay a year and go to school. It might take them a little while to ride horseback to Virginia, but they had plenty of

time, and friendly cabins would gladly provide them food and shelter for the nights along the way. It took the whole month of February, 1844 to make the trip.

Grandfather David was ardently religious. He was no doubt largely responsible for the unusually active Sunday School work being conducted by the Lower Gold Mine Baptist Church. Children came from everywhere. The emphasis was put on memorizing Scripture. Before leaving here David succeeded in memorizing the Four Gospels and the entire book of Acts. But when the[1] Baptists put on a strong evangelistic campaign, urging people to come to the mourner's bench, David refused. He insisted that baptism was for the remission of sins, a fact that probably disappointed his grandfather. During the year at his Grandfather's home, David had the chance to hear James Bagby and William Hunter preach. This was his only opportunity to hear members of the church of the Lord preach the primitive gospel.

Returning to Franklin County, David and Billy realized they were the better for the year in their grandfather's home. The opportunity of memorizing so much Scripture had given them a familiarity with the Bible that they had never known. The year in school had advanced them to the point where they could realize their need for more education.

Meanwhile, Granville Lipscomb had been busy trying to build up the Old Salem congregation. He talked the Bible to all with whom he came in contact, rich and poor, black and white. Preachers were few and far between, but Granville never grew tired in securing the services of preachers to come into the neighborhood and preach the gospel. He felt personally responsible[1] for each soul. Many of these baptized in those early days were people he had taught the word of God as they worked in the fields. His greatest disappointment came when he failed to reach a Negro man with whom he had been reared.

On the Lord's Days, Granville Lipscomb taught a Bible class composed of the children of the neighborhood. In the summer of 1846, Joshua K. Speer visited the Bean's Creek congregation, as

it was then called, and preached for five days. There were five baptized, and Speer came away greatly impressed with the work. He wrote,

> This church bids fair to do well under the care of brothers J. C. Lipscomb and T. Woods. Bro. G. Lipscomb has a Bible class, composed of the children of the neighborhood, to whom he gives lessons, and they meet on Lord's day morning and recite. This example should be followed by every church in the world. Bro. L. is sowing seed from which a rich harvest will one day be gathered.[11]

David Lipscomb watched the Lord's work moving along In such an unostentatious manner, and the impression it made upon his mind never left him. His heart went out in sympathy for the poor preachers who sacrificed so much to build up the church. David Lipscomb would never be too proud to teach the Bible to one or two under a shade tree or in a school house or in a log cabin. By such unpretentious beginnings he would know that a rich harvest would some day be gathered. He watched with sincere sympathy the work of Madison Love, a poor shingle-maker by trade, build up eight or ten congregations in a years' time. Love died as an old man, scarcely heard of outside the country of southern Tennessee, but he baptized over five thousand people in his life. Thacker Griffin was the first preacher he ever remembered hearing. As a boy he often heard J. J. Trott "who was not a learned man, but one who studied carefully and was a thoughtful man." To the day of his death, David Lipscomb never lost his dislike for any move or teaching that would tend to create a class of clergymen in the church. He determined to model his own life after this humble type of servant represented by Madison Love. He would farm or teach school, and then as he had an opportunity teach the Bible to those he could reach. David Lipscomb never regarded himself as a preacher in any professional sense of the term. He was a Christian, and personally responsible to teach the Bible wherever and to whomever he could reach. He never saw the day that he felt at home in the pulpit. At no time could his sermons ever be rated the best in homiletic structure. He read the Bible to his listeners and explained to them what it meant. But he always felt more at home studying

[11]J. K. Speer, no title, Christian Review, Vol. III - No. 9, (Sept. 1846) p. 216.

the Bible with a half dozen people in an informal way under a shade tree or in a school house.

He was impressed, too, with the common sense rule that all teaching of the word of God should be intensely practical. Christianity was a way of life, and this fact no teacher of the word of God should ever forget. He registered his disappointment in the sermon of one good preacher when he recalled,

> When I was a young man, before I began to talk to the people, preachers were scarce; churches were scattered, we had no railroads, and preachers would ride horseback from fifty to one hundred miles to an appointment for preaching. They usually preached on Saturday, Sunday, twice each day. The attendance on Saturday forenoon was usually small and confined to members of the church—the older ones generally. On one occasion a preacher of piety and good logical powers rode sixty or seventy miles and preached on Saturday morning. Everybody in the house was a member of the church. But he delivered as a full and methodical discourse on the conversion of Cornelius. I felt disappointed and remonstrated with him when we were to ourselves. I insisted there were Christian duties and obligations to God and man that ought to be taught.[12]

And so went the years. January 21, 1846, David was fifteen years old. Granville Lipscomb was determined that Billy and David should receive some more education, and there was no place better to send them than to Tolbert Fanning at Franklin College up near Nashville. So that month a new kind of life began for the boys.

[12]David Lipscomb, "The Rule of Faith," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol, **LII** - No. 23, (June 9, 1910) p. 688.

CHAPTER IV

SCHOOL DAYS

"Why, philosophy would split your head wide open!" The voice was stern but the speaker had a smile in his words. He was a big man, clean shaven but far from handsome. His two hundred and forty pound frame towered ominously over the short, timid boy of fifteen before him. Philosophy!! Young David Lipscomb felt ashamed that he had even mentioned it. Why should he' have told President Tolbert Fanning that he wanted to take the "short course" instead of the long one, and study philosophy, of all subjects? Philosophy might be all right for the erudite youngsters from the upper crust, but a country boy from Franklin County would do well to stick with subjects of a more practical nature. At any rate, David marked it up as one more lesson learned in the school of life, and marched in to take the "long course."

The fact that Franklin College was a new school with a student body of less than a hundred did not lessen its appeal to either Billy or David Lipscomb. Everybody in middle Tennessee knew of Tolbert Fanning. For sixteen years the puissant Fanning had been preaching, debating and teaching in that section of the state. His converts to primitive Christianity were numerous; his fame widespread. Although the college had opened a year earlier with fifty students, it now had nearly doubled that enrollment.

Tolbert Fanning

Born in 1810 in Cannon County, Fanning spent a large portion [0l] his early life in northern Alabama. Fanning went to school to Ross Houston. He was baptized by James Matthews at Cypress, Alabama, in September, 1828, and almost immediately started Preaching. His first sermons were delivered in groves and school houses. On October 1, 1830, he left home, crossed the Tennessee River, and headed toward middle Tennessee. The first person he baptized was Luke Shirley. Shirley was then twenty-seven years old. Shirley's later life was lived at Woodbury in Cannon County where he died on May 23,1865.

In November, 1831, Fanning enrolled in the University of Nashville, a school already taking its place among the few centers of education in America. The Legislature of North Carolina had passed an act on December 29, 1785, "for the promotion of learning in the county of Davidson" which resulted in the beginning of Davidson Academy. The name of this school was later changed to Davidson College, and in 1806 to Cumberland College. It was incorporated as the University of Nashville in 1826, five years before Fanning entered.

But Fanning by no means gave all of his time to his studies. He joined himself to the disciples in Nashville. The congregation was far advanced beyond many of that day. P. S. Fall had come to Nashville in the spring of 1826 at the invitation of the Nashville Female Seminary to teach school, and to work with the Baptist Church. Largely through Fall's influence, this congregation broke with the Baptists and launched out on a plea for the restoration of New Testament Christianity. In December, 1830, Alexander Campbell and Jacob Creath, Jr., had come to the city. While there Campbell debated Obadiah Jennings. In June, 1831, Fall's ill health had forced him to retire from the work at Nashville and return to his home at Frankfort, Kentucky.[1]

Fanning, then, became connected with the church at Nashville at a time when it was without a preacher. Having naturally a forceful character and being extremely ambitious, Fanning urged the elders to try to build up the talents of the congregation. The elders were urged to do much of the teaching themselves, and to encourage other capable brethren to assist. At the suggestion of Fanning, the church sent out Absalom Adams and Tolbert Fanning. These men preached in brush arbors, school houses, and log cabins. The elders themselves and other capable brethren went out into the environs of Nashville and preached. Much of the later success of the work in the city was due to this humble work.

Fanning stayed busy. In August, 1832, Tolbert Fanning held a meeting near Calvin Curlee's old home in Cannon County, and baptized Edward Lawrence. Lawrence, while in Nashville to sit on a jury, heard P. S. Fall preach on the Holy Spirit, and was

so impressed that Lawrence and his wife were baptized in this meeting held by Fanning. Fanning at first preached along with others the mourners' bench system of getting religion. At Owl Hollow in Franklin County, near where David Lipscomb was born, Fanning became convinced that he was wrong, and during the service one day, dragged the altar out into the woods. On Saturday before the fourth Lord's Day in November, 1832, he was present at a four day meeting at Rock Spring during which time thirty-two were baptized. Immediately afterward, he went on into the borders of the Chickasaw Nation in Georgia and baptized three. The next spring he spent in Murfreesboro and between March 1st and July 1st baptized fifteen, making now a congregation of forty disciples. During this spring, Fanning and Calvin Curlee took time off to go to Statesville and Alexandria, thirty miles from home, and baptized fourteen. The last week of August, 1833, Fanning visited Franklin, Tennessee and baptized five Baptists. On the first Lord's Day of September, he preached at Berea and baptized thirty-three. He went to Nashville the middle of September and saw the brethren baptize nineteen. The third Sunday of the month he preached at Lebanon, and the fourth, at Alexandria, baptizing twenty at each place. His August meeting in Franklin had begun on Tuesday and lasted through Saturday with Fanning preaching each day. The opposition was bitter, the Methodists and Baptists both starting meetings at the same time. But Fanning baptized seventeen in all, and on Saturday morning met with these brethren in the Masonic Hall to determine their willingness to begin a congregation. They were willing, and so, the congregation in Franklin, Tennessee began.

In spite of all his travels and preaching, Fanning did enough studying to graduate from the University of Nashville in 1835. But his graduation was only a quiet and temporary interlude from his preaching. On the fourth Lord's Day of October that year he preached at Georgetown, Kentucky, the home of John T. Johnson. Fanning baptized a Captain Warren of the United States Navy, his wife and their daughter.

The particular event that Fanning most appreciated was his journey in the spring of 1836 with Alexander Campbell to New

England. They visited Ravenna, Ohio, in Portage County on the Western Reserve where Campbell spoke on the evils of denominationalism as impeding the advance of the true gospel. They went on to Randolph and here, Fanning stayed behind to help in a meeting, while Campbell and a Brother Taffe, another traveling companion went on to Cleveland. A four mile walk in rain and mud brought Campbell down with a severe cold. Fanning rejoined Campbell on Tuesday, and by Friday they were ready to go to New York by way of a steamer on Lake Erie. The boat broke down, causing a day's delay. When they finally got started, the lake was so rough that almost all of the sixty or seventy passengers on board were sea-sick, Fanning included. Campbell and Fanning slept together at night. About midnight, Fanning still wide awake, nudged Campbell to inform him they had arrived at Buffalo. Fanning was unable to take the entire trip, so upon saying farewell to Campbell, started for home.

In 1837 he married Charlotte Fall, sister to Phillip S. Fall. Later that year Fanning and "his accomplished lady," as Campbell called her, established a female school near Franklin, Tennessee. P. S. Fall no doubt furnished the inspiration for the move for he was running one near Frankfort, Kentucky, which Campbell said, "had the best philosophical apparatus belonging to any private school in Kentucky, perhaps in America." Fanning's time for the next two years was taken up with the running of the school and preaching in the vicinity.

Aside from his interest in preaching and teaching school, Fanning possessed an avid enthusiasm for farming. For a short time he edited an agricultural paper. He had a weakness for good, purebred stock. It was not unusual for the Nashville papers to report that Tolbert Fanning had taken the blue ribbon on some live stock he had entered. With such interest in farming, it was a growing temptation to neglect the school or even his preaching to care for it. And sometimes, even Fanning himself was conscious of yielding to the temptation.

Having bought a farm at Elm Crag, five miles southeast of Nashville just off the Murfreesboro Pike, Fanning struck upon

the idea of combining teaching and farming by establishing an "agricultural school." He opened the school in the fall of 1842 with seven "young men" and five "boys". The routine for each day was eight to nine hours of study and four to five hours of working in the garden or on the farm. Every day the study of "Sacred Scriptures" and "Sacred Music" was a part of the schedule. Four of the young men were interested in preaching the gospel. These Fanning charged fifty dollars a year which covered board, tuition—everything except books and clothes. Other young men paid one hundred dollars a year.

It was also Fanning's idea that the faculty should share the day's routine with the boys. So, the faculty taught eight or nine hours a day and worked on the farm from four to six. Quite conceivably, the whole scheme broke down and Fanning complained that it was because the faculty would not work.

Evangelistic work was too deserving to be neglected, so Fanning stayed busy. In 1843 he conducted a debate at Moulton, Alabama, with a man by the name of McMillan. After the debate, he baptized twenty-five people. That summer, he also debated N. L. Rice in Nashville. Fanning regretted having conducted this debate, confident that Rice was using him to prepare for his coming discussion with Campbell which was held the following November. About the same time he found himself embroiled in a controversy with the Methodists. F. E. Pitts, an influential Methodist preacher of Middle Tennessee, wrote a book in 1835 on baptism, "chiefly designed as a Refutation of The Errors and Infidelity of Campbellism." Pitts made many charges against Alexander Campbell and the church in Tennessee. G. W. Elley came down from Kentucky in the spring of 1843 to the Old Union congregation in Sumner County, and spent most of his time in refuting Pitts' tract. He later visited Nashville, talked to Fanning about it, and wrote a tract in refutation of Pitts' allegations. Fanning wrote an introduction to the tract entitled, "Review of Baptist Theology." The work was printed by the J. T. S. Fall Printing company in Nashville. Fanning was gratified to see the cause prospering so well, and on December 20, 1842, sent the fol-

lowing note to John R. Howard, editor of the Bible **Advocate** at Paris, Tennessee:

> The cause is prospering in Middle Tennessee. An express arrived for me this evening to go to the aid of brother Jones at Lebanon, where the gospel is, for the first time, making a favorable impression. Some 10 or 12 have obeyed. Several of Mr. Howell's Baptists have recently united in Nashville. The truth is prevailing.
>
> Your brother in Christ,
> T. Fanning.[1]

John R. Howard had been immersed one cold night in November, 1833, by J. R. McCall of Lexington, Kentucky. Howard started publication of the **Christian Reformer** in January, 1836, he resumed his editorial work from Paris, Tennessee, by publishing the **Bible Advocate,** another monthly periodical. Howard faced some serious difficulties in getting the paper going, and often, for several months at a time, no issues were printed. At a meeting of brethren at Rock Spring in Rutherford County, on September 18, 1843, it was decided to publish a paper in the interest of the church of Christ. W. H. Wharton, Tolbert Fanning, and J. C. Anderson were asked to edit it. When, therefore, Howard received a "prospectus" from Tolbert Fanning in the fall of 1843 for the **Christian Review,** his feelings were wounded. He clearly saw that the **Christian Review** would increase his own troubles in that part of the support of the **Bible Advocate** would be lost. Fanning responded with a kind letter to Howard, insisting that he had meant no harm to Howard's work, but only that several brethren besides himself had sensed the need of a lively periodical in middle Tennessee.

So in January, 1844, the **Christian Review** began. It was forceful, stimulating and newsy. Had it not been for the fact that Fanning was too busy with too many details, the **Review** would likely have had a happier and longer existence than four years.

Franklin College

The failure of Fanning's agricultural school in no sense of the term discouraged him. The legislature of Tennessee granted

[1]**Bible Advocate, 1842, p. 116.**

a charter for the building of Franklin College January 30, 1844. The farm at Elm Crag, belonging to Tolbert Fanning and Bowling Embry was leased for the site of the college. Embry, a devoted member of the church, was several years postmaster of Nashville. Later in life he lost interest in the church. He died on October 18, 1880, and E. G. Sewell preached his funeral.

The first session of Franklin College began on January 1, 1845. Tolbert Fanning was president; Bowling Embry, Steward of the Boarding House; A. J. Fanning, Principal of the Preparatory Department; P. R. Runnels, Principal of Juvenile Department; J. N. Loomis taught mathematics and chemistry; John Eichbaum, languages, and E. S. Chandler, music. On the opening day, Loomis was unable to take his position, and J. Smith Fowler of Ohio took his place. There were forty-five students the opening day but the number soon increased to seventy.[2] But by May when S. B. Aden made a tour of Middle Tennessee, spending two or three days at Franklin College, the number had increased to eighty students. Aden was impressed. "We look upon the President, he wrote, "as being well qualified for the task he has undertaken, being a man of great precision and decision of character."[3]

Before this man of "great precision and decision of character" Billy and David Lipscomb came early in January, 1846, just as the second term of Franklin College was about to begin. Over a hundred students were enrolled that month, and many were turned away for lack of space. But Fanning had not yet lost sight of the fact that the ideal educational situation required 'good moral government," and essential to this was employment for the students. No school could exist, he believed, and have good moral government just by getting and reciting a few lessons, while half of the time was given to idleness. At the same time, Manning's educational philosophy was that the "honor of God" and the "good of man" were the only goals worthy of pursuing.

[2]Tolbert Fanning, no title. **Christian Review,** Vol. **II** - No. 1 (Jan., 1845) P. 2.
[3]**Bible Advocate,** May, 1845, p. 119, 120.

> Colleges and schools have sprung up with remarkable rapidity, amongst the disciples, within a past few years. ... In a Christian point of view, there are few things more bain and corrupting than the idea that colleges give denominational respectability; and it is not altogether clear, that the kind of training most popular is, at the same time, most favorable to true piety. ... If personal aggrandizement, or sectional and sectarian pride, have influence with us, our colleges will prove a curse instead of a blessing to the world. The honor of God and good of man should be our exclusive study.[4]

Although entering school at the same time, Billy finished ahead of David. Billy completed his work in July, 1848, and David, one year later. David admitted that brother, William, "learned much more readily than I did, and was always more quiet, retiring and equable in temperament." David, who by no means was ever retiring in disposition, soon found that President Fanning meant what he said about "good moral government." The last whipping he ever received in his life was given to him while he was a student at Franklin College for stealing a kiss "from a cherry-lipped Baptist lass." He fell in love and out of love like any other school boy, admitting that while in love, the freckles on his beloved's face looked to be marks of beauty. While out of love, of course, they looked just like—freckles.

Up to now William had never been baptized. So, he gave the matter serious consideration. The spring passed and the month of May arrived. A lively congregation, referred to as the Franklin College church, was meeting regularly in the college premises. Fanning was giving more of his time to preaching here rather than being gone on week-ends. Preaching at the college congregation one Lord's Day in May, Fanning rejoiced to see two of his faculty members—J. S. Fowler and J. N. Loomis—respond to the invitation. The time seemed opportune, so William Lipscomb made the move at the same time. The **Bible Advocate** reported it that J. S. Fowler and J. N. Loomis, former Presbyterian, and "a prominent student" had responded.[5]

It would be impossible to over estimate the influence of Franklin College upon David Lipscomb's developing mind. His

[4]**Tolbert** Fanning, "Colleges Under Christian Influence," **Christian Review,** Vol. III - No. 2, (Feb. 1846) p. 48.
[5]**Bible Advocate,** June, 1846, p. 142.

first month in school he studied English, mathematics, natural history, music and physics. He made his poorest grade in music, and was only slightly above average in his other courses. The next month he settled down to work a little more seriously and raised his grades. In March he added sacred history to his course of studies but his grade was hardly satisfactory. By June and July he had added courses in both Latin and Greek. These last two months President Fanning decided to grade him on "Manners." There apparently was too much country in him at this early stage in his life to excel very highly in this.

Judging from the prolific notes that Lipscomb preserved in his composition book, he was searching eagerly for information. He copied several remarks from Mosheim's church history, Jones, church history, and Neander on the practices of the early Christians covering the first three centuries. A considerable portion of his time must have been given to Orchard's, **History of The Baptists,** for his notebook shows copious notes on such subjects as "the remission of sins," "baptism," "the Lord's Supper," and the history of the Waldenses.

Although his convictions were not yet fully settled, Lipscomb was giving some consideration to the Christian's relation to civil government. In political thinking Lipscomb claimed to be a Whig. He was an ardent admirer of Horace Greeley, so much so that when a baby boy was born to his step-mother and she asked David what she should name him, his reply was "Horace Greeley." Thus it was that H. G. Lipscomb got his name. However, David Lipscomb was carefully surveying the whole subject of the Christian's relation to civil government during his college years, as his notes in his composition book indicate.

David Lipscomb found nothing at Franklin College to contradict his father's childlike faith in the Bible as the all-sufficient . guide for man, a faith which had been planted deeply in young David's own mind. President Fanning, although possessed of talent and education far superior to that of Granville Lipscomb, shared his fundamental faith in the Bible. While being neither impulsive nor erratic, Fanning knew no fear when it came to

pressing fervently what he believed the Bible taught. When, back in 1832, Fanning had observed a Christian sell his Negro slave by dragging him in chains away from his friends and family, Fanning considered this cruel treatment a violation of the law of Christ, and delivered a scathing sermon at the guilty brother who was so angered that he had Fanning arrested. A long and threatening trial was conducted which finally resulted in Fanning's being set free. The incident is indicative of Fanning's type of thinking. The Bible was right and whoever violated it should be called to task for it.

Under the tutelage of Fanning, David Lipscomb's own simple faith was nurtured. In his notebook he wrote the following:

> God has given laws to the emotions, as well as to the perceptions of the soul; He has fixed laws for his own operations. Since God observes such laws, we must observe them, for in so doing we shall not be laboring at random and in uncertainty, but we shall be employing and spending our strength to the highest possible advantage. We shall be co-laborers with God.

Here, then, was a growing conviction with David Lipscomb, one calculated to influence him greatly through his future life. It is only by understanding this principle that one can understand the reason for Lipscomb's unrelenting opposition to movements later to develop in the church. The Bible, he believed, was an embodiment of God's laws to man. If man will live in complete harmony with the laws of God as revealed in the Bible, he will be living in complete harmony with God Himself. To encourage man to do this, to discourage him from setting up his own frail judgments as the standard of right and wrong, now became the controlling passion of his life. The lesson first learned at his father's knee was now re-impressed upon him by the truculent Tolbert Fanning. David Lipscomb might lack the polish of many of his contemporaries, he might not be a debonair of the Old South, but one thing was certain: he would be a curious mixture of unrelenting, courageous insistence that the authority of the laws of God be respected on the one hand and of kindly tolerance on the other hand.

June 8, 1847, arrived and David Lipscomb spent the day in taking his examinations. He was glad when they were over—not merely because he could put aside the anxiety which they brought, but because of an event to which he could look forward. The third Monday in June was the day the faculty had appointed for a "geological excursion." Such a great event was all a part of the educational advantages offered at Franklin College. Led by Fanning, by P. S. Fall, or by one of the other faculty members, the excursion might go south to Alabama, east toward the mountains, or north to Mammoth Cave in Kentucky. It was a diversion from class room study but none the less educational in itself.

And so the three years in Franklin College moved by, each day contributing something to his advancement. There were days of monotonous study and work interspersed with interludes of levity. David, already following a habit which stayed with him most of his life, never slept well at night, and seldom anytime in his life, ever slept an entire night. Sleeping little at night, he would often doze in a chair in the day. Sitting in the back of his class room one day at Franklin College, he barely heard through his drowsiness a question asked by President Fanning. He knew the answer but suddenly dozed off. Fanning asked each pupil the answer, and no one knew it. Upon hearing his own name called out, David spoke out the correct answer, Fanning was quick to tell the class that he thought all of them had better go to sleep.

Early in the summer of 1848 William graduated from the College. David, however, faced another year before his graduation. William decided to take a trip to Louisa County, Virginia, and spend the summer visiting relatives. His health was still frail and perhaps he was thinking of a summer of relaxation. But it was hot, riding across the country in a stage coach. William simply could not take the close confinement, so asked permission of the driver to ride on the top with him. This was better, but still, the night air was cool, and William contacted pneumonia. He bled at his lungs profusely. Although he recovered that summer, the remainder of his life William bled frequently at his lungs.

The fall term at the college was scheduled to open in October. Fanning needed another teacher, one that could teach Greek and Latin. William had made a brilliant record, and Fanning wanted him on his faculty. But there were problems. Would William make an acceptable teacher with his former class-mates? After serious consideration, Fanning decided to employ William but restrict his teaching to other than the seniors, his former school-mates. Somehow the word spread that William was not to be in charge of the senior class because of his former connection with it as a student. The class went to the faculty and remonstrated. So William went in as a faculty member in October and David Lipscomb spent his last year studying Latin and Greek under his brother.

College life meant association with many other students, some of whom would leave their mark in the world. Lipscomb attended school with E. W. Herndon, who for a time many years later edited the **Christian Quarterly** from Missouri. He went to school with E. C. Sallee of Warren County. When the Civil War broke out, Sallee, even though he was married and had five children, joined the Confederate army. When the Federal army overran middle Tennessee, Sallee's wife and children were sent North by military order. Sallee himself was captured and sent north as a prisoner of war. David Lipscomb tried to help bring him and his family together again after the war but whether he was successful or not, is not known. Lipscomb was a classmate with William Richardson, Henry Appleton, James Callendar, C. C. Braden, and Turner Goodall. All of them fought with the Confederacy. Goodall, a promising young preacher, was killed in battle.

One of Lipscomb's most intimate friends in college days was F. M. Carmack. Carmack, a dashing debonair from Tishomingo County, Mississippi entered Franklin College in 1849. His brother, E. W. Carmack had been in William Lipscomb's graduating class the year before. F. M. Carmack graduated in 1851, and like William, was asked to join the faculty. He married Miss Kate Holding of Lewisburg, Tennessee. A daughter and two sons were born to them. Shortly afterwards, F. M. Carmack contacted tuber-

culosis. He moved with his family into the hospitable home of the Joseph Harlans' near Castalian Springs in Sumner County. The spring of 1861 Carmack was worse, and it was obvious that he would not live long. That spring and summer David Lipscomb was in and out of the Harlan home, visiting his friend, Carmack, and looking out for his every need. The summer of 1861 came, and amidst the chaos of military conflicts, Carmack quietly died. His last request was that David Lipscomb and Joseph Harlan look after his family. Both men made a special point to be faithful to the dying request of their good friend.

One of Carmack's sons was a brilliant lad by the name of Edward Ward, named after his father's brother who had proceeded him at Franklin College. About the time of the war, Granville Lipscomb baptized the younger Edward Ward. David felt confident that Edward Ward Carmack would make one of the greatest preachers in the church. David spoke to him about it, and received the promise of the young man to meet him at a specified place with a sermon prepared to preach. The boy never appeared. The next thing David Lipscomb knew he was studying law. He saw him no more after that, but was saddened with the rumor that Edward Ward Carmack had forgotten the church. Carmack's rise was meteoric. He became Tennessee's senior senator in the United States Senate. But the day came when Senator Carmack saw his mistake' in forsaking the church. E. A. Elam was conducting a meeting in the summer of 1904 at Columbia, and Senator Carmack made a public confession of his wrongs. Afterwards, David Lipscomb wrote him a letter, reminiscent of happier days in his father's home, and asked Carmack if he would surrender politics and preach the gospel. Carmack by now had made many political enemies, and politics was not as alluring at this point as it had been. He appreciated David Lipscomb's letter and replied with the following note:

> My dear Brother Lipscomb:
>
> I thank you very much for your kind letter and for the affectionate interest you have shown in my contest and in my future. I have accepted the result with resignation and without bitterness. I should but ill deserve the confidence and respect of good men if I could not endure misfortune with patience and dignity. It is, of

> course, a trial to bear the grossest and foulest calumnies without retorting in kind; but I am thankful that I have been given the strength to do so, and am more happy in the thought that no act of mine has stooped below the plane of honor than if I had gained a victory at the cost of my integrity. I am offered an opportunity to return to the practice of law. I think I shall accept. I am too old, perhaps, to radically change my life work; but I hope I can still do my duty, in an humble way, to the church and to my fellow-man. I hope I may see you before long and talk with you fully.[6]

Later Carmack got into a political brawl with Col. D. B. Cooper which resulted in his being shot down on the streets of Nashville on November 9, 1908.

Graduating exercises were held on Wednesday, October 17, 1849. David Lipscomb delivered the valedictory address. Graduating in the class were A. J. Swepston of Mississippi; A. J. Wyatt of Kentucky and J. E. Campbell of Austin, Texas. Campbell ever afterwards rather mischievously remembered Lipscomb as the "ugliest man he ever knew." Lipscomb would take the joking in good stride, insisting that Campbell himself was hardly a beauty.

[6]David Lipscomb, "Religion And Politics—**Church and State," Gospel Advocate, Vol. LII - No. 49; (Dec. 8, 1910) p. 1864**

CHAPTER V

"COMING ON THE STAGE OF EVANGELICAL ACTION"

The decision as to his vocation was possessed of problems for David Lipscomb. William had gone into teaching. But William was less restless than David. It was more William's disposition to settle down. David would cast about first before doing so.

In the back of his mind David felt sure that he would follow in the footsteps of his father. He would own a farm and earn his livelihood from the soil. Maybe he would teach school a little if the opportunity was right but that was an unimportant detail. His main work, of course, would be to attend to his duties as a Christian. To be a preacher in any professional sense of the term never entered his mind. During his childhood years he had never once taken a public part in the worship services, and had no intention of doing so. He was modest, a little awkward and easily embarrassed, especially before an audience. Nevertheless, he would earn his way by farming or other manual labor, save his money with a view to owning his own farm some day, and in whatever way he could do it, encourage the preaching of the gospel wherever he happened to live.

For the next six years Lipscomb gave vent to his restless ways. Nearly two years were spent in Georgia, managing a large plantation. He had two uncles living near LaGrange, but whether his work was with them or not cannot be definitely said. He worked briefly for the Nashville, Chattanooga, and St. Louis railroad, cutting away high ground for the tracks to be laid. By the fall of 1851 he was back in Franklin County. On Friday, October 17th, that year, he came as a messenger from the Salem congregation to the Tennessee Cooperation Meeting held at Columbia.[1] The following Tuesday when brother, William, was married to Miss Anna Fulgham, David Lipscomb may have been present.

The Lipscomb family ties were strongly bound. When one

[1]B. F. Hall, "Minutes of The Tennessee Cooperation Meeting," **Christian Magazine,** Vol. IV - No. 11, (NOV. 1851) p. 345-61.

member of the family married and set up housekeeping, he almost knew that brothers, sisters, nieces or nephews would soon be living with him. Judging from the frequency with which this occurred, it was taken as something entirely normal. By the close of 1851 David had moved in with William. David found his sister-in-law to be everything one could ask in a Christian. He enjoyed talking over his problems with her, for she was understanding, patient, and sympathetic. Life near Franklin College was enjoyable. The association was pleasant, and then there were occasional parties that brother William held at his home, like the one in February, 1852. It was a gala affair. That night David Lipscomb met James E. Scobey for the first time. Scobey, a somber youth, stayed apart from the gaiety, and David sized him up as a thoughtful and earnest young man.[2]

By the fall of 1852 William and David faced the fact that their father was not well and would not likely recover. Looking after the farm was too much for Granville, so a young man by the name of James Perry was employed to manage it. But Granville Lipscomb's interest in the Lord's work grew with the passing of years. The commonly accepted way of doing mission work seemed to be by organizing missionary societies. Everybody understood that Fanning was somewhat skeptical of these societies, but David Lipscomb in no sense of the term shared Fanning's qualms. So, when a meeting was held in Fanning's home in the fall of 1852 to organize a society, it was agreed that the dying Granville Lipscomb should be appointed manager, and that William should be its treasurer. This society never had a meeting.[3] Any hopes that anyone may have entertained for its future died with Granville Lipscomb, who passed away November 16, 1853.

Meanwhile David Lipscomb was passing through one of the most serious trials of his life. In spite of all that one can do, he will, if he is not careful, find himself placing too much faith in the men whom he admires. David Lipscomb found that he had

[2]**Gospel Advocate,** 1917, p. 1179.
[3]**Gospel Advocate,** 1909, p. 1516.

made this mistake. Although the trial was difficult, it taught Lipscomb a lesson that he never afterwards repeated. He learned now to put more faith in God and less in his brethren. He learned to do his own thinking, to formulate his own ideas rather than to depend upon his brethren. It was an important lesson for him to learn, but the ordeal of learning was far from pleasant.

The adroit Jesse B. Ferguson had by his eloquence captivated the hearts of the brethren around Nashville as early as 1842. Since then they had been determined that Ferguson should take the place of the beloved P. S. Fall, who had returned to Kentucky. Ferguson's refusals went unheeded. He was prevailed upon, and by the spring of 1846, only a short time after David Lipscomb entered Franklin College, Ferguson began work with the church in Nashville. With the passing of weeks the fame of twenty-seven year old Ferguson grew. He was thought to be a preacher without a peer, no one noticing any of his erratic tendencies.

It was the habit of the ambitious Tolbert Fanning to take on too much work. With him the desire to do a thing and the doing of it were one and the same. As if it were not enough for him to farm and operate Franklin College at the same time! He had to edit a paper! How could any man do all three? In reality, Fanning could do them for a short time, but sooner or later it would become evident to him that something had to be stopped. So, by the fall of 1846 Fanning decided that the **Christian Review** would have to be turned over to someone with more time to look after it. Fanning shared the popular enthusiasm for Ferguson, and decided he had found the man for the job. Ferguson accepted the invitation, changed the name of the paper to **Christian Magazine,** and by the beginning of 1848, with a new name, a new style and a new editor, Fanning's old paper came from the press.

Everything went well with the Christian Magazine until the spring of 1852. Ferguson then admitted that for eight years he had held some divergent views with his brethren on the teaching of 1 Pet. 3:18-20. To him it seemed that Peter taught that Jesus had preached the gospel to those that were dead in order that he might become the judge of the living and the dead. Ferguson's views shocked Alexander Campbell, who in fighting it,

referred to it as the "posthumous gospel." But Ferguson knew that he had a great following. He felt sure of his ground, and pressed on. With the passing of months Ferguson went from one extreme to another, until finally, like a true member of the Spiritualist cult, he advocated "spirit rappings," and believed in communications with the spirits of the other world. In the fall of 1854 he published a book entitled **Spirit Communion** which he intended should be a record of communications from the Spirit-spheres and which would contain "incontestable evidence of personal identity, presented to the public, with explanatory observations."

Tolbert Fanning watched Ferguson's blunder with an unusual forlornness. He could hardly forgive himself for not having noticed Ferguson's erratic nature, and for having turned the **Christian Review** over to him to be used as an instrument of propagating error. In the environs of Nashville were several small congregations which had fallen under Ferguson's spell. There was only one thing to do: show these people the error before it was too late. To this end he worked tirelessly, saving many congregations from Ferguson's spiritualism.

But David Lipscomb was disappointed. For the moment he was off balance. So keen was his regret that he thought he was in the wrong church. Maybe the Baptists were not so bad, he reasoned. Old Grandfather David had been a Baptist, and a more zealous, pious man had never lived! Maybe his mother and father had not been wise to leave the Baptists! So he vigorously read the Baptist Manual, comparing it to the New Testament. It took awhile to complete his studies, but he was convinced that the Baptists could not be in harmony with the Bible. He had been right all of the time! The wrong was in reposing too great a confidence in J. B. Ferguson. He regained his balance, resolved to profit by his mistake, and never afterward repeat it.

Texas Trip

Aunt Fanny was in need! Since arriving in Texas, things had gone from bad to worse. As David Lipscomb sized up the matter, here was an excellent opportunity to repay her kindness.

Aunt Fanny had married when she was only seventeen to Isaac Van Zandt, a prosperous merchant, three years older than she. They took "immigration fever," and moved to Mississippi. Then came the big depression of 1837 and the Van Zandts lost everything. Isaac studied law, and in 1839 decided to open his practice in a new locality. Having decided upon moving to Texas, they went west. Near the Sabine River was an old garrison, called Camp Sabine. Here their money ran out and the Van Zandt family stopped. The family's first need was a home, but with no money or feed, Van Zandt decided to find some corn, and rode horseback ten miles to do so. He left his wife, two small children, and a half-grown Negro girl named Amy and went off for four weeks to earn some money. The winter of 1839 was difficult for Aunt Fanny.

The following year Isaac Van Zandt was elected to the Texas Congress, and was one of the framers of the constitution. Afterwards he was made a minister for the new Republic of Texas to the United States government at Washington, D. C. He helped to negotiate the treaty of annexation which brought Texas into the union. In 1846 Van Zandt announced his candidacy for governor of Texas, but while campaigning for office became ill with yellow fever and died. This left Aunt Fanny a widow with five small children.

The problem of rearing a family of five children in Marshall, Texas, was great. Besides looking after their physical necessities, there was the problem of their religious training. There was no New Testament church here in this frontier town, and the fact bothered her. There was nothing especially to hold David Lipscomb back in Tennessee. Maybe he would come to Texas and help her establish a church! All Aunt Fanny had to do was ask, and David was ready to come.

The exact date of Lipscomb's going to Texas and the duration of his stay there are questions that cannot be decided with certainty.

The trip, however enjoyable, proved a failure so far as getting the church established in Marshall. Lipscomb spent a good

portion of his time with J. H. Cain of Harrison County. The problem of what to do about the children's religious training still loomed before Aunt Fanny. It is not hard to imagine the advice she received. By January, 1856, Aunt Fanny had moved, bringing all of her children, back to Franklin College to make her home with William, and educate all her children. That David Lipscomb had a hand in this arrangement is not too difficult to see.

Christmas Day, 1854, found David Lipscomb in an unusually meditative mood. It is impossible to say where he was or what brought on the melancholy. If one's imagination could be used, he might say that Lipscomb was still in Marshall, Texas, and having failed to establish a church there, was wondering why. At any rate, it occurred to Lipscomb that Christian people were inexcusably lifeless. He gave vent to his gloom by writing an article which he called "The Cause of Christian Lifelessness," and addressed it to his brother, William. Whether he wrote the article intending that it should be published or whether he wrote it as a literary expression of his abject forlornness cannot be said. It proved, however, to be the first article from David Lipscomb's pen ever to appear in print. It was published in the **Gospel Advocate** during the year 1856.

The spring of 1855 found Tolbert Fanning once again weighing the possibility of starting a paper. He had spoken to William about it, and both men decided that the need was so great that they could not long put off doing so. This time they would call their paper the **Gospel Advocate.** It is understandable why they did not choose to call it the **Christian Magazine,** but why not call it the **Christian Review?** Could they have known that Elder Ben Franklin was then contemplating the publication of a weekly to be called, the American Christian Review? Did they prefer that the whole Christian Review - Christian Magazine episode be forgotten? Did they remember that John T. Johnson and B. F. Hall had once edited a paper from Georgetown, Kentucky, called Gospel Advocate and have some special, fond memory of it? Or, did they just like the name because it represented what they wanted to do—advocate the gospel? Maybe all of these reasons were involved.

It was readily agreed that the Gospel Advocate was sorely needed. Fortunately, the Christian Magazine was dead and that cut off any wide dissemination of Ferguson's views. But this could not relieve Fanning of his feeling of guilt for turning the Christian Review over to Ferguson. Besides any remnant of Ferguson's views needed to be counter-acted. Fanning, therefore, made it clear that he regretted the past action when he wrote:

> The history of the work substituted for 'The Review' is well known and bitterly regretted. The error committed cannot be corrected—there is no place for repentance! But we would gladly shroud the past in impenetrable night. We once more appear before our brethren and the world as a religious journalist, and whilst we ask the indulgence of all, we are happy in the belief that our labor in the 'Gospel Advocate' will prove a blessing to many.[4]

The second circumstance that created the need for the **Gospel Advocate,** Fanning and William Lipscomb agreed, was the existence of divergent views on the subject of "congregational cooperation."

By 1849 the brotherhood generally had reached a point where many were determined to establish a general organization through which the churches could cooperate to do their work. For seven or eight years Alexander Campbell had been preparing the way for such a move by frequent essays on "Church Organizations." In February, Campbell announced in the **Millennial Harbinger:** "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."[5] The problems that concerned Campbell were the form or character of the organization, and the best method to establish it.

Campbell urged his readers to send him their criticisms or suggestions immediately, and then determine if a general meeting could be called in either Lexington, Cincinnati, Louisville or Pittsburg. Various suggestions were made for the next two or three months as to place and time of meeting, but by the late

[4]Tolbert Panning, "Reminiscences," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. I, No. 2, (August, 1856) p. 27.

[5]**Millennial Harbinger,** 1849, p. 90.

summer, it was agreed that a general convention should be called for Cincinnati on Tuesday, October 23, 1849.

Despite his absence because of illness, Campbell's place was ably filled by W. K. Pendleton who was already well schooled on Campbell's personal desires. Later, Pendleton wrote:

> We met, not for the purpose of enacting ecclesiastic laws, not to interfere with the true and scriptural independence of the churches, but to consult about the best ways for giving efficiency to our power, and to devise such methods of cooperation, in the great work of converting and sanctifying the world, as our combined counsels, under the guidance of Providence, might suggest and approve.[6]

There were one hundred and fifty-four delegates present during the four days of deliberations. A constitution of thirteen articles was adopted identifying the organization as the American Christian Missionary Society. Alexander Campbell was president. Twenty vice-presidents were selected. In this number were included, D. S. Burnet, Walter Scott, W. K. Pendleton, John T. Johnson and Tolbert Fanning. Upon hearing of the results Campbell exclaimed: "We have an organized Missionary Society—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."[7]

Fanning had for many years doubted "the practical results of the cooperations in Tennessee, and indeed in other states." His attendance at the first meeting of the Society in Cincinnati was purely to observe. He hoped to learn something that would permit him to acquiesce to his brethren's views on the subject. He came away disappointed, entertaining increasing doubts as to the propriety of a Society. But his brethren in Tennessee by no means shared his skepticism. It was obvious that the majority of the brethren would sooner or later fall in line with the missionary society; indeed in Tennessee they were already going along. David Lipscomb himself was not fervently pro-society in views, but the fact that he was willing to work with Societies at

[6]**Millennial Harbinger,** 1849, p. 690.
[7]**Millennial Harbinger,** 1869, p. 76.

all shows that he did not possess a strong feeling of opposition. It was not until after the Civil War that David Lipscomb became as violently opposed to Societies.

At the beginning of 1855 eight congregations in Van Buren, Warren, Cannon and Franklin Counties organized as "the Christian Churches in the Mountain District of Tennessee." Lipscomb was chosen secretary, and accordingly, on July 23, sent a notice to the **Gospel Advocate,** announcing a cooperation meeting in Woodbury, Cannon County, to begin on Friday before the fourth Lord's Day in September, 1855. He pleaded with brethren to take an interest in the work. "Brethren," he wrote, "shall we not make one united, earnest effort to do more than we have ever done? The cause of our Master and the interests of humanity demand it at our hands."[8] At the meeting, W. D. Carnes spoke on Friday, and Tolbert Fanning on Saturday. The reports indicated that up until June two evangelists had been in the field—Aaron Seitz, and L. N. Murphree. Furthermore, there had been 127 additions in these eight congregations during the past year. In June, J. D. Eichbaum and A. P. Seitz had been added to the area as evangelists in the field. The meeting now decided that David Lipscomb, S. J. Walling, B. Fugett, and D. Ramsey should be appointed to the Board of Managers. Eichbaum was appointed to spend the year, 1856 in preaching in Franklin County. During the cooperation meeting, J. J. Trott preached each night, resulting in eight additions.[9]

Fanning refused all overtures to hold an office. Instead, he watched the discussions thoughtfully, being impressed that brethren spoke "as men at sea":—they have theories, suggestions, plans, etc., which was really an acknowledgement that no divine' directions or examples had been given. He also felt that from the character of these meetings, the sole purpose was to raise salaries for preachers. It was really the case, as David Lipscomb later wrote, that "in their efforts to conserve peace among the disciples, those opposing the Societies went as far as possible

[8]**Gospel Advocate,** 1866, p. 88.
[9]**Gospel Advocate,** 1856, p. 153.

to satisfy those approving them."[10] Now that the subject of publishing a paper had come up, Tolbert Fanning felt that its most important contribution to the cause would be to give the whole subject a thorough discussing.

> In establishing 'The Gospel 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.[11]

First Preaching

The next year, the cooperation of the Mountain District met at Philadelphia in Warren County on November 21, 22. It was a foregone conclusion that sooner or later David Lipscomb must speak publicly. Up to now he had refused. His work **had** been done by visiting among the churches and encouraging them to greater zeal for the Lord. But some of his brethren were getting the idea that it was time for Lipscomb to "speak out" publicly. W. D. Carnes insisted that Lipscomb speak; so he did, advocating **a** strong society for preaching the word. J. D. Eichbaum, Isaac Jones and L. D. Mercer backed him, but old John Stroud and a Brother Murphy tried to tone down the enthusiasm and arrive at a compromise acceptable to all.[12]

Now that Lipscomb had "spoken out," it was inevitable that other such occasions would present themselves. Shortly afterwards, he was taking a trip to get a preacher to come to his community. On the way an old sister asked him to get a preacher to come and speak for the benefit of her children. Lipscomb proceeded on his journey, failed to get a preacher, and on his return trip, stopped to see the old sister. She saw him coming and said, "Brother David, you need not tell me about it, for I know you have failed." So David himself talked to the woman and her children and did a good job of preaching. He made several

[10]**David Lipscomb, "Tolbert** Farming's Position," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. LI - No. 48, (Dec. 2, 1909) p. 1516.
[11]Tolbert Fanning, "Cooperation," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. **I - No. 4,** (Oct.1855) p. 110.
[12]**Gospel Advocate, 1878, p. 38.**

return trips here, talking to the family, preaching in his own informal way, before his family ever found out about it. He had never read a chapter or offered a prayer publicly before at his home congregation.[13]

David Lipscomb's first attempt to preach a formal sermon was at a school house near McMinnville about the close of 1856. He had worked hard on his sermon, had chosen his text, and was ready for the occasion. Old John Stroud, who had preached many a sermon, was present and listening. Lipscomb stood up and began reading his text. Suddenly, he forgot his sermon, so he continued reading. He finally turned to Stroud and said, "Brother Stroud, will you please preach the sermon today?" Brother Stroud was so startled by the suddenness that he could say nothing. Going home after the service that noon, they rode along in the buggy several miles before either spoke. Stroud finally said affectionately, "Brother Lipscomb, don't be discouraged with today's results." Lipscomb replied, "I'll try not to be but I must confess that it is a little discouraging to see one become so confused and have to leave the pulpit who has been preaching as long as you have."[14]

Nothing could stop Lipscomb from preaching now that he had started. The first year of his preaching career was 1857, spent for the most part around McMinnville. He was a young preacher and needed continual encouragement. He was easily embarrassed, and years later, wrote: "I have not been able to this day to throw off a feeling of embarrassment when I get up to speak to an audience. It was distressing when I began to work, and I always suffered from apprehension and dread as the time to speak approached."[15] Smith Dabney, a good friend, "and one of the best men I ever knew," as Lipscomb put it, encouraged him considerably.

There was nothing ostentatious about the circumstances of this early preaching. Meeting houses were few, so most of the

[13]F. D. Srygley, **Biographies & Sermons**, (Nashville; McQuiddy Printing Co., 1899) p. 158, 9.

[14]**Gospel Advocate,** 1917, p. 1206.
[15]**Gospel Advocate,** 1897, p. 164.

preaching was done in a school house, under a shade tree, or in some log cabin. Crowds as a rule were small. One rainy morning when Lipscomb got up to preach only one man and two ladies were present. The man said, "I am sorry it is a bad day. I was hopeful you would have enough to preach to, as I am interested in your preaching." Lipscomb replied: "If you are interested, we have enough to preach to." After the sermon, the man said: "Well, I learned more of the Bible today than I ever learned before." The next time he heard Lipscomb preach he obeyed the gospel. Once in north Alabama, Lipscomb preached to five people out in the open by only the light of a log fire, and baptized three of the five. During the year spent at McMinnville, only thirty to forty people attended with any regularity, and these were poor and uneducated.

Preaching services were often interrupted by unforeseen circumstances. One Saturday night Lipscomb had an appointment to preach in a school house in a mountain cove in Tennessee. In the audience was a man who had imbibed a little too freely. During the sermon, the man became very demonstrative, nodding his head and, speaking out so all could hear him: "that's so! that's so!" Finally, Lipscomb made a statement that the mart did not like, so he jumped up crying out, "That's a lie." Two men grabbed his arm to usher him out. Lipscomb said to the men, "Let him alone. He has the same right to disapprove that he has to approve." The men released him. As the man took his seat, he looked up into Lipscomb's face and said: "You are a gentleman, sir." Lipscomb kindly replied, "Well, you must be one, too, and keep quiet until I am through." The man remained quiet the rest of the meeting. Several years later, when Lipscomb visited this region, he found the man to be a sober, Christian gentleman, an earnest member of the church in that district.[16]

Lipscomb's religion was intensely practical. He believed the Christian religion made a man a better farmer, a wife a better housekeeper, or a professional man better in his work. His preaching, then was simple, directed to the needs and and the everyday

[16]**Gospel Advocate, 1881, p. 499.**

lives of his audiences. Once as he was riding in a buggy with an infidel over the roads of Franklin County, the infidel said, "Mr. Lipscomb, I want you to tell me one good thing the Christian religion has given us." Lipscomb replied laconically, "It has given us better hogs." He was not trying to be sharp: he meant it. Christianity, as it improved men's lives improved their work. This was a cardinal point in his whole concept.

During the year, 1857, while preaching at McMinnville, he took frequent excursions into other areas for brief preaching appointments. He often preached at Murfreesboro when the church met in "a little frame house in the flat near the railroad." Here he made his home with Sister Amanda Mosley whom Fanning had baptized in 1833, only a year after the church in Murfreesboro was established. On Friday, before the fifth Lord's Day of August, Lipscomb met Joshua K. Speer and went with him to New Hermon. That night they had nine additions. On the fourth Lord's Day in October, Lipscomb and Speer attended the old Ebenezer congregation and heard Tolbert Fanning preach on "The Gospel." It was one of the most impressive sermons Lipscomb ever heard. He requested Fanning to give him a copy of it. The sermon was printed in the Gospel Advocate in 1857, reprinted in the **Advocate** in 1910, and printed in the book, **Franklin College And Its Influence** published in 1904.

Now that he was preaching, Lipscomb was bothered some by the question whether he should have some properly authorized person to lay hands on him. Men were generally appointed to preach by this process. In 1858 he saw Jesse L. Sewell and the elders at the New Smyrna congregation near McMinnville lay hands on a person to appoint him to office. Still he decided that he would have none of this. He wrote about his decision,

> I started out to preach believing preachers were appointed by laying on of hands. I failed to submit to it, because I did not care to be considered a preacher. I began preaching because I thought I could do some work in that line that would be helpful, and all the help that could be given was needed then. I have had no ambition for official places or honors in the church or out of it. I desired to do what I did as a layman. I did not know how long I would continue in the work or when I would quit

> it. I did not wish to continue a day longer than I could do good. I soon saw that Barnabas and Saul had preached ten or twelve years before they had hands laid on them, and those scattered abroad from Jerusalem, both men and women, 'went everywhere preaching the word.' I felt sure with these examples that I was on safe ground in preaching what I could. I did not care for any one to feel any responsibility for supporting me. So I preferred that kind of work.[17]

David Lipscomb's own code for life was very strict. He believed in working hard, staying out of debt, and practicing thrift. He never spent a nickel in his life unnecessarily, and was a shrewd business man. Behind his religious activities, Lipscomb also spent a great portion of his time in buying and selling property. By the time he died, he had acquired a considerable amount of property, and yet, ironically enough no man cared less for money than he.

Not all of his time in 1857 was spent in preaching at McMinnville. This year William and David pooled their resources and bought a farm from Tolbert Fanning for $16,275. The property lay in White's Bend in the Cumberland River. It was five hundred acres of good farm land. The land had been purchased by George C. Bain from George Anderson. Bain had sold it to Luther A. Martin, who had sold it to Jack Fanning, and Jack (A. J.) had in turn sold it to Tolbert Fanning. William and David agreed to pay Fanning $2,166 ⅔ plus interest on January 1, 1856, and the same amount on January 1, 1857. A small note for $312.50 they agreed to pay in May, 1857. Then, they agreed to pay Fanning $5,750 on January 1, 1858, and the same amount on January 1, 1859. Fanning was permitted to hold a loan on the property until the debts were paid in full. To make the deal pleasing to William and David Fanning threw in two wagons, all the farm tools, carpenter's tools, household furniture, two mares, forty-five head of cattle, five yoke of oxen, and "the hogs on the place and all the wood crop."

David Lipscomb's preaching was done all over middle Tennessee, but his home remained at Franklin College, Tennessee, with William. Here he spent most of his time until the out-

[17] **Gospel Advocate, 1905, p. 869.**

break of the Civil War. Nor did he neglect Nashville proper. One bright Sunday afternoon he went to Fireman's Hall on Cherry Street in the south part of town to preach. Despite the fact the meeting had been well advertised only three women came. One of these was Lavina F. Bennett, a woman he had known from his childhood.[18] Lipscomb preached to the three women. At the close of the sermon, he told each of them to bring another and he would come and preach again. "With many ups and downs the work continued," and eventually, there was a good congregation established here.[19]

By such humble efforts churches sprang up all over Middle Tennessee. In 1859 two women, Mrs. Marcissa Johnson and Mrs. C. M. McDaniel, lived near a little community called Euclid. They wanted a congregation established. Sister McDaniel finally persuaded R. B. ("Bob") Trimble to come and hold a meeting. With the help of James C. Owen, a wealthy farmer, the effort was made. Trimble's meeting was hardly successful, but on the fourth Sunday of July, 1859, Fanning came out and preached on "Church Organization." This was the beginning of Owen's Chapel Church in Maury County.

R. B. Trimble and David Lipscomb worked often together in these days at the eve of the Civil War, and even during the war. Trimble, a native of Davidson County, had been a Presbyterian. While serving an apprenticeship in a tailor shop in Franklin, Tennessee, he heard the gospel and obeyed it. Lipscomb first met Trimble at Owen's Chapel. Trimble was then preaching out in the woods. During their travels, Lipscomb observed that Trimble's power lay in his personal work. Trimble, a restless man and a poor financier, died at Milan, Tennessee, on January 13, 1896, and was buried at Alamo.[20]

John R. Howard left his home in September, 1858, for a lengthy tour through Tennessee. Among the preachers he met were

[18]**Gospel Advocate,** 1878, p. 296.
[19]**Gospel Advocate,** 1895, p. 84.
[20]**Gospel Advocate,** 1896, p. 151.

Joshua K. Speer and David Lipscomb. Of these two men he said:

> Bros. Speer and Lipscomb are young men, well educated, and very promising preachers; and of modest, affable, unassuming deportment, and truly Christian temper and character. It is very gratifying to see such young men coming on the stage of evangelical action, to take the places of us old men who, ere many years will have to leave it.[21]

By April, 1861, David Lipscomb had "come onto the stage of evangelical action."

Then came the war.

[21] John R. Howard, "Tour In Middle Tennessee," American Christian Review, (Vol. II - No. 10, (March 8, 1859) p. 37.

CHAPTER VI

"MAY THE GODS AVERT THE OMEN"

The body of South Carolina's truculent senator, John C. Calhoun, lay in state in the Senate chamber one gloomy day early in April, 1850. His fellow statesmen filed by in melancholy procession. Daniel Webster turned and spoke laconically to gruff old Senator Thomas Benton of Missouri. "There lies the dead body of Calhoun," he said solemnly. Benton, a bitter enemy of the departed statesman, growled back: "There may be no animation in his body, sir, but there is plenty in his doctrine." The gentleman from Missouri proved an able prophet. Calhoun was dead, but his doctrine of states' rights was not. Ten years later his doctrine was to explode in its full, terrifying force, engulfing the nation in blood and tears.

While David Lipscomb remained busy preaching in middle Tennessee during the years 1859 and 1860, the staccato of the war drums beat more loudly, gradually rising in dreadful crescendo. All eyes were focused upon the crucial election of 1860. The election of a "Black Republican," to use an odious sobriquet then current in the South, would be the sound of doom for the South, and would leave open to her one of two courses: humble submission to the obvious dominance of the North, or war. Meanwhile, through the year 1859 and the spring and summer that followed the South worked feverishly to see elected a president sympathetic with her cause. It was her last chance.

Enthusiasts were busy on both sides whipping up war talk. Hinton Rowan Helper wrote in the **Impending Crisis of The South,** "Our motto, and we would have you to understand it, is the abolition of slavery, and the perpetuation of the American union. If by any means you do succeed in your treasonable attempts to take the South out of the Union today, we will bring her back tomorrow—if she goes away with you, she will return without you." The book angered the South as nothing ever had. Daniel Worth of Greensboro, North Carolina, a Wesleyan Methodist preacher, for selling and circulating Helper's **Impending Crisis,**

was given thirty-nine lashes, and was told the penalty of a second offense would be death. The Nashville Union and American declared editorally on January 5, 1860, that the great body of "Black Republicans" in Congress endorsed Helper's book, and served notice on these men that

> there is another class of men in the country who also desire to 'perpetuate the Union' but on terms and conditions essentially different—loyal, patriotic, national men, who know that free and republican men and institutions can only be secured by a written constitution and a faithful observance of all its provisions and guarantees. . . .

A week later the same paper insisted that it was time to stop the policy of appeasement toward the "Black Republicans." "What then must be the astonishment of every man," it declared editorially, "who appreciates in the slightest degree the dangers that surround us, and feels that the hour is past for any further concessions to Black Republicanism?"

Rough talk was the order of the day, both editorially and otherwise. The psychology of it no doubt was that each side hoped by its dauntless words to intimidate the other. So while Nashville citizens barked roughly at the North at one moment, they went on their merry way way toward making their city the imperial idol of the South. The L. & N. Railroad was completed between Nashville and Bowling Green, Kentucky, in the summer of 1859. It was a sprightly crowd that came together on Wednesday morning, August 10, to watch the first train leave for Bowling Green. The population in 1860 was 23,715. Transportation was needed, so the State Senate passed a bill on February 28, 1860, authorizing the formation of the McGavock and Vernon Horse Railroad Co. This railroad was to run from the post-office to the Mount Vernon Garden, with the privilege of having one or more branch railroads. Two weeks later the Senate passed another bill incorporating the South Nashville Railroad Co., and authorizing the construction of a street railroad from Church Street along Market and down College or Cherry Streets to the city limits or to the State Fair Grounds on the south side of the town. Nashville was growing up. Nor did the threat of war frighten John Overton from constructing the Maxwell House on the Corner of Church and Cherry Streets in the summer of 1860.

Nashville was proud when the cornerstone was laid on August 23 and suavely approved the naming of the famous hotel with the maiden name of Overton's wife.

June, the traditional month for naming candidates for the presidency, furnished in 1860 an opportunity for Nashville citizens to let off steam. On June 13 the "Black Republicans" called a convention in Chicago while the slaveholding states called a similar convention at the same time in Atlanta, Georgia. Meanwhile, the "Opposition Party" had already met the previous month in Baltimore and had named John Bell as its standard bearer. Shortly after his nomination Bell had come to Nashville and found the city waiting with wide open arms. His train arrived at two o'clock one afternoon in late May, but a parade had started at noon. A lively crowd had marched in time with the heavy beat of the drum and the shrill notes of the fife. Banners were waving everywhere. One read: A HOME WELCOME TO HON. JOHN BELL. Bell got off the train, and marched with the crowd up Market Street to the Square, turning right at Douglas' cornel and marched around the Square to the City Hotel. The Stars and Stripes were unfurled at the head of the parade. A streaming banner beside it read on one side: "JOHN BELL CLUB —1860," and on the other side, NOVEMBER, 1860—JUDGMENT DAY FOR SHAM DEMOCRACY.

Upon Bell's arriving at the hotel, Governor Brown made a reception speech. The crowd gave three cheers for Bell, three for Everitt, and three for the Union. Bell spoke briefly and with a heavy heart. Mr. E. Ewing was called upon to speak. He insisted that he had nothing to say, but once he got started, nothing could stop him. Ewing spoke on a platform. Over his head was unfurled a banner which read: WE HONOR JOHN BELL OF THE UNION. While the southern orator spoke, the banner fell with a crash on his head.

"May The Gods Avert the Omen" exclaimed Ewing melodramatically.

On Monday, June 25, 1860, it was announced in Nashville that the National Democratic Convention had nominated John C.

Breckenridge of Kentucky and Joseph Lane of Oregon. That night thirty-three cannon shots were fired in Nashville. The Nashville Union And American, breathing easily at last, called this "daylight at last," and felt confident now of victory in the fall under these two men.

But victory was not to come quite so easily. The "Black Republicans" had nominated a homely lawyer from the prairies of Illinois. Fate had determined that while armies clashed on fields of battle, the tall, gaunt form of Abraham Lincoln should move sadly and silently through the White House, a solemn sentinel guarding the hopes for a united nation. News of Lincoln's election reached Nashville two days after the polling. The Nashville Union And American sadly wrote:

> The dispatches which we have received clearly indicate the realization of our most serious fears: the election of Lincoln. What will follow the announcement of this result in the more Southern States we cannot determine. But judging from the tone and temper of the leading man and journals in South Carolina, Mississippi and Texas, we are apprehensive that those States will withdraw from the Union. Should they do so, it is probable that they will be followed by Florida, Alabama, and perhaps Georgia. If but one State succeeds, the question will present itself to the Federal Government whether or not it will admit doctrine of peaceful secession. Should coercion be attempted although the other Southern States might not take adverse action in their corporate capacity, it is quite certain that thousands of their citizens would be enlisted under the banner of the Seceding States. . . .[1]

From November, 1860 through the following spring Southern states one after the other seceded. Buchanan, filling out the last days of his term, wrung his hands in impotent bewilderment. The simulacrum of a government in Washington watched in sickening helplessness the disintegration of the Union. An agonized bystander remembering how sternly Andrew Jackson had once threatened to hang John C. Calhoun "as high as Haman" if South Carolina seceded from the Union, lifted his quivering hand above his head and cried, "Oh, for an hour of Old Hickory Jackson." Lincoln took office on March 4th, and in less than six weeks the nation was plunged into war.

[1]**Nashville Union And American, Nor. 8, 1860.**

On June 17, 1861, amid the cheering of the people and the booming of the salute guns, the "bonnie blue" flag of the Confederacy was raised over the State Capitol in Nashville. This climaxed Tennessee's swift secession. On April 17th Governor Isham G. Harris had wired President Lincoln: "Tennessee will not furnish a single man for purpose of coercion, but 50,000 if necessary for the defense of our rights and those of our Southern brothers." On June 8th, the voters had ratified the orders of Secession passed by the General Assembly. Early that same month the most spectacular parade ever held in Nashville was conducted. It formed along Church Street and Summer Street in the vicinity of the St. Cloud Hotel and was made up of thousands of men, women and children, military companies, home guards, and brass bands. There were music and shouting and the firing of guns as the parade moved down Church Street to College Street and up to the Public Square. All patriotic southerners were sure that after a few shots were fired, the North would surrender. A certain egotism contributed some to the excitement. The Southern cause was right; the Northern, selfish and evil. Southern men, by their own standards, were gallant debonairs with the purest blood of a noble aristocracy; Northern men were rough, uncouth, unmitigated seigniors of the slums.

Nashville found itself a focal point of attention in the months that followed. A rumor spread that Nashville was to be made the capital of the Confederacy instead of Montgomery, Alabama, and that, the Tennessee State House would be the National Capitol Building of the Confederacy. In September, Albert Sidney Johnston, on his way to Bowling Green to assume command of the Confederate troops, stopped at Nashville to visit Governor Harris. People thronged about the Capitol Building and Johnston was forced to come out and make a speech. During his stay, Johnston was impressed with the strategic location of Nashville and urged that the city be strongly fortified. But the citizens, still moving in dreamy stupor, were unimpressed by the warning, and placed only a few cannon on the surrounding hills.

Early the following February, General U. S. Grant's Federal forces started to march. On the 7th of the month, Fort Henry fell.

and the next day Grant took his staff up the Cumberland River for a reconnaissance of the outer lines of Donelson. Grant found his previous knowledge of the Confederate commanders at Donelson particularly helpful. He believed General John B. Floyd, the commander, to be no soldier at all, and that General Pillow with whom he had fought in Mexico was so dilatory that he could approach the outer entrenchments of any line he was given to hold. So by the middle of February, 1862, Fort Donelson had fallen and the Cumberland Valley was open all the way to Nashville.

Meanwhile, news reached the city that General Grant had attacked Fort Donelson, and the first rumors had it that the Confederates had won an overwhelming victory. But early on Sunday morning, February 16, the cheerless word came that Donelson had fallen. A frightful chaos followed. The decision forced itself quickly upon Johnston whether to defend or abandon the city. His previous warnings had gone unheeded. There was not enough time to assemble an army nor enough artillery available to fight the Federal forces. The irate citizens ran in wild confusion as Johnston sadly announced that Nashville would be abandoned. A medley of wild rumors turned affairs into a snarl. Many fled in panic; some loitered aimlessly about; others jammed the railroad station and packed wagons for departure.

In the next hours retreating Confederate soldiers poured through the city. They were a motley lot with their bloody bandages and gapping wounds. The Quartermaster Corps gave the public their supplies, and the eager people turned into a plundering mob. General Johnston ordered General Floyd to restore order to the city, but Floyd was helpless. Colonel Nathan B. Forest rode into town from Fort Donelson and undertook the task of restoring order. He ordered thousands of pounds of bacon and many boxes of army clothing shipped to Chattanooga and Decatur, Alabama. Forest appealed to the mob on terms of patriotism to stop their plundering but to no avail. He rode his horse into the mobs, beating down the ringleaders with his sword. On Tuesday morning, it was decided to destroy the suspension bridge and railroad bridge across the Cumberland north of the city.

It was the following Sunday before the first scouts of the Union troops appeared in Edgefield, across the river from Nashville. The next evening General Buell arrived. That night Mayor Cheatham surrendered the city to him. The next day, Tuesday, February 25, 1862, the Stars and Stripes flew back over Nashville. That same day the first Federal troops unloaded gleefully from their gunboats at the foot of Broad Street. Blaring bands of blue coats played "Yankee Doodle" all the way to the Capitol Building where they hoisted the Stars and Stripes. Nashville had fallen, the first large Confederate city to be lost.

On March 12th Andrew Johnson came to occupy the Govenor's chair. He was determined that his native state should be whipped back in line with the sternest of measures. He began by demanding that all people of major station in life should be forced to take the oath of allegiance to the Federal Government. Those who refused were arrested for treason and sent to prison. Many of the city's major citizens, among them Judge John C. Guild, spent the war in prison. Johnson's orders went to municipal officers, business men, clergymen, and teachers. Andrew Johnson became an intensely hated man.

Amid these chaotic events David Lipscomb moved with as little perturbation as possible. He spent the year 1860 preaching in Middle Tennessee and taking care of his river bottom farm. He attended a meeting of an "Educational Convention" held in Franklin, Tennessee, May 3 and 4, and was appointed to a committee to prepare an address to be delivered at the next meeting to be held at Columbia, on October 31.[2] That summer he attended a meeting of the Alumni Society of Franklin College and heard an address by F. M. Carmack entitled "The Curse of The Sun." The theme dealt with a favorite subject of Lipscomb's—the future of the Negro.

The eve of the war found brethren apprehensive of the future, determined to preach the gospel. The work of J. B. Ferguson had been largely checked. James R. Collinsworth, a Ferguson man, moved into Marshall County early in 1859 to play havoc

[2]**Gospel Advocate, 1878, p. 150.**

with the churches, but found himself squarely up against the cold, logical mind of the erudite Dr. T. W. Brents. When the skirmish was over, Collinsworth joined the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.[3]

In Nashville, the meetinghouse which had burned in 1857 was being replaced, and by the latter part of 1859 brethren were ready to move in. The preaching was being done by visiting speakers. James Challen of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, spent most of the month of February, 1860, in Nashville and spoke for the church each Lord's Day. On Sunday morning of the 26th, however, he gave way to W. D. Carnes, president of the University of East Tennessee. Carnes' presence in Nashville furnished Tolbert Fanning the opportunity of talking over with him the possibility of his taking over the presidency of Franklin College. At other times in the year D. Pat Henderson of Louisville, Kentucky, or C. W. Sewell, or P. S. Fall spoke.

David Lipscomb faced the war determined to stay aloof from it as far as possible. His preaching on the eve of the war largely emphasized what he considered to be the duty of all Christians to have no part in it. It was like crying into a hailstorm. He was regarded by his fellow southerners as being unpatriotic and cowardly. A man, standing in a doorway listening to him preach his views, roared out angrily that if twelve men would help him, he would hang David Lipscomb to the highest tree.[4] But Lipscomb was adamant, preaching his views wherever he could find an audience.

The war came. Confederate forces visited his farm and took off his horses and mules, asking no questions. He had barely managed to replace these when General Grant's forces swept down the Cumberland valley and took them again. It was useless to try to farm with no tools, so Lipscomb made plans to teach school.

The fall of 1861 while Albert Sidney Johnston was in Nashville, the city was filled with Confederate soldiers. David Lipscomb, on one of his visits, watched the deportment of Colonel

[3]**American Christian Review,** 1859, p. 87.
[4]**Gospel Advocate,** 1892, p. 458.

Gregg's Texas regiment. The suave Texas soldiers with their noble courtly manners pleased Lipscomb. Speaking one day to the Colonel's wife, Lipscomb commented that her husband's regiment was more civil and moral than those from Mississippi or Tennessee. "Oh," she replied proudly, "a Texas gentleman is the most complete and reliable gentleman in the world. He is so, purely from principle—no coercive restraint of public sentiment forcing him into gentlemanly behavior." Texas stock went up with Lipscomb at the moment.

Lipscomb received news that a close relative, a Confederate soldier, was sick in a hospital at Hopkinsville, Ky., so determined to make him a visit. The brethren had been running a school here called South Kentucky College, and the buildings had been taken over for a hospital. Upon arrival Lipscomb was heartsick when he noticed that ruffian soldiers were cutting down the trees on the grounds and demolishing the buildings. Lipscomb met Enos Campbell who also had observed the damage being done. Campbell asked Lipscomb if he could get it stopped, and Lipscomb thought he could. Relatives often come in handy, and it proved so at this time. "Aunt Fanny" Van Zandt's oldest daughter had married a man who was now a Confederate soldier. He was Colonel J. M. Clough and fortunately was garrisoned here at Hopkinsville. Lipscomb spoke to the Colonel about it, and together they went to examine the premises. Colonel Clough took Lipscomb to the commanding General and orders were immediately issued that the destruction should stop.[5]

A few weeks later Colonel Clough, fighting under General Floyd at Fort Donelson, was killed in action.

Tolbert Fanning spent the eve of the war preaching, running Franklin College, and tending his farm. But all indications are that his farm was getting considerable more attention than the College, and the burden was more and more thrown on William Lipscomb. The State Fair came to Tennessee in 1859, and Fanning took the premium for having the best ewe sheep and the fastest trotting stallion. The next year he walked away with premium ribbons with his sheep, and also won one for having

[5]**Gospel Advocate,** 1884, p. 155.

the best harness mare. That winter he was ready to turn Franklin College over to W. D. Carnes. Carnes, seeing the approaching doom of war, resigned after a few weeks. It was impossible to keep the school open. Young men left College and joined the army. Many were killed before the war ended. When the Federal forces moved into Nashville, Franklin College was confiscated for use as a hospital.

If David Lipscomb preached that Christians should not fight, Tolbert Fanning was no less vigorous, and probably paid the greater price. When the war broke out, Fanning preached that Christians should stay out of the army. At first, his chief problem was with his own brethren who accused him of being disloyal to his Government. Preachers sneered at him, and for the moment Fanning became intensely unpopular. When Andrew Johnson became military Governor of Tennessee, Fanning was among those called up to swear the oath of allegiance to the Federal Government. Fanning refused and was arrested for treason. Fortunately he was not sent to prison, but all of his property was confiscated. His buildings were burned to the ground, his possessions taken from him, and in general, he was treated as an outlaw. These privations did not dent the spirits of Fanning or Lipscomb, and the few brethren of like mind. Andrew Johnson decided to increase his stern methods by compelling all eligible young men to fight in the Federal army against the South. At that, David Lipscomb, R. B. Trimble and E. G. Sewell called one day at Johnson's office insisting upon exemption from the order. Johnson insisted to the three young men that there was nothing in the constitution to allow him to dismiss them. Trimble asked to see a copy of the constitution. He read aloud a clause showing that it was possible. Governor Johnson was called out of the room. When he returned, he was obviously nervous and uneasy. He dismissed the three men from his office saying, "Gentlemen, I think you need not be uneasy. I do not think anybody will be hurt." Nothing more was heard of Governor Johnson's compelling order.

The brethren had been tireless in their efforts to keep all Christians out of the army. It was decided to send a petition to

Richmond, Virginia, to see if Christians conscientiously opposed to war could not be exempt from military duty. E. G. Sewell and O. T. Craig were appointed to take the message. They set out on horseback and on the way stopped at McMinnville where the headquarters of the Conscript Department of Middle Tennessee was located. They met a Colonel Wright and showed him their petition. He read it carefully and then said, "Well, gentlemen, this is a well worded and carefully worded document. While I believe it is the duty of all to fight when the government calls, at the same time I respect the conscience of every man that honestly believes it is wrong for him to fight. So if you are willing to trust me with it, I can get it before the authorities at Richmond sooner than you could if you were to go. And, besides, I will release any of your brethren that can give satisfaction that such is their conviction, subject to the decision of the authorities at Richmond."[6] Sewell and Craig left the document with Colonel Wright and later had the satisfaction of knowing that several young men were released from the Confederate army.

Marriage

Five miles east of Columbia on the Santa Fe Pike near Knob Creek was a meetinghouse known as Philippi, built by a congregation which David Lipscomb and R. B. Trimble established in 1860. Trimble preached on Saturday night and Sunday in a schoolhouse nearby. A small crowd gathered on Saturday night that was disappointing to both men. As Trimble and Lipscomb waited for the people to assemble, a man who introduced himself as Henry Zellner entered. At his side was his sprightly eighteen year old daughter, Margaret. David Lipscomb looked into her piquant face, and something inside him moved. Turning to Bob Trimble, he whispered, "There's the girl I'm going to marry."

If, however, Lipscomb could have read Margaret's mind, he would not have considered his chances too hopeful. At the moment, Margaret was sharing the common opinion that the good Lord had not been overly lavish in supplying David Lipscomb with any masculine pulchritude.

[6]**Gospel Advocate,** 1883, p. 210.

Henry and Margaret Zellner listened this Saturday night to the gospel preached. Trimble considered the audience so small that he would not extend an invitation, but all were asked to return the next day. The Lord's Day came, and when the invitation was extended, Henry Zellner stepped out to confess Christ. To his surprise his daughter, Margaret followed. These two baptisms constituted the beginning of the congregation known as Philippi.[7]

Henry Zellner in some respects was a remarkable man. Of German descent his forefathers had first settled in Georgia before moving to Tennessee. Zellner himself was born in Giles County on January 28, 1814. He possessed an unusual mechanical talent, being able to patent several machines. He installed the waterworks that supplied the town of Columbia for over fifty years. He also installed one at Huntsville, Alabama. Zellner married Martha Hughes on May 20, 1839. They had seven children, three of whom died in infancy. She, too, obeyed the gospel under the preaching of R. B. Trimble in 1860.[8]

On January 21, 1861 David Lipscomb passed his thirtieth birthday. It was high time that he think of marrying. He was determined that it would take more than a lot of Yankees to checkmate Dan Cupid. Margaret, still unimpressed with his looks, saw the real character of the man, and was in quite a receptive mood to his overtures of marriage. When David Lipscomb drove up in his old buggy, his dusty clothes dirty and unpressed; the horse uncurried and its mane and tail thick with cockleburrs, Henry Zellner wondered what his daughter ever saw in such a man. Margaret saw that with a woman's polish and care, David would go far in life. So, on the 23rd of July, 1862, they married.

The summer of 1862 passed slowly and nervously for Governor Andrew Johnson in Nashville. The river was low, food was short, and business was at a standstill. But worse than that was the anxiety of expecting the Confederate forces to attempt to take Nashville. At times Johnson was almost hysterical. He bom-

[7] **Gospel Advocate,** 1883, p. 210.
[8] **Gospel Advocate,** 1899, p. 740.

barded Washington constantly, demanding more Federal troops to defend the city. Actually, there was no danger at all from a Confederate assault. But nobody was happy. Filth covered the streets and alleys of the city, and the hot air was nauseating. But this was war and danger was impending. General W. S. Rosecrans moved his army to Nashville on November 10, and established his headquarters. This was in reality a dramatic announcement of things to come.

Six weeks later the armies of Rosecrans and Bragg were locked in battle at Stone's Creek near Murfreesboro. From December 31, 1862, through January 2, 1863, the battle raged. Wounded and dead poured into Nashville, and the Federal cemetery in the northern part of the city filled up with grim rapidity. The Confederate underground worked, meanwhile, in and out of the city. So successful was it that the Federals viewed it with alarm and appointed Colonel William Truesdail to stop it. Truesdail went to work in earnest. Many more of Nashville's citizens were thrown into prison, but the spy work continued.

David Lipscomb, meanwhile, continued to preach that Christians should stay aloof from the struggle. General Nathan B. Forest, while garrisoned at Columbia, heard rumors that Lipscomb was preaching a doctrine disloyal to the South, and sent a staff officer to hear him. The officer sat in a front seat and listened carefully as Lipscomb unfolded his views on the Christians' relation to civil government. During the sermon, he was moved to tears several times. Afterwards he said to Lipscomb, "I have not yet reached a conclusion as to whether or not the doctrine of the sermon is loyal to the Southern Confederacy, but I am profoundly convinced that it is loyal to the Christian religion."

The winter of 1862-63 David Lipscomb spent teaching school near Lawrenceburg. It was impossible to purchase furniture during the war, so David Lipscomb and his bride kept house as best they could. They owned no cook stove, so Margaret cooked over an open fire. Knowing her husband's fondness for corn bread, she liked to cook it for him, but nearly always managed to burn her face doing so. On Monday, February 16, Lipscomb opened

school at Eagle Mills with eight pupils. Among them was his brother-in-law, William Zellner.

Early in 1864 the Lipscombs moved to the farm near Nashville. On June 26 a baby son was born, and they appropriately named him, Zellner. Unfortunately they were never destined to rear children of their own, for early the next spring, the child died. They discussed where they should bury him, and decided that due to the uncertainty of their possessions near Nashville, they should bury him in the Zellner family lot in Maury County. Margaret instructed an old Negro man to cut down a cedar tree and dress some pieces for the coffin. A neighbor lady helped her make a heavy cotton gown for the little corpse. The baby had died early in the night, and by four in the morning, they had loaded their buggy with a few possessions, placed the coffin in their laps, and were riding through Nashville toward Maury County. They were delayed getting through the picket lines but reached Franklin that night and stayed with friends. The next day, they arrived at Henry Zellner's home and buried the infant. Margaret found it hard to comfort her husband. But he finally said with grim resolution, "I'll just have to work hard and forget."

As the war continued, it became increasingly clear that the South's was a "lost cause." Enthusiasm for war slackened considerably, but the conflict left its mark on the church. While the Civil War did not cause an open division, it created feelings that were to last for a generation. The work of the church naturally slowed. Preachers were unable to travel great distances. Many congregations ceased meeting. Mail had ceased coming, so religious papers were seldom seen. David Lipscomb worked tirelessly to keep men out of the struggle. When the news came to the South that the American Christian Missionary Society had passed resolutions in its convention in October, 1863, against the South, many members of the church rushed out angrily and joined the Confederate army.[9] Four or five impoverished congregations in middle Tennessee raised money in the winter of 1863 and 1864 to buy homes for both R. B. Trimble and E. G. Sewell. But the

[9]**Gospel Advocate, 1866, pp. 170, 1.**

struggle was hard and about all one could do was anxiously await the end of the war with a view to pressing the Lord's work more vigorously.

By the summer of 1864 David Lipscomb saw clearly that the war would soon be over. His mind played with ideas reviving the church work during the days of reconstruction. His determination to work harder than ever after his baby's death inspired him. The many congregations that had ceased meeting during the war would need to be encouraged to meet regularly again. A picture of desolation greeted him everywhere he looked. Farms had been burned, and poverty, like a grim, ghastly monster stalked the land. These poor people would have to be fed and clothed. Southern people would be humbler now and more ready to listen to the gospel and this opened up a wide range of work to be done. With these ideas in mind the need of renewing the **Gospel Advocate,** which had not been published since the war, assumed a status of paramount importance. There was no question that the **Advocate** would be the best medium of getting all of this work accomplished.

The **Gospel Advocate,** if revived, would need an editor. But who would it be? It had to be a man in sympathy with pacifist views, and one who would help feed and clothe the desolate people of the South. William was hardly well enough to assume such a role, and the indefatigable Tolbert Fanning would be reviving Franklin College. Neither man could be counted upon for any major work in the paper. The best man Lipscomb could think of was John W. McGarvey up at Lexington, Kentucky. McGarvey had opposed Christian participation in the war and was known to be a man of literary talent, whose broad Christian sympathies would lead him to help the destitute people of the South. The only question was that McGarvey was a little more wedded to the society than most people around Middle Tennessee. Still, the question of scripturalness of the missionary society was one that Lipscomb was in the process of thinking through. Christian brethren, Lipscomb reasoned, ought to be able to study these questions dispassionately. When he grew older, Lipscomb

was to learn that sometimes Christian brethren find it very difficult to study any questions dispassionately, but at this time he was more inexperienced with the ways of men.

The Kentucky State Meeting was to be held in Lexington in October, and Lipscomb determined to attend. On the way he spent a night and a part of two days at the Kentucky Female Orphan School, established by L. L. Pinkerton fifteen years earlier, at Midway. Brother and Sister Broadhurst were then in charge of the home. "Our estimate of it was such that we thought the surroundings better calculated to promote sound education and the development of true practical Christianity than any other school in Kentucky."[10] At Lexington he met John Shackleford, and his heart sickened. Shackleford belonged to the "Home Guards." Every time he heard that John Morgan's raiders were nearby he grabbed his gun "in the hope of getting a crack at the portly form of Winthrop H. Hopson" whom he understood was riding with Morgan's Raiders.[11] Imagine brother killing brother, Lipscomb thought. Was it not evident that with most Christians loyalty to the kingdoms of this world was a greater consideration than loyalty to the kingdom of Christ?

Lipscomb watched the movements of the Kentucky State Society carefully. His observations made him more skeptical than ever of the scripturalness of these institutions.[12] On the way home he had time to think considerably. McGarvey had been cool to the idea of editing the **Advocate.** Some of the prominent preachers present had promised half-heartedly to contribute occasional articles if the paper should be revived. But the **Advocate** had to be printed, even if he himself had to edit it. Of this fact he was sure.

The war dragged out eight months yet before it closed. There were many more men to die, more robbing and pillaging to be done. Regular armies crowded along the roads near Nashville, and marauding bands roamed the regions away from the high-

[10]**Gospel Advocate,** 1866, pp. 436, 7
[11]**Gospel Advocate,** 1872, p. 900.
[12]**Gospel Advocate,** 1891, p. 680.

ways. Chickens, ducks, cattle and horses were driven or carried off. Wagons pulled up to the granaries and hauled off whatever could be found—no questions asked. Scurrilous stragglers from both armies swept down on E. G. Sewell's farm on the Franklin Pike. With great difficulty Sewell kept his family alive through the winter of 1864-5.[13]

David Lipscomb himself suffered no bodily harm, but the cheerless news often reached him that some friend or relative had been killed or injured. James Perry, manager of his father's farm in Franklin County, had joined the Seventeenth Tennessee Regiment. He fought at Murfreesboro, was injured, and barely escaped alive. A cousin, Ira, son of his father's brother, William, was killed at Petersburg. Another cousin, William, son of his father's brother, Thomas, who lived at Shelbyville, joined General Forest's regiment, and was killed in November, 1864. His grandmother, Ann Day Cooke, found her home in the path of Sherman's march to the sea, and was stripped of everything. She was taken to the home of her youngest daughter, Mrs. Tahpenes Hunt, where she lived until her death in 1870.[14]

The southern armies were obviously beaten but the proud spirits of the men unbroken. For the life of him fiery, red-headed Sherman could not understand why the South did not surrender. He would show them war as they had never seen it. He would march across the southland, destroying everything in his wake, while Grant's army of the Potomac took the offensive and crushed Lee into submission. Southern generals saw the handwriting on the wall. But in one bold, daring move, they decided to send General Hood's army across the Tennessee River in a desperate effort to retake Nashville. If the move succeeded, the South might yet win; if not, they had little to lose. The gallant Hood crossed the Tennessee. A bloody battle at Franklin failed to stop his inspired troops. But at the Battle of Nashville on December 16, his luck played out. General Thomas' blue coats held their line on the southern edge of the city. Beaten but not dejected,

[13] **Gospel Advocate, 1907, p. 424.**
[14] **Gospel Advocate, 1870, pp. 401, 2.**

Hood's straggling troops tramped down the mud of Franklin Pike, singing to the tune of "The Yellow Rose of Texas,"

> But now I'm goin' to leave you;
> My heart is full of woe,
> I'm goin' back to Georgia to see my Uncle Joe.
> You may talk about your Beauregard and sing of General Lee
> But the gallant Hood of Texas played hell in Tennessee.[15]

[15]**Tennessee Historical Quarterly,** March 1945, p. 1.

CHAPTER VII

THE CHRISTIAN'S RELATION TO CIVIL GOVERNMENT

The approach of the Civil War, ominous but inexorable, found David Lipscomb fully confident of his future course of life. It was evident that Christians in both the North and South would be called upon to take up arms and defend their respective political governments. The decision of what to do did not force itself upon Lipscomb unaware. He had studied the whole question thoroughly in the light of the Bible's teachings and was of the conviction that Christians should refrain from having any part in civil and political affairs. He must refuse to take up arms either for the South or for the North. He would continue to preach the gospel as he had the opportunity, meanwhile encouraging all he could reach to lay down their arms and live by faith in obedience to the commands of Christ.

When, therefore, the bell of doom sounded and the rugged terrain exploded, it was evident that the terrible catastrophe men dreaded was here at last. David Lipscomb, Tolbert Fanning, E. G. Sewell and R. B. Trimble met with a few other like-minded preachers at Beech Grove in Williamson County, Tennessee. The result of their discussions was the following letter, penned by Tolbert Fanning but expressive of the feelings of each.

To His Excellency The President of The Confederate States of America:

> WHEREAS, A large number of the members of the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout this and the adjoining counties of the State of Tennessee, feel a deep sense of the responsibility they are under to recognize the Bible in its teachings, as the only infallible guide of their life, and the supremely authoritative rule of action, and as being a superior authority to and more binding upon the subjects of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, than the rules and regulations of any human government or power, they would respectfully represent,
>
> 1st. That they are fully satisfied that God, through the Scriptures of Sacred Truth, demands of his servants that they should submit quietly, heartily and cheerfully to the government under which they may live, in all cases,

except when compliance with the civil law would involve a violation of the law of God. They are deeply impressed with the truth that when there is a conflict between the requirements of worldly government and the law of God, the duty of the Christian is, upon the peril of his well-being, to obey God first, let the consequences be to him what they may.

2nd. They are firm in the conviction of the truth, that no man, who regards the authority of God, the spirit and letter of the Sacred Scriptures in their proper division and application, the life and teachings of the Son of God, or his Holy Apostles, as given for the guidance of his followers, can in any manner engage in, aid, foment, or countenance the strifes, animosities and bloody conflicts in which civil governments are frequently engaged, and in which they often involve their subjects.

The measure and limit of their duty to, and connection with, the governments under which they live, as laid down in the Sacred Scriptures, is not an active participation in its affairs to destroy or upbuild, but simply a quiet and cheerful submission to its enactments, in the payment of tribute and any demands on our property or time, modified only by the first and highest obligation to obey **God.**

With these considerations of what our duty to God requires at our hands, the enforcement of the "Conscript Act" for the purpose of raising and maintaining an army, for the carrying on of this unhappy war, in which our country is involved, cannot fail to work indescribable distress to those members of our churches holding these convictions. Some of them will be driven as exiles from their homes, for no political preferences, but because they dare not disobey the commandments of God. Others may be thrown into seeming opposition to your government, suffering imprisonment ana such punishment as may be inflicted on them. Others still, by the pressure of circumstances, may be driven to a deeply sadder fate, the violation of all their conscientious convictions of duty to their Maker and Master, whom they have, under the most solemn vows, pledged themselves to serve.

In view of these things, we are induced to make a statement of these facts to you, with the hope that some relief may be afforded to those of our members thus distressed.

We are the more encouraged, too, in this hope, from the fact that we perceive that Congress of the Confederate States of America, with a commendable regard for the conscientious convictions of its subjects, made provision upon certain denominations of professed Christians, from the performance of requirements repulsive to their repulsive to their religious faith. With the view, too, that this law might not act invidiously with reference to individuals or bodies of individuals, not specially named in said act, the power was vested in the Honorable President, or making such further exemptions as, in his judgment, justice, equity or necessity might demand. We respectfully petition of you, that members of our churches who

> are now, and have been striving to maintain a position of Christian separation from the world, its strifes and conflicts, may be relieved, on terms equitable and just, from requirements repulsive to their religious faith, and that they may be, at least, placed upon a footing similar to that in which denominations holding a like faith.[1]

This document was signed by the elders and evangelists of ten or fifteen congregations in middle Tennessee. A copy was also sent to the Governor of Tennessee and to President Lincoln in Washington, D. C. It was, of course, intended by its authors to be a declaration that they would take no part in the war, either for or against either side.

The paucity of source material makes it impossible to say when or why David Lipscomb first began to consider the problem of the Christian's rightful relation to civil government. That Tolbert Fanning, his teacher whom he idolized had these views, is evident, so there is always the possibility that Lipscomb may have been challenged to think of the subject by Fanning. It is evident that his mind was not made up on the subject until sometime after he graduated from College. Once or twice he voted, and voting was a practice which, in line with his views on civil government, was strictly forbidden. Lipscomb was not old enough to vote until 1852, so that if he voted twice, his votes were likely cast in 1852 and 1856. By 1860 his mind was already made up that voting was wrong, so it's a foregone conclusion that he cast no ballot that year. Lipscomb's preaching career began in the year 1857; so it is fairly certain that his views on civil government crystallized between the years, 1857-60.

One thing is certain: his views were not hastily reached. He once declared that he had examined thoroughly every tenet of the popular point of view held by most brethren before he finally concluded that it was wrong. When, In 1880-81, Lipscomb and John F. Rowe conducted a written debate on the subject in their respective papers, the **Gospel Advocate** and the **American Christian** Review, W. B. F. Treat, a former editor of the Review who radically differed with Lipscomb, declared that Lipscomb was much more

[1]Tolbert Fanning, "Church of Christ And World Powers, No. 11," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. VIII - No. 27, July 3, 1866, p. 417f.

familiar with the subject than Rowe. It was not Lipscomb's nature to adopt a point of view too hurriedly, but once adopting it, to hold to it tenaciously.

From whom did David Lipscomb get his point of view? It has already been suggested that Tolbert Fanning, his teacher at Franklin College, influenced his thinking on this subject. To trace the viewpoint farther back than this, is, however, impossible. To determine to what extent Lipscomb's viewpoint was that of Fanning is impossible in view of the fact that Fanning elaborated but little on his own thinking. Whether they agreed in every detail cannot be said. It is significant, however, that when Lipscomb was working the hardest to develop and explain his theory in the **Advocate,** at no point did Fanning ever disagree. It is only a conjecture, but one which fits in with all of the details, to suggest that Fanning first suggested the line of thought to Lipscomb's mind, but that the full development of the theory was left to Lipscomb.

One is also treading upon uncertain ground when he inquires into the reason this subject challenged Lipscomb's thinking as it did. Why did Lipscomb devote himself so painstakingly to this study? What facts impressed him so much with its importance? The answer to this may partially lie in Lipscomb's disposition and partially in certain environmental factors.

His young manhood was spent with the thought of slavery on his mind. It would be impossible for any person to consider the subject as much as he did without also recognizing what **the** existence of this institution was leading to in his own country—a Civil War. John C. Calhoun died in the spring of 1850 but the tempo of the war drums beat louder. Through the long tumultuous decade of the 1850's, the talk in every social circle, from the press, and from the politicians was, WAR. That war was coming was evident to all, and that members of the church both in the North and South would be called upon to participate was equally evident. The question of the part the Christian should play in the conflict was a live issue.

It was David Lipscomb's disposition, in harmony with his childlike faith in the teachings of the Bible, to answer the question in harmony with the Bible. From a child he had learned to put absolute, unwavering faith in the Bible, leaving the consequences to God. That every man owed it to God and to himself to stand courageously for what he believed was a cardinal principle in his creed of life. Standing close beside that was the conviction that no man believed anything who was unwilling to suffer for it. Submission to anything save the laws of God was a sign of weakness to Lipscomb. The thought, therefore, that his view would be unpopular never entered his mind. Of course it would. He could take in full stride the taunts and threats of his fellow citizens. During the heated days of passion that followed the opening of the war, Lipscomb preached that Christians should not kill. He preached this when the Confederate army held middle Tennessee, and a group of men once threatened to hang him. He preached this when the Federal army moved in and was sneeringly called a Copperhead. This he took in full stride. He would be an unworthy servant of God if he refused to suffer for the sake of the truth. Where hundreds of other men would have failed to take this point of view for the love of popularity or the lack of courage, Lipscomb would never fail. Men were to refer to this trait in his character as his eccentricity, but whatever men might call it, it was Lipscomb.

The **Gospel Advocate,** started as a monthly periodical in July, 1855. At opening of the war in 1861 publication stopped, since all mail service in the South was closed. In January, 1866 the **Advocate** resumed publication with Fanning and David Lipscomb as editors. It was a general trait of Fanning's to start something and then get himself too involved in business to complete it. Only a few issues of the new weekly edition of the **Advocate** had gone out until Lipscomb was clearly the force behind it. It was he who made the sacrifices for it and who kept it alive through hard days of depression.

Now that the war was over, it was Lipscomb's conviction that the whole question of the Christian's rightful relation to civil government should be investigated. Slowly, methodically, he

developed, one step at a time, his views. The issue largely filled the **Advocate** in the years 1866 and 1867. In 1889 these articles were compiled and published in a book called "Civil Government." Through Lipscomb's long life the subject of the Christian's relation to Civil Government was seldom absent for long in the **Advocate,** but at no period did it receive the thorough treatment that it did during the year 1866. Here, the theory was developed. In later years, the discussion was mostly in defense of this position. It is the purpose in the remainder of this study to trace step by step this theory, then to place an evaluation upon it.

The Theory

Lipscomb had announced in the Prospectus for the **Advocate** of 1866 his intention to investigate the question of the relation which the church sustained to civil government. He recognized, so he stated, that there was a danger of adopting the ideas of those with whom men were surrounded in their childhood without ever questioning whether these ideas were in accordance with the Master's teachings. God, he believed, had given man instructions on how to conduct himself in all life's relationships. He had given instructions to the parent and to the child, to the husband and to the wife, to the master and the servant," to the friend and to the enemy, and to the neighbor and to the stranger. It was unthinkable to Lipscomb that God would leave man without instructions on this relationship of the church to civil government.

On this subject, Lipscomb believed there were three viewpoints. The first, which he identified as the Roman Catholic idea, was the belief that the Church should form alliances with the civil governments for the purpose of using them to further its own end. When the interest of the church demanded it, these governments would be encouraged; when the same interest demanded it, these governments would be destroyed. The Roman Catholic Church approved of no specific government, but allied herself with any that she could use to further her own end. The only thing good in political institutions, according to this theory, was that they be used to advance the church. The second he called the Protestant, which said that political governments were

of divine origin, and should be supported and sustained for their own intrinsic worth. The political governments were, according to this idea, essential to the well being of the church. The church must be subservient to the government. This idea puts the State first, and the Church second. In accordance with this idea church members enter into their wars, because they believe their highest duty to be here.

Protestantism, Lipscomb taught, had its birth in the rebellion of the political rulers of England, Germany and Switzerland against the corruption of power on the part of the Roman Church. Each branch of Protestantism received its own peculiar nature from the political government where it was born. English Protestantism differs from Swiss and German and so on. It is this view of the relationship of the Church and State that prevails in all Protestant countries, so Lipscomb taught.

The third point of view said that in all ages a few individuals had maintained that the church and political institutions were entirely and necessarily separate and distinct, that they can form no alliances with each other, that each was necessary in its own proper place. The church needed no help from human governments to direct the affairs of its children. But God did, continues Lipscomb, permit men, who refused to submit to the divine government, to form governments of their own according to their own views of propriety and for the accomplishment of their own ends. Christians could have nothing to do with these governments "farther than God has connected them with it." Christians must submit to all governments alike, and comply with whatever requirements those governments may make, only remembering that their first allegiance belongs to God. It is not the Christian's right to be an active participator in any government no matter the form or kind. The Christian in England will submit to that government, not because he approves, but because it is the will of God that he do so. So in any other country. When these political governments engage in wars, he will remain aloof from them.[2]

[2]**Gospel Advocate, 1866, pp. 28-30.**

Does God take part in the wars and conflicts conducted by the nations of the world? "It is clear," wrote Lipscomb, "that in ancient days He directed and controlled the Jewish nation." God fought their battles for them when they trusted and obeyed Him; He withdrew His aid when they disobeyed Him. "Yet no political government at the present day occupies the same relationship to God that the Jewish did. It was the type, not of the political governments of the world, but of the church of Jesus Christ. God deals with the church, not by the nation, today, as he dealt with the Jews in days gone by." It was Lipscomb's belief that he who applies God's dealings with the Jews to the nations of the world "grossly perverts the scripture of truth."

The real type of present world governments, he said, is found in the human institutions of the ancient world. The kingdom of Babylon was the first human government known to either sacred or profane history. Founded by Nimrod, grandson of Ham, it soon grew into Babylon. The kingdom of Babylon "rioted in sin, and died weltering the blood of its own subjects." Then came Medo-Persia, then Greece, then Rome.

"Do we wish to learn then the nature, mission, and destiny of these earthly governments," he wrote, "the true position they occupy with reference to God and His church, together with the principles of God's dealings with them, we must go to the record of his dealings with those ancient governments of human mould." God used these human governments to carry out his purposes, says Lipscomb, "not as His approved institutions, but as fitted for certain kinds of work." (Isa. 10:5) God here used the Assyrian government to punish his own people, the Jews. In Jeremiah, chapter 25 God is said to use the Babylonians to punish his own people. God used and controlled the ancient kingdoms as instruments for punishing His wicked children, destroying His enemies. "We find no intimation of a change of God's course with reference to them, but rather that he still thus uses them, and will, to the end." (Rev. 17:17)[3]

The fact that one nation conquers another, said Lipscomb, did not mean that God blessed or approved of the one or cursed or

[3]**Gospel Advocate, 1866, pp. 22-24.**

disapproved of the other. Babylon was not less odious to God than the kingdoms she destroyed. Lipscomb advised the South to submit to the decision of Divine Providence in being conquered by the North. "While taking this decision as providential indication that God intends them not to run a race of political human nationality, let them accept it as a divine call to find labor and honor in higher, holier, heavenly nationality."

Civil government did not originate, then, among the subjects of God's divine government, "but from the nature of the divine government, it was impossible for them so to do." "Whenever human laws and institutions were interpolated into His government, it was regarded as an infringement of his prerogative, and caused him to cease to recognize such as His own." Civil government, then, must have originated, said Lipscomb, among that portion of the human family who were in rebellion against God, in the family of Ham. These people were dissatisfied with the government of God. Josephus says Nimrod, their founder, told the people it was too degrading and humbling to them to submit to God's government. Civil government was an embodiment of man's effort to throw off the rule of his Maker. Babel grew into Babylon, and God showed His displeasure by calling it "Confusion." Their tongues were confused. The beginning of all human governments resulted in strife and bloody destruction.

It was next Lipscomb's intention of tracing the history of these human governments through the Bible by way of showing their contrasting characteristics to the divine government. He began with Genesis, chapter 14. Five kings were at war with Abraham. Abraham represented those in submission to the government of God. So, Lipscomb concluded, that every contact of God's people with these human governments down through history shows a spirit of antagonism and enmity. When the Jewish nation—God's type of the church—was born, it began amidst the travail and sorrow of Egypt and succeeded in reaching the promised land only against the ambushes and fightings of the worldly governments against it. After dwelling in Palestine, it was at continual war with the human governments. This is a type of the church. Physical Israel—using carnal weapons—was trying

to free itself from the worldly kingdoms. So, spiritual Israel, the church, must use its spiritual weapons to attempt to do the same. Israel was told to make no covenant with the heathen nations. (Ex. 33:31, 2; 34:12, 16; Deut. 7:2; Josh. 13:12) Any alliances the people of God would make with these heathen nations would result in their rejection by God. Solomon's violation caused the rending of the kingdom. (1 Kings 11:2) Hezekiah received the messengers of Babylon in kindness and was condemned for it. (Isa. 39:6) The Jews were carried into captivity. (Ezra 10:3; Isa. 30:31) Lipscomb wrote, "There is not a principle of God's dealings with his people, under the Jewish dispensation more clearly marked, more deeply stamped upon every page of the Old Testament Scriptures, than that of total, entire and perpetual separation from all associations, alliances and affiliations with those choosing to govern themselves, rather than let God govern them."[4]

When first settling in Palestine, Lipscomb continued, the Jews were under God. No man was allowed to add to or subtract from the law of God. But, the people became wicked, and wanted a "man government" so they could be like the nations abo,ut. (1 Sam. 8:1) God granted this but looked upon it as a rejecting of Him. In the process of time this nation of God became so corrupted by its alliances with human institutions that God would no longer forbear with it, but abolished it and established in its place, the spiritual kingdom, the church.[5]

With these historic facts from the Old Testament established, Lipscomb then proceeded to raise the question: Has the separation that God established and perpetuated through four thousand years between God's institution and man's been obliterated during the dispensation of the reign of Christ? The prime object of this separation was to have its permanent effect upon the kingdom of Christ. Is God less concerned about the sanctity of His eternal kingdom than His earthly one?

[4]David Lipscomb, "Church of Christ And World-Powers - No. 3," **Gospel Advocate, Vol. VIII** - No. 7, (Feb. 13, 1866) pp. 102-05.
[5]**Gospel Advocate,** 1866, pp. 113-116.

Lipscomb believed that when the kingdom of heaven, the church, would work effectively, this working would destroy the kingdoms of the earth, the world governments. The true mission of the kingdom of God, he stressed, was "to break in pieces, consume and destroy all the kingdoms of earth," and to prove the point he quoted Jer. 25:31 and Dan. 2:44. There is a spirit of perpetual antagonism between God's kingdom and the kingdoms of the earth. This strife, he emphasized, could only cease with the complete triumph of God's kingdom and the complete overthrow of the other. God would accept no divided allegiance among His subjects. God reserved for Himself the right to govern man.

It cannot at once be the mission of the kingdom of God to uphold and destroy the kingdom of God. "The kingdom of heaven," he wrote, "will destroy all these earthly kingdoms and so engross the feelings, affections, time and labors of the denizens of earth, that no room or place will be found for the service of the earthly kingdoms."[6]

Leaving the Old Testament, Lipscomb next emphasized that this perpetual antagonism between the government of God and the human government came on to the New Testament. Christ, the King, was no sooner born than He was met with a decree from the king that He be destroyed. The devil, even, showed Christ all the kingdoms of the world and said he would give them to Christ if the Saviour would bow down and serve him. The devil recognized that all these kingdoms belonged to him. There would be no point in the devil lying to the Son of God who would certainly know it. Jesus does not accuse the devil of lying. In fact, for this to be a "temptation," it had to come from one who had the power to bestow it. Christ's mission was to deliver people from the bondage of the devil. His rule would be completed when He had put down all rule, power and authority except His own.

[6]David Lipscomb, "Church of Christ And World Powers - No. 5," **Gospel Advocate, Vol. VIII - No. 9, February** 27, 1866, pp. 129-33.

All the kingdoms of the world then, must be in submission to the Lord. (1 Cor. 15:24, 28)[7]

Jesus asked Peter, "of whom do the kings of earth take tribute—of their own children or of strangers?" But to avoid offence Peter was told to catch a fish and pay the taxes. Jesus by his own act, confirmed by a miracle, placed himself and Peter among the strangers to the kingdom of the world.

When the enemies of Jesus saw that His claims to be king might be adverse to those of any earthly king, they tried to use this against Him. (Matt. 22:17) The enemies of Jesus, knowing that His kingdom was in opposition to the kingdoms of the world, expected Him to forbid paying tribute to Caesar, and to develop an open and violent hostility to Caesar's kingdom. They mistook the nature of His weapons as well as the manner of His establishing His kingdom. At His trial they charged that he claimed to be a king and could not be Caesar's friend. Jesus admitted the charge but only answered, "My kingdom is not of this world." So therefore, Lipscomb concluded, Jesus recognized the antagonism between world governments and His government.

The disciples of Christ, having been sufficiently warned by Jesus of the antagonism between His government and world governments, gained the impression that they were not subjects of earthly kingdoms. (Acts 1:6) (Rom. 13:1 and 1 Pet. 2:13) There would be no necessity of repeated warnings to them to be subject to the government if they had not gained the impression they were not subjects of the earthly governments. Too, the devil is regarded in scripture as the "prince of this world." (Jn. 12:31; 16:2; Eph. 2:2; Eph. 6:11, 12, 13) To belong to the kingdoms of the world and promote them was conclusively, so far as Lipscomb's reasoning went, to work in the interest of the devil.

The Scriptures have recognized every relation of life in which a Christian may be found and have given teachings to regulate the Christian in these relations. Yet, it is noticeable, Lipscomb pointed out, that the Scriptures never gave directions for the world rulers of the kingdoms of this world. If it be right for

[7] **Gospel Advocate,** 1866, pp. 145-149.

Christians to enter these relations, why have not instructions been given? Is it not clear that God did not intend for Christians to occupy the role of magistrates?[8]

Lipscomb turned to a new line of argument when he considered the spirit that animated the kingdoms of the world. Every organization, he said, must have a spirit which abides in it and animates each member. What spirit is in the church of Christ and what is in the world powers? None can be under two spirits that are diverse. Each institution must partake of the spirit of its founder. Now, God through Christ established the church and the spirit of Christ animated, guided and controlled the body of Christ. Whoever put himself under the control of another spirit, ceases to be a member of the church of Jesus Christ. To give the church another spirit than that of Christ's was to change the character of the church.[9]

The founder of the church is the "prince of peace." (Isa. 9: 6,7) The church is open to all men of every nation, and certain ones will come out of the nations to serve the Lord. As a result, "he would judge among the nations and rebuke many people, and they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Isaiah is not here saying that the political nations will beat their swords into plowshares, but those who go to the Lord's house—who are taught the way of the Lord, who walk in his paths. The Bible nowhere says the political kingdoms shall come to a state of peace, but only those out of the nations who are taught of God. (Isa. 2:2-4) The spirit that pervades the church is that of peace—not strife and destruction. The spirit that pervades the governments of the world is that of strife and blood shed.

The spirit that is in the church is exemplified in the life of Christ. The angel announced, "peace on earth, good will to men." The law of the kingdom of God is to return good for evil and so grow unto the character of God. This spirit must be cultivated

[8]**Gospel Advocate,** 1866, pp. 161-166.
[9]**Gospel Advocate,** 1866, pp. 267-63.

by every child of God. Jesus had it., Stephen had it, and so did Paul. But, by way of contrast, it is evident, thought Lipscomb, that human governments originate amid strifes and bloodshed. They live by their strength and skill in the use of carnal weapons, and they all die in bloody strife.

> The banners of all earthly institutions (he wrote) are rendered glorious and estimable by being drenched in the blood of their enemies, shed for their own benefit. The banner of the cross glories in the death of its own subjects for the good of its enemies. Its virtue is derived from the bloodstains of its own great standard bearer, dying that His enemies might live. Can the same heart love and adore two banners, the representatives of two such diverse and antagonistic spirits? Can a fountain send forth, at the same place sweet water and bitter?

In a major way Lipscomb's attention was directed to the following words from Paul:

> Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power, withstandeth the ordinance of God: and they that withstand shall receive to themselves judgment. For rulers are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil. And wouldest thou have no fear of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise from the same: for he is a minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil." (Rom. 13:1-4)

These particular verses have formed the basis for what Lipscomb called "the Protestant idea" of the relation of the Christian to civil government. They were used to show that the Christian must be under the government, that the civil government is ordained of God for the good of Christian, and submission to the government in all of its dictates is essential to one's obedience to God.

On the other hand, Lipscomb felt this was an injustice to the teaching of God to so interpret the words. The Christian, he observed "that lived in the South quoted them to prove his duty to fight for the cause of the Confederacy, while the Christian in the North was quoting the same words to prove it his duty to fight for the Federal government. So, on the battlefield Christians killed Christians and each felt justified on the ground of Romans 13. On the other hand God's vision was uni-

versal. God cared no more for Christians in one government than for those in another, and the teaching of the New Testament is that all Christians were to live in harmony with each other. Their relations were to be peaceful. Out of these considerations Lipscomb concluded that the popular idea of Romans 13 was wrong.

The Roman letter, Lipscomb observed, was written while Nero was emperor. Nero constituted the chief and supreme minister of God. Is it possible for Christians to be a Nero in terms of character and position? Then, putting his thought in the form of a syllogism, Lipscomb viewed it in the following light:

> Major Premise: None but the approved subjects of God are His minister.
> Minor Premise: Civil rulers are His ministers.
> Conclusion: Therefore, Civil rulers are the approved subjects of God.[10]

Lipscomb then insisted that the fault here was in the major premise. Whereas the Protestant idea, based on a misunderstanding of Romans 13, said that none but the approved subjects of God are His ministers, Lipscomb insisted this was in error. Nero, a bloody persecutor of Christians, set fire to Rome. The fiendish emperor wished the human race had one neck so he could cut it at one blow. Such a monster is alleged, according to Romans 13, to be a "minister of God," and therefore, according to the Protestant idea, approved of God!

Actually, said Lipscomb, God used world rulers at times to serve Him in some particular stated work. Nebuchadnezzar is referred to as "my servant" (Jer. 25:9; Jer. 51:34) and was used by God to punish Israel. Furthermore, Isa. 10:5 says that God used the Assyrians to punish rebellious Israel, although Assyria was not conscious of Israel's rebellion. Both Assyria and Babylon were wicked and idolatrous nations, but God used these wicked people to punish Israel, God's chosen nation. A humble worshipper of Jehovah is unfit by character for such a work of destruction, but God looked about, found a wicked people, "an instrument in character," fitted for the work of desolation God wanted done.[11]

[10]**Gospel Advocate,** 1866, pp. 721-724.
[11]**Gospel Advocate,** 1866, pp. 737-739.

Thus, the wicked are sometimes God's servants, but this does not mean they are His approved subjects. Cyrus, a wicked idolater, was not a true subject of God, yet was a minister of God. (Isa. 45:1) God used Cyrus for His purpose of punishing Israel. Nero, a sadistic idolater, was such a minister of God.

Jesus Christ, Lipscomb alleged, is the minister of God to encourage virtue, truth, purity and holiness. But the devil is also God's minister to perform a different work—punishing wicked and rebellious people. The Son of God is meek, lowly and self-sacrificing, unfit for the work of punishing, but the devil is God's agent to do this. God uses the devil's spirit of wickedness and rebellion to do this work. So, a minister of God may be a most corrupt man. Again, this is put in the form of a syllogism:

> Major Premise: Christians should participate in every ordinance of God to perpetuate it.
> Minor Premise: Civil Government is an ordinance of God.
> Conclusion: Christians should participate in civil affairs.

It is here falsely assumed, said Lipscomb, that every ordinance of God is desirable in itself. Every ordinance of God is good for the purpose for which it is intended. Heaven and hell are both ordinances of God, good for the end for which they were designed. Each of these has ministers appointed by God for operating in and through them. These are God's ministers for executing God's laws.

The church, the kingdom of heaven, corresponds to the kingdom of heaven above. It has the same king, Jesus Christ; it has the same purpose—to encourage and reward virtue and holiness; it cultivates the same spirit. Christ works through His church to accomplish His ends; the devil works through these earthly kingdoms to accomplish his ends. In short, the devil executed his wrath, punished wickedness and performed vengeance through the kingdoms of this world.

The two institutions—the church and world governments—have two distinct sets of ministers, controlled by two antagonistic spirits, accomplishing different ends although territorially in contact. The church conducts a man upward. "The self-denying,

self-sacrificing, spirit of the Savior of mankind is the animating, pervading, controlling spirit of this kingdom." Sin and violence must be punished. But vengeance does not belong to the Christian. (Rom. 12:19-21) The Christian cannot do the avenging. God does this through His ministers—Civil Government.[12] So then, Lipscomb's conclusion was that the kingdoms of this world are the kingdoms of the devil. But that Christian can operate through these institutions of wrath was lacking in authority.

Lipscomb next anticipated an objection to this thought. Christians are told (Romans 12) not to resist the power of Civil Government. But, if the Civil Governments are the kingdoms of Satan, ought they not to be resisted?

The meaning is, Lipscomb affirmed, we are not to resist it by force, by carnal weapons. Civil Governments will be destroyed, not by carnal weapons, but by removing the cause that originated them. That cause is the lack of confidence in God's institutions. As long as sin and rebellion reign in the world, they are ordained by God to punish the wicked. He concluded:

> Thus the true position of the church of Christ to this world-power is definitely fixed. The Christian's connection with it is marked by the' pen of inspiration, and no man need be in doubt in reference to his duty to it. This connection is one of simple submission to, not of active participation in, or support of. There is not a word or intimation in the Sacred Scriptures that indicate that it is the duty of any Christian to support, maintain, or defend any institution or organization of man, farther than a quiet, passive, but conscientious and faithful submission to its requirements, may have a tendency to sustain it. That submission he must render, not as a duty he owes to government, on account of any virtue or merit it possesses, but as a solemn duty he owes to his Maker. This sense of duty to God connects him with all the governments and powers of earth alike. It permits him to become the partisan of none. … If we follow the examples and precepts of the Bible, as taught and presented under the dispensation of God to man, but especially in the examples and precepts of the Saviour and His apostles, we will never come into a closer contact with these governments than that of submission to their authority. [13]

[12]**Gospel Advocate,** 1866, pp. 753-755.

[13]David Lipscomb, "Church of Christ And World Powers, No. 17," **Gospel Advocate, Vol. VIII** - No. 50, (December 11, 1866) p. 787.

Effects

Having now followed in some detail Lipscomb's point of view on the Christian's relation to civil government, it is now in order to consider the effects of this viewpoint upon the restoration movement.

Lipscomb's views published in 1866, in the first year of the **Advocate's** life after the war, took up most of the year, except a few weeks during the summer when Lipscomb was busy collecting funds to care for the poor in the South. For the most part his readers were cautious. Some read thoughtfully, but decided they would reserve their judgment until they had studied longer. Some, of course, readily agreed, and some others were bitterly opposed. Carroll Kendrick wrote a letter to Tolbert Fanning from Texas in the spring of 1866, protesting Lipscomb's point of view. He felt Christians could vote, hold office, and "under some conditions" take part in war. But, he insisted that we have had war long enough, so let us work for peace.[14] During the war, Kendrick worked vigorously for the Southern Confederacy. His reaction alienated him and Lipscomb, although for the next five or six years a forced amiableness prevailed.

On the other hand, Ben Franklin's attitude was one of mild castigation. Early in the war, Franklin lined the **American Christian Review** up on the side of pacifist. He took no part in the war, and did everything he could to discourage Christians from fighting each other. By the close of the war, however, his thinking was definitely tending toward being more conciliatory. Franklin felt that some people were gaining the impression that the position of the **Gospel Advocate** was also the position of the **Review.** He decided to correct this. He insisted that the New Testament was silent on the subject of a Christian's going to war, holding office or voting. The war was over now, Franklin thought, so why encourage a sectional spirit? Rather encourage each and all to work for peace. In the November 13, 1866, issue of the **Review** Franklin wrote:

[14] **Gospel Advocate, 1866, pp. 712, 13.**

> "We incline strongly to the opinion that when the authorities call out men to arrest a robber or murderer, then the men called out are not responsible even though an innocent man should be arrested, or though lives should be lost in making the arrest It may be, in like manner, that when the civil authorities call out men in war, they are responsible for all that is done in war."[15]

This looked to Lipscomb to be a tacit admission that the church cannot change the laws of God but the world governments could. There was a certain Roman Catholic viewpoint here, Lipscomb said, except the power of granting indulgence to sin and of requiring individuals to act contrary to the laws of God is transferred from the church to the civil government. The New Testament teaches, Lipscomb said, that the laws of God must first be respected above all else. The command to submit to any and all—parents, civil governments, elders, etc., — is limited by a sense of responsibility to God.

It can easily be seen, if Lipscomb's point of view was right, how this could color one's entire thinking, and there is little question but that it did with Lipscomb. Whether he was right in thinking so or not is beside the point, but the fact is that for the next few years Lipscomb interpreted many of the moves in the brotherhood as inspired purely by a political motive. He was never an enthusiast of the Missionary Society but from 1855-57 worked with one in Tennessee all the time with an uneasy conscience. After the war, he was one of the most ardent enemies the Missionary Society ever had. One factor that produced this was the action of the Society, during the war, passing two resolutions in praise of the northern army. Thus, in Lipscomb's estimation the Society had backed political government, was itself political. It would have been easy for the Society's friends to imagine that if these resolutions had favored the southern cause, Lipscomb's anger would not have been so intense. Still, this would hardly have been the case. The resolutions nevertheless were interpreted as political in nature, and proved to Lipscomb the danger that a missionary society might be to the church.

The launching of the Christian Standard in April, 1866 was another major development in the restoration movement which

[15]**Gospel Advocate,** 1866, p. 802.

Lipscomb interpreted as a purely political move. Backers of the **Standard** were the wealthy Phillips brothers of Newcastle, Pennsylvania who had secured their wealth from the oil business during the war. Policy planners of the paper were in the main Isaac Errett and James A. Garfield. Garfield, a General in the northern army, was also an influential member of Congress, and later, president of the United States. Errett, a close friend of Garfield, was sympathetic with the same general viewpoint as Garfield on the subject of a Christian's relation to civil government. At the beginning of the war, J. W. McGarvey wrote to Errett, asking him to throw his influence against Christians participating. Errett politely refused. He tried to get a commission for himself and this was denied, so he spent his time giving rousing speeches for the North and in condemning the South. Errett had defended the resolutions made by the Society during the war. It is clear, then, that his sympathies were decidedly pro-northern, or, as Lipscomb would view it, political in nature.

What was the need which established the **Christian Standard?** Lipscomb felt that the "need" was two-fold. For one thing, the **American Christian Review,** edited by Ben Franklin was the most popular weekly publication among the brethren. But Franklin's confidence in the American Christian Missionary Society had been shaken, so that by the spring of 1866 the paper was openly opposing it. The men behind the **Standard** were all enthusiastic backers of the Missionary Society. They wanted a paper that would encourage and build up the Society. It was felt that the **Review** would not do this. The second reason for establishing the **Standard** was, to Lipscomb purely political. While, by the end of the war, Franklin had become much more conciliatory on the question of the Christian and civil government, he had by then already incurred the anger of "Errett & Co." Because Franklin had encouraged Christians to stay out of the war, and over all discouraged them to participate in politics, Errett wanted a new paper that would kill the **Review.** Beliefs like this Lipscomb made little attempt to document. It was rather something he sensed but which was an inherent part of him, and the feeling that this was the case grew stronger as the years passed. When

the **Standard** was launched, Lipscomb did not hide his dissatisfaction.

It is very clear that Lipscomb's attitude is open to question. Lipscomb was a southerner; his sympathies in the war lay with the South, and the South had lost the war. Errett read Lipscomb's articles on "Church of Christ and World Powers," and studied Lipscomb's strictures on Christians and politics, and tried to settle in his own mind the question of the reason for Lipscomb's attitude. Errett concluded that the only thing worrying Lipscomb was a hatred for the North because the South had lost the war. Errett, Garfield, the Missionary Society, and the **Christian Standard**—all of these in some way were a grim reminder to Lipscomb of his Northern conquerors.

So then, Errett bounced back at the **Gospel Advocate.** He declared that before the war when the "worldly powers" upheld slavery, he heard nothing south of the Mason-Dixon line from brethren about separation of the church from "World Powers." He believed these brethren worked to pull political strings to keep the Government pro-slavery. At that time, the advocate of the doctrine of the separation of the church of Christ and world powers were anti-slavery men, who felt the civil powers oppressing their views. Now that things had changed these anti-slavery men had become quiet, and the pro-slavery men, who then were intensely political, had suddenly gone against world powers. Errett insisted that Lipscomb need not feel that he was free of political bias, but Errett pointed out, "the course of the **Advocate** has not carried conviction to us of its freedom from political bias." Errett felt that all this talk about the separation of the church of Christ and worldly powers was Lipscomb's way of appealing for the support of the South, few of whom loved the political government of the North.[16]

Errett's response was a hard blow and to some extent understandable. His charges could have only been answered by his knowing more intimately Lipscomb's heart. Errett did not know that Lipscomb had never voted but once or twice in his life, that

[16]**Gospel Advocate,** 1867, pp. 184-188

he had opposed the southern Christians from entering into politics and fighting during the war as much as he did after the war. Actually, Lipscomb cared no more for the Confederate government than for the Federal so far as urging Christians to stay out of one and enter the other was concerned. As to slavery, Lipscomb had always said that it was neither right nor wrong in itself, certainly he had never advocated it at all. The fact then is that David Lipscomb was much more unbiased in his viewpoint than Errett ever gave him credit for being. But it must be remembered that those were days of intense hatred and suspicion. Too many southern men had been killed, thousands humiliated, homes had been wrecked and possessions carried away for the South hurriedly to fall in love with the North. On the other hand, the memory of the rebellion was too recent for the North to open up her arms to the South. This was the atmosphere out of which these men wrote, and it would be unnatural to imagine that they were not influenced by it.

The real question to be answered here, however, is: "What influence did these skirmishes have on the future course of the restoration movement?" The **Advocate** and the **Standard** drifted farther and farther apart. Across forty years there was no fellowship between them. Is it possible that the Civil War lay ultimately behind this breach? It is not the intention here to ignore this possibility, nor is it the intention of attaching an undue importance to it. To attribute the break entirely to the Civil War it would be necessary to assume that personal dislikes and prejudices were so deeply a part of these men that they refused to recognize the truth in one another's position. This is assuming too much.

More basic in the whole controversy is a fundamental attitude toward the Bible as the infallible guide for the human race. In years to come, the subject of liberalism was to become a point of controversy. The realization of what liberalism might do to the restoration movement led J. W. McGarvey to write a long series of articles in the **Christian Standard** on "Biblical Criticism." J. H. Garrison, editor of the **Christian-Evangelist** frankly conceded that if one were to assume McGarvey's point of view toward the Bible, McGarvey's strictures would then be consistent. This was

a frank admission that different schools of thought existed in the church relative to the Bible. Some men might speak of Paul's errors in "theology," but not David Lipscomb for it was his profound conviction that all of the writers of the Bible wrote as they were moved by the Spirit of God, and that the combined result of their writings is a complete, infallible, and accurate guide to heaven for the human race.

In line with this conviction Lipscomb opposed the Missionary Society. The principle involved with Lipscomb was that it was a human addition to the plan God had given. On the same ground he opposed instrumental music. Those who had no sympathy for the principle upon which Lipscomb worked would likely think his opposition stupid. But all actions which violated this principle David Lipscomb opposed whether these actions were pressed by men in either the South or the North.

But still another question must be asked: "How much influence did Lipscomb's point of view have on his own brethren?" In what way has Lipscomb's viewpoint influenced the church? It must be admitted that the warmest friends which the **Gospel Advocate** had did not see as Lipscomb has on the Christian's relation to Civil Government. Some on his staff did not follow altogether. Fortunately, Lipscomb was always willing to allow the greatest amount of latitude on the subject. At no time did it ever occur to him to make the subject a test of fellowship. And through the years, brethren who have differed radically on this question have never been willing to make it a divisive issue.

Lipscomb's attitude on what to do with those who differed with him came to a showdown in 1875 in a controversy with R. C. Horn of McKinney, Texas. Horn did not vote and considered politics too corrupt for any Christian. Still, he approved the good in human government, saying, "God ordained the 'powers that be' and approves them doing right. I can approve what God does." In a letter to Lipscomb dated March 8, 1875 he asked Lipscomb what to do about those who voted and held political office. The problem in the church at McKinney was that some brethren danced. When the elders tried to disfellow-

ship them, they remonstrated saying the elders would also have to disfellowship those who voted and held office. The elders then asked Horn to write Lipscomb for his answer. In response Lipscomb wrote:

> We suppose we have done as much to excite an investigation of this question as any one in the land. But a few years ago, because we did not advise some brethren in Arkansas to excommunicate every man that failed to see as they saw, they charged us with being a mere time server with no independence, and disgusted with our cowardice and infidelity to truth, as they called it, they quit taking the Advocate as an unclean and unholy thing. Well, we were sorry for their course, but we think we can quietly bear opposition both front and rear, when we know we are right.[17]

But R. C. Horn insisted; "If I held the views of Bro. Lipscomb that it was a positive violation of the teachings of the New Testament to engage in these things, I should then, after admonition, favor withdrawal." But Lipscomb never believed it right to withdraw from a brother for voting or holding office. His explanation to Horn was,

> The reason for this is, the brethren have not been sufficiently taught upon the subject. The Scriptural means for correcting an evil has not been sufficiently used to resort to this extreme measure. ... we have never to a single individual taken the pains to present the subject in such fullness and with such earnestness as to be ready to give him over to Satan for rejecting it.

Lipscomb's brethren have differed radically on Christian's voting, holding political office and going to war, but so far, none have ever been willing to make these things a test of fellowship.

How far Lipscomb's views have attached themselves to members of the churches of Christ is difficult to say. While Lipscomb was still alive, his influence over a host of young preachers, particularly his students at the old Nashville Bible School, was so great that these accepted his point of view. The publication of his book, "Civil Government," in 1889 has given a wider distribution to the view so that it is held by many in the church. Still it would be incorrect to say that the majority of the members have ever at any time come to hold them. The largest bulk of

[17]David Lipscomb, "Queries on Civil Government," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. VII - No. 17 (April 22, 1875) p. 398.

the brethren have gone on voting, a few holding office, and many going to war. Those who have studied Lipscomb's views with very much care at all have probably taken the attitude of J. W. McGarvey.

In 1891 Lipscomb spoke at the Missouri Christian Lectureship on his views of Civil Government. He was not allowed enough time to completely set them forth. Some listened discourteously if at all, but a few listened very intently. After the lecture was concluded, McGarvey responded that he did not share Lipscomb's views, but that he did not know how to answer them.[18]

And the bulk of Lipscomb's brethren have felt the same way.

[18]**Gospel Advocate,** 1891, p. 484.

CHAPTER VIII

RECONSTRUCTION DAYS

Captain William H. Gay of Quincy, Illinois, waited anxiously with his fellow soldiers at Fort Negley, south of Nashville, during the early days of April, 1865, for news of the war's end. On April 10 came the glad message that Lee had surrendered. Gay's battery of fifty guns was ordered to shoot a salute. Soldiers mad with joy cheered and shouted.

Saturday, April 15, was the day set for the celebration. The Union soldiers at Fort Negley were to march into the city, accoutered for war. The day came and energetic martial strains filled the air. While drums beat, the fifes' shrill notes filled the air with inspiring music. The infantry and artillery marched in separate columns. Captain Gay, mounted on his horse, rode proudly at the head of the artillery. When he turned into College Street, he saw a rider hurrying in his direction, and he recognized him as General Thomas' chief of artillery. The rider pulled up beside Gay. His face showed the strain of one deeply moved. "Have you heard the dreadful news?" he asked solemnly.

Gay motioned for his command to halt; then looking at the rider, inquired, "No, what is it?"

"President Lincoln and Secretary Seward were assassinated last night," was the terse reply.

Gay, shocked and speechless, rode silently into the public square where he met Governor Brownlow. The news spread among the rank and file of the great throng that had assembled for the celebration. Gaiety turned to sorrow. A ripple of deep indignation spread among the people. The sullen crowd milled about for a time and gradually broke up and returned home.

The war was over, but the aftermath was to be felt for many years. The citizens of Nashville paid their full share for the conflict. The months immediately ahead were the hardest. Prisoners of war retained by the North, created a manpower shortage in the South. Homes could not be rebuilt, nor could farms be

cultivated. Governor William G. Brownlow was petitioned constantly to urge the release of these prisoners; but even then, they were released slowly. Houses, barns and fences had been burned to the ground. Roads and railroads needed repair. Farm stock and implements were scarce. Confederate money was no good, and food supplies were extremely low. Negroes had left the farms en masse and swarmed into the cities. Some drifted back to the farms late in 1865, but most of them deserted the farmers when they were needed most. Lawless bands roved the country side. Homes were pillaged and robbed. A crime wave swept Nashville, and Governor Brownlow received numerous petitions to establish military police. The Governor reported to the General Assembly in November that Nashville's reputation was humiliating; that no man or woman was safe on the streets after night. In Edgefield a crime wave persisted for months. Elsewhere, Union soldiers burned and destroyed property, falsely claiming to have orders to do so from the Federal Government.

The Negroes themselves created a serious problem. The Freedman's Bureau, organized in March, 1865, urged the Negro to return to the farm, but most refused. To them freedom meant freedom from work. Most believed the Federal Government would support them if they refused to work for the rebels. When a group of Negroes tried to rob a man in the street in November, a racial fight flared up and a pitched battle raged in the streets.

Only after the Confederate soldiers drifted back to their homes did the situation improve. They could offer some protection to their families, and gradually worked and rebuilt their farms. However, their ignominy was not short-lived. Confederate officers who appeared in public places in uniform were openly ordered off the premises, even though most of them wore their uniforms not from choice but from necessity.

Reviving The Churches

The close of the war found David Lipscomb visiting churches in Maury, Marshall, Lincoln, Bedford and Franklin counties. Many people had been so discouraged by the war that they were no longer meeting. In July, 1865, he preached in a meeting at

Cedar Creek in Maury County. From here Lipscomb went to Wilson Hill in Marshall County. With him was Dr. T. W. Brents. Their chief aim in visiting these congregations was to "inspire the brethren and sisters with more earnestness and devotion." At Cedar Creek Lipscomb had seven or eight baptisms, and at Williamson Hill, nineteen. At the latter place Lipscomb enjoyed the refreshing association of Wade Barrett, one of the oldest preachers in Tennessee. Lipscomb next proceeded to Cane Creek in Lincoln County, but became ill and was forced to leave in four or five days. It was not easy to cheer and encourage the brethren. One Saturday afternoon about the first of August, Lipscomb met William Mason of Knox County. At the beginning of the war, Mason had been a preacher. He became a Captain in the Confederate army, was captured and held prisoner for two years. He was on his way home when Lipscomb met him, gloomy in spirit and dreading the ordeal of facing his wife again. Something happened that he did not get home, and his distressed wife appealed to Lipscomb to help her locate him.[1]

Despite an illness that often hampered his work, Lipscomb possessed an insatiate desire to help the distressed people of the South. Before the crisis was over he had raised a hundred thousand dollars for the poor. Upon receiving money he would send it on to the elders of a local church to be dispersed among their needy. His rule was to help the needy preacher first so he could go and preach the gospel. Then he would assist the widows and orphans and finally, help the people of the world. When one congregation sent money to him, requesting help for a brother within the reach of that church, Lipscomb wrote, "The **Gospel Advocate,** nor either of its editors, has proposed to become disbursing agents for any church. We being in constant communication with the brethren South, simply proposed to forward the contributions of those not favorably situated for doing so themselves, to those in need. There are brethren in Middle Tennessee in need, and the churches should supply their wants, but do not send the means for so doing to us. . . . "[2]

[1]**Gospel Advocate,** 1866, pp. 45, 287.
[2]David Lipscomb, "Dispensing Christian Fellowship," **Gospel Advocate, Vol. VIII - No. 30, (July 24, 1866) p. 473.**

The winter of 1865-66 a severe drouth hit the South; so added to the havoc wrought by the war a crop failure. This made the need for food and clothing more desperate than ever. Lipscomb made arrangements for Metcalfe Bros. & Co. in Nashville to handle all boxes marked "For The Destitute South." Meanwhile, he traveled extensively, asking brethren to come to the aid of these people. Before the brethren of the Second Church in Louisville, Kentucky on the first Sunday in June, 1866, Lipscomb read a letter from Nathan W. Smith of Georgia. Smith had been left desolate by the war. He had had no bread or meat to eat for days. Then Lipscomb delivered a sermon on "Fellowship." T. P. Haley, the local preacher, joined in the plea, and five hundred dollars was raised.[3]

It was, of course, comparatively simple to combine the work of preaching with raising funds for the destitute, and the indefatigable Lipscomb was almost constantly in evangelistic work. He was sick most of the time during January and February, 1866, being able to go to the office only once. Yet, the first Sunday of the year, he met W. C. Huffman of Sumner County and preached at the Old Union congregation. The weather was so disagreeable that only a few came, but Lipscomb learned from Huffman that people were coming almost daily to his home, requesting to be baptized.[4] In February, M. P. Bailey organized a congregation at Franklin, Kentucky, and wrote requesting Lipscomb to come and conduct a meeting. So Lipscomb went, beginning his meeting on the first Sunday of April.

In the spring Tolbert Fanning suggested that a "Consultation Meeting" be conducted somewhere in Middle Tennessee and that brethren from all over the South be invited. He reasoned that old acquaintances could be renewed, new ones formed, and the general status quo among the congregations could be determined. The idea met with approval, and the meeting was set for Murfreesboro early in June. Although his health would hardly permit it, Lipscomb attended the meeting "solely to disburse several hundred dollars that had been entrusted" to him and to inquire

[3] **Gospel Advocate,** 1899, p. 537.
[4] **Gospel Advocate,** 1866, p. 45.

of the destitution of others.[5] His health would not permit him to remain for the entire meeting, but he did accomplish his primary purpose in attending.

The middle of August Lipscomb spent a week with the Knob Creek congregation in Maury County. "Bob" Trimble and John A. Sidener were with him part of the time. Sidener was a newcomer to Middle Tennessee. On his way to Columbia, from Texas Sidener had stopped and visited with Lipscomb in Nashville the previous February. He had lost everything in the war, and decided to start over by moving to this region. After the Knob Creek meeting, Lipscomb went to Franklin, Tennessee, with a view to starting a meeting with the brethren in their new meeting-house. But J. F. Brown of Paducah, Kentucky had unexpectedly dropped by and was already in a meeting. Lipscomb stayed from Saturday until Monday before returning to his home.

The last Sunday of September, he preached at Franklin College, baptizing eight. Two weeks later he joined Bob Trimble and C. M. Day in a meeting in Todd County, Kentucky. They worked together over three Lord's Days and baptized thirty. Day himself had been working in this community over thirty years. Other meetings were planned for the fall, but a sudden cholera epidemic struck Nashville and Lipscomb cancelled them all to assist his neighbors in this crisis.[6] Before the epidemic, however, he was able to attend a brief meeting at Franklin, Tennessee, and listen to Joseph Wheeler tell about the destitute conditions in Alabama and Georgia.[7] The brethren asked V. M. Metcalf to act as the agent for distributing supplies, and both P. S. Fall and David Lipscomb to assist him.

In simple, unostentatious ways Lipscomb preached the gospel and watched the good develop. William Dudley Baker, a farmer, lived over near Donelson. Although he was a sectarian, he did not believe in the mourner's bench system of religion, and for this his neighbors called him a "Campbellite." Baker, however, was in the dark since he had never met a "Campbellite." One

[5]**Gospel Advocate,** 1867, pp. 364, 365.
[6]**Gospel Advocate,** 1866, p. 621.
[7]**Gospel Advocate,** 1866, p. 720.

night in June, 1865, a weary and hungry stranger came to his door asking for a night's lodging. The stranger's conduct led the Bakers to see that he was a man of culture. He finally explained that his name was Wright, that he was on his way home to Missouri, that he had been a chaplain in the Confederate army. When they asked what kind of a preacher he was, he replied, "A Christian," and proceeded to explain that he was a Christian only and had always endeavored to preach like the apostles. Baker immediately perceived that this man was a "Campbellite," so gloried in the opportunity of learning what these people believed. Nearly all night they questioned him. He stayed and preached in their home. A few months later, Baker subscribed to the **Gospel Advocate,** and finally sought out David Lipscomb. The **Advocate's** editor promised to preach if Baker would find the place. When the denominational preachers refused to allow the use of their meetinghouses, Lipscomb preached in Baker's home, returning each morning during the meeting to his office in the city. In this way the church in Donelson began, and through the influence of Baker and Lipscomb other congregations sprang up in the immediate area.

Meanwhile, Lipscomb found himself also in the center of a move to establish a large school in middle Tennessee. A young man, in an attempt to "burn out his chimney" at Franklin College in September, 1865, set the main building on fire and burned it to the ground. The following fall and winter Fanning urged the establishment of a large university in middle Tennessee for the education of the poor. It is not unlikely that Fanning had his eye on Kentucky University. Eight years earlier John B. Bowman had stumped the state raising money by convincing the citizens that the school the brethren would operate would also be the state university. Fanning urged the forming of an Educational Stock Company to raise between two and three hundred thousand dollars. David Lipscomb was appointed secretary-treasurer. It should have been obvious that an undertaking of this proportion was premature. This large amount of money simply could not be raised in the South so soon after the war. Maybe Lipscomb realized this, or maybe he was just too busy. At any

rate, on the rainy day of February 14, 1866, at a meeting of brethren at Franklin College, Lipscomb resigned his office.[8] In a matter of a few months the dream burst.

As the days passed, Lipscomb's health became worse. It was obvious that he would have to do something about it, but in the meantime he was determined to preach as much as he could. So, during the year 1867 he preached at McWhitersville, Tennessee, a strong Baptist community, speaking near the McCory's Creek Baptist Church. He also held a meeting for a small congregation at Guthrie, Kentucky. In North Nashville he went out to the old army barracks and preached often. The effort was hardly promising because "for several years we' could get no one else to visit them." Eventually the North Spruce Street congregation came out of this early effort.

To Cleveland For A Cure

At the close of a meeting in Paris, Kentucky, in the late spring, he was in so much pain that he decided to take the suggestion of some friends and try a "water cure" in Cleveland, Ohio. He complained of a "general biliary derangement, torpidity of liver, costiveness, alternated with looseness of bowels." For several years he had been bothered with "severe paroxisms of pain," so decided that now was the time to get a cure if one were possible. The trip to Cleveland would make it necessary to postpone a trip to Texas planned since the previous December. Carrol Kendrick, then one of Texas' leading preachers, had objected so strenuously to Lipscomb's views on civil government, that Lipscomb suggested a meeting of brethren at some designated place for the purpose of studying the question.[9] Kendrick replied that the State Meeting would be held at Bastrop on Friday before the third Lord's Day and urged Lipscomb to be present. It was agreeable to Lipscomb but bad health would now obviously force a delay of the trip.

So in July, 1867, Lipscomb set out for Cleveland. In Kentucky he met for the first time Thomas Munnell with whom he was then

[8]**Gospel Advocate,** 1866, pp. 235, 6.
[9]**Gospel Advocate,** 1866, p. 816.

engaged in a controversy in the columns of the **Advocate** on the question of the missionary society. His visits in Kentucky convinced him that many brethren regarded him as "peevish" and "offensive." But he made it clear that while it was always his policy to be plain, it was also his policy to be kind. He left Paris, Kentucky on July 5 and crossed "the longest suspension bridge in the world" at Covington, Kentucky for Cincinnati. Leaving here at seven o'clock one morning, he arrived in Cleveland, a city of 80,000, that afternoon at 3:30. He sought out the establishment of Doctors Seylie and Prince, two miles from the Lake shore, who gave him the water cure.

> In a very little while, (he wrote) we were in soak in a trough of warm water, since which we have been soaked and almost boiled, rubbed and scrubbed, drenched and applied with wet cloths—have been magnetised and electrified for twelve days, and the result is, we have felt more bodily comfort during the time than we have for the same length of time possibly in two years.[10]

He attended services with the brethren in Cleveland. The first time he attended, B. A. Hinsdale was preaching when he arrived. The next Sunday he heard Isaac Errett speak on "The Fellowship." The congregation of about two hundred members used "a machine of some sort" as an instrument. Lipscomb spent the afternoon with Errett. In a very congenial way they talked over the problems of editors.[11] Lipscomb was then editing the **Gospel Advocate** and Errett, the **Christian Standard.**

Lipscomb returned from Cleveland feeling much better, but far behind in correspondence. The need of another "Consultation Meeting" was being felt so Lipscomb, P. S. Fall, and Fanning took the initiative to plan one for Nashville for Tuesday, October S. On December 26, Lipscomb sat down to write his articles for the first issue of the **Advocate** for the new year. Fewer but longer lists of subscribers had come in, and Lipscomb observed that a "deep, dismal gloom" still hung over the people.

[10]David Lipscomb, "Notes of Travel," Gospel Advocate, **Vol.** IX - No. 30, (July 25, 1867) p. 586.
[11] **Gospel Advocate,** 1892, p. 436.

Preacher And Editor

Through the next year, Lipscomb continued to divide his time between preaching and editing the **Advocate.** The fourth Lord's Day in March he spent at Tullahoma, Tennessee. N. W. Carter had started a congregation of a dozen members here. They had rented a hall and were now ready to meet regularly. On the fifth Lord's Day in May he spoke at Camp Trousdale in Sumner County. This was the first preaching ever done here by one claiming to be only a Christian.[12] He returned here the third Lord's Day of August, and spent several days. He spoke seven times, had six baptisms, and got twenty brethren to promise to meet regularly. Later that year Fanning and Lipscomb attended a Preacher's Meeting in Louisville, Kentucky. They met corpulent B. K. Smith, grandiloquent L. L. Pinkerton, the erudite J. W. McGarvey, T. P. Haley, L. B. Wilkes, Robert Graham, and fifty or more others. The plan was that any question proposed for study should be introduced by a written essay and responded to in the same way. The chief questions proposed related to the elders and deacons and their relation to the churches. Lipscomb heard the essays of Munnell and Wilkes on Church Edification; J. W. McGarvey on the Evangelist and his work, and T. P. Haley on the importance of teaching children. Fanning dared to interrupt long enough to say that this work of teaching children was the work of the church as a whole and not the work of a society outside the church. But he failed to solicit a discussion of the question. J. F. Brown asked McGarvey for copies of his essay for publication in the **Advocate,** but Lipscomb admitted that he himself was too timid to make the request.[13]

The first Lord's Day of October Lipscomb met with the church at Fountain Creek in Maury County. This was a new congregation that met for the first time in its new meeting house. A short time later, he received a letter from J. H. Banton of Huntsville, Texas requesting him to spend the winter in Texas. Lipscomb replied that he was still too busy to come.

[12]**Gospel Advocate,** 1868, p. 561.
[13]**Gospel Advocate,** 1868, p. 721-3.

> We are our own proof-reader, mailer and clerk for the Advocate—as yet, (he wrote). We have no big preachers in Tennessee now—we are glad they are all gone. Our little men are all earnestly at work; and wherever the looking for 'big preachers' can be crushed out, the word of the Lord saves, and souls are greatly added to the Lord.

The last of October, 1868 Lipscomb made a preaching tour to Georgia, visiting with brethren in Clark, Newton, and Walton Counties. In Atlanta he visited with F. P. Perdue who worked in a blacksmith shop. General Sherman had left the city badly demolished four years earlier, but it had rapidly rebuilt. A few brethren were meeting in a rented hall. Lipscomb reached the Corinth meeting house near Walnut Grove in Walton County on Saturday before the fourth Lord's Day of October. A new congregation had been planted here the year before by P. F. Lamar. Lipscomb made the acquaintance of N. W. Smith, W. T. Lowe, M. B. Doster, and spent two days in the home of D. W. Elder.

By 1869 the war was farther behind him but still Lipscomb must work to relieve the suffering. That summer, another cholera epidemic struck Nashville, taking many lives. Lipscomb worked assiduously among both high and low. He sent a poor woman with a shady moral reputation to a public store for flour, bacon, and coffee. The supercilious store keeper refused to wait on her, and in his disdainful manner, explained his reason later to Lipscomb. Lipscomb told him that he would be glad to know that he had given orders to a number of bad women.[14] Lipscomb's kind of Christianity would not make him too proud to help the low in life if that opportunity presented itself.

In August Lipscomb joined W. C. Huffman and W. F. Todd in a meeting at Cottontown in Sumner County. But his old trouble returned. He had to leave the meeting, and spent the next month in bed. Without having fully recovered, he visited Columbia and Corinth but could do very little preaching.[15] In October he performed the marriage ceremony for Martha A. Franklin to Dr. Humphrey Bate.

The year, 1870 Lipscomb felt considerably better most of the time. With the addition of E. G. Sewell to assist in the paper he

[14]**Gospel Advocate,** 1890, p. 39.
[15]**Gospel Advocate,** 1869, p. 1067.

had more time than ever for preaching appointments. On Friday, April 27, he took a train for Mayfield, Kentucky to spend a month preaching with his old friends, R. B. Trimble and John Nash, in what was then called the "Kentucky Purchase," west of the Tennessee River. Lipscomb was sick when he left home, and the continual moving of the cars made him worse. Trimble and Nash met him on Saturday noon at the depot. He preached from Saturday night through the next Thursday on the nature and claims of the kingdom of God as outlined in the Old Testament prophets and developed in the New Testament. He was amazed at western Kentucky, saying, "We have never seen a community in which there is more of a debating spirit."

In June that year Lipscomb preached a series of sermons at Laguardo, Wilson County, Tennessee, on "the kingdom of God, the terms of entrance, and offices of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." There were only a few disciples here but a large Baptist Church. G. W. Griffin preached for the Baptists. Defiantly reviewing Lipscomb's sermons, Griffin arrogantly challenged any opponent. The brethren asked Lipscomb if he would debate Griffin, and Lipscomb agreed to do so. He heard nothing »more of the matter at the moment and so dismissed it from his mind.

In 1870 Lipscomb moved from his farm into Nashville **proper** to give more time to the **Advocate** and to preaching in the growing city. During the year, he, aided by **a** Brother Gentry, baptized a number of people on White's Creek Pike in the northern part of Edgefield. These people started worshipping in Odd Fellow's Hall on Woodland Street. In June J. W. Goss, who **had** been recently operating the school at Hopkinsville, Kentucky, came through Nashville and visited Lipscomb at his home. Goss, an old Virginia preacher, had left his home state at the close of the war and moved to Hopkinsville. His health broken, he was returning to his Virginia, as he probably realized, to die. He did die on November 26. The next record of Lipscomb finds John B. Scobey accompanying him in a meeting at Berea in Williamson County early in August. A week after this Scobey was caught in a saw at a saw mill and killed instantly.

W. C. Huffman and Lipscomb returned to Cottontown in Sumner County late in August and baptized thirteen. Two weeks later Lipscomb's half brother, Granville, worked with him in a meeting at Knob Creek in Maury County. The middle of September, Lipscomb attended the West Tennessee Cooperation Meeting at Trenton for the main purpose of getting acquainted with the brethren. After the meeting he remained three days and preached at Trenton. The first Lord's Day in October he met Granville again and the two conducted a meeting at Reunion, near Athens, Alabama. His friend, Baker, at Donelson made arrangements for Lipscomb to preach in the "Pleasant Hill" schoolhouse a mile and a half away. Lipscomb held a long meeting here, baptizing thirty-six people.

The Gospel Advocate

Having followed Lipscomb's work of preaching and relieving the suffering through the five year period, 1866-70, we now return to the year 1865 to notice the rebirth of the **Gospel Advocate** and trace its existence through the same period.

In the fall of 1865 Lipscomb wrote to Ben Franklin, editor of the **American Christian Review** announcing his intentions to publish a religious weekly. At the time Franklin's **Review** was the only such paper in the brotherhood, so Lipscomb found he was addressing a sympathetic mind. "Why, Brother Lipscomb," Franklin replied, "it takes money to publish a weekly paper," and proceeded to say if he had money to sink, he knew of no better place to lose it. Lipscomb proceeded, however, to make plans for the project. A certain sympathy for the southern people urged him on.

> The fact that we had not a single paper known to us that Southern people could read without having their feelings wounded by political insinuations and slurs, had more to do with calling the Advocate into existence than all other circumstances combined.[16]

On Christmas Day, 1865, he wrote to Carroll Kendrick in Texas, asking for his cooperation in enlisting subscribers.

[16]David Lipscomb, "The Advocate and Sectionalism," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. VIII - No. 18, (May 1, 1866) p. 273.

On January 1st the first issue of the **Advocate** weekly appeared. As was to be expected, it had its faults. Nothing was said about whether the paper was a weekly or monthly, nor was there any statement as to the terms of publication. This was partly due to Lipscomb's hurry and lack of experience. The printing was done by J. T. S. Fall Printers, an old reliable firm. They had, as early as 1843, printed Fanning's **Agricultural Journal,** and later had printed the old **Christian Review,** and probably the earlier years of the **Gospel Advocate.** The indefatigable Lipscomb often munched cold lunches, and spent two or three days at a time away from home in the city to get the work done. Lipscomb's wife—later so affectionately known as "Aunt Mag"—looked after mailing the' paper, receiving no pay for her trouble.

Lipscomb went at the publication of the **Advocate** expecting "to give a whole year to this work, without one dollar's compensation." He urged his brethren to spend one, two or three days a week presenting the **Gospel Advocate** to their neighbors, and asked those that were able to give a subscription to the poor. While Lipscomb and Fanning were editing the paper, P. S. Fall, Jacob Creath, Jr. and W. H. Hopson had promised to write for it. Fanning began a series called "The Signs of The Times" in the first issue. Beginning with Phil. 2:11, ". . . every knee to bow to Christ," Fanning admitted that there is no indication of this yet, but he looked for it to happen. "Where, brethren," he asked, "are the signs of our Savior's triumphs? This is a rich field for examination, and we invite attention to the subject, in the firm confidence that our readers will be pleased and much profited by the investigation."

Free copies of the first issue were' widely distributed. Most readers welcomed the new periodical, regaling long over its pages. The reception was all Lipscomb could expect. Subscriptions came in the first of February at the rate of one hundred a day. He hoped that the more wealthy people of the North would support the paper and many did. Subscriptions came in from Missouri, Mississippi, Georgia and Alabama in the main. Lipscomb estimated that it would take 2,500 subscribers to pay the bill. He wrote in the first issue,

> We have revived the publication of the Gospel Advocate at a time when all the materials of publication are very costly. The price of composition, press work, paper and every species of labor is about twice as high as before the war. Yet we have placed our rates as low as any similar publication was made five years ago, and lower than any publication now known to us. We have placed the terms low, that the paper may be within reach of all, even the poor in desolated regions of our country. You need not be told, brethren, that without an extensive circulation, the publication must result in heavy pecuniary loss to the publishers. They are as illy prepared as you are, for bearing such losses. Will you then give us a helping hand in extending its circulation and usefulness.[17]

Many letters, some critical and some complimentary, poured steadily in to Lipscomb's hand. George W. Longan wrote that he was glad to see the Advocate's reappearance, although he felt the editors were like the Indian's tree—"so straight they leaned over backwards." Gilbert Randolph of Maryville, Tennessee wrote,

> No doubt you all feel that we very much need a paper in Tennessee, entirely devoted to the advocacy of Primitive Christianity, supporting no creed and advocating no ism. We need it as a medium of thought and communication through which we can renew old acquaintances and form new ones. You are well aware that such a paper depends upon individual exertion, and upon that alone. You must see that if we have a paper in Tennessee, some one must commence it and run the risk of success. Brother Fanning, aided by Bro. D. Lipscomb, a tried man; a man in whom we all repose the utmost confidence; a man who has always stood firm to the Bible cause; a man of unblemished Christian character; a man of undoubted ability to take the lead and the management of such an enterprise, has volunteered to commence the work. . . .[18]

R. B. Trimble who at the beginning of 1866 was still working in middle Tennessee, wrote in a letter from Maury County,

> I have received five numbers of the Advocate, and am delighted with it. The spirit which it breathes is, to my mind, but the dawning of the Millennium, for when that day comes, it will, in my view, be characterized by the principles now being advocated in the Advocate. . . . The Gospel Advocate is certainly the paper needed, and is demanded by the present condition of the church and the world. . . .[19]

[17]David Lipscomb, "The Advocate," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. VIII - No. 1 (Jan. 1, 1866), p. 2.
[18]Gilbert Randolph, "**The Gospel Advocate,**" Gospel Advocate, Vol. VIII - No. 2, (Jan. 9, 1866) p. 25.
[19]**Gospel Advocate,** 1866, p. 108, 9.

Through the spring and summer of 1866 Lipscomb worked on the Advocate in what was a slow uphill struggle for its very existence. The April 17th issue appeared with a cover. Lipscomb announced that he had hoped to add eight pages to the paper the first of April, but would need one thousand more subscribers to do this. He saw the opportunity of adding some to his subscribers when he received word that Carroll Kendrick's paper, **Christian Philanthropist,** was about ready to cease publication. He wrote Kendrick, proposing to fill the latter's obligation to his subscribers if Kendrick in turn would write for the **Advocate.** The arrangement proved satisfactory, so Kendrick began his editorial work the first of 1867.

Ben Franklin read the **Advocate's** strictures on the Christian's relation to civil government with some vexation. Franklin, admitting that he had "been much inclined to the Quaker principles on war" and had only voted a few times, nevertheless said,

> If the Advocate would accept a suggestion from us, we would kindly suggest, that he would be much nearer correct and more acceptable to the brethren, if, instead of trying to make the impression that all our papers are political—full of war and blood—he would state, that there is not a political paper among them, and but a single one that ever gives political news; that we are as much devoted to the cause of Christ as he is himself; that we are going for the gospel, the whole of it, and nothing else; and that the war has made no new revelations to us, on religion, either concerning bearing arms, holding office, or voting; and he will certainly gain nothing by singling himself out as the only Simon Pure. If we stand at all, we must stand together, and not by pulling apart.[20]

Franklin let Lipscomb understand that he thought it unwise to continue to "harp" on the war, seek to inquire who was at fault, and try to place the blame. The war was over. Let it be forgotten. Let each preach peace.

Franklin's reference to "the impression that all our papers are political" came as a result of Lipscomb's charges against the **Christian Standard.** The Standard's ostentatious beginning with Isaac Errett as editor occurred in early April, 1866. It was known that the chief backers of the **Standard** were the wealthy Phillips brothers of Newcastle, Pennsylvania, and James A. Garfield, a

[20]Quoted in **Gospel Advocate,** 1866, p. 659.

former Major-General in the Union Army. Errett himself had very pronounced sympathies for the North. Lipscomb felt that

duty of Christians to support their government to put down the rebellion as well as against slavery. Errett claimed that Franklin was as much in favor of the war as he was, but that the Review editor was fearful of losing subscribers in the South. Lipscomb's suspicions were obviously not as ill founded as Franklin preferred to believe.

The next two and a half years proved to be ones of continual crisis for the Advocate. P. S. Fall at the beginning of 1867 announced his intentions of helping in the editorial work of the Advocate. The paper was enlarged to two columns to each page instead of one. W. H. Hopson who had formerly agreed to write for the Advocate, remained silent, mute evidence of his displeasure with the paper's opposition to missionary societies. John T. Walsh of North Carolina, Jacob Creath, Jr., T. W. Brents, and Carroll Kendrick were added to the editorial corps, Kendrick editing the "Texas Department." As an economy move, Lipscomb changed the cover from a colored one to white and used smaller type to allow more material. It was a bold move to give the readers over fifty percent more reading material while the paper yet lacked enough subscribers to pay the printing costs. While begging for five hundred more subscribers, Lipscomb announced that he would set up an office, keep tracts, supplies and books for sale.

[21]David Lipscomb, "An Explanation," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. VIII - No. 27, (July 3, 1866) p. 427.

People wrote that they thought the Advocate the best paper printed, but Lipscomb told them, while he appreciated that, he would rather they send him more subscribers. He had lost three hundred and fifty dollars the previous years and did not prefer to do it again.

By the end of January, 1868 larger subscription lists were being received. The strongest circulation of the paper was in Maury, Williamson, Rutherford, and Wilson Counties—places where Lipscomb was personally known. The last seven weeks of the previous year the Advocate had not been printed for lack of funds. But now the circulation was on the increase, and by June, Lipscomb announced the paper was for the first time on a self-sustaining basis. The full editorial responsibility now fell on Lipscomb's shoulders. Through the remainder of 1868 and all of 1869 he edited the periodical alone. A year of this convinced him that he needed some reliable help. Neither Fanning nor Fall could be depended upon in any large way to assist the Advocate, so Lipscomb's attention turned toward Elisha G. Sewell.

Sewell, now forty years old, had been preaching for twenty years when he cast his lot with Lipscomb to help in editing the Advocate. Baptized on the fourth Lord's Day in October, 1849, he began preaching two years later. After marrying on November 22,1853, he lived for a short time with his wife's parents. Feeling the need of more education he enrolled in Burritt College in February, 1856. Two years later he transferred to Franklin College. He had often heard of Tolbert Fanning but had never met him. "When I was introduced to him, he was a large, tall, stout, bold, independent-looking man. . . . He was bold, determined and resolute." Of himself Sewell said, "I have always been timid, backward, and bashful, and I could not be otherwise." After Sewell graduated in 1859, Fanning encouraged him to continue his preaching, and even arranged some appointments. From his graduation to the war Sewell spent his time holding meetings. On March 31, 1860, he became a member of the Owen's Chapel congregation "by letter." On Thursday, November 26,1863 Sewell, Tolbert Fanning, David Lipscomb, R. B. Trimble, O. T. Craig and a few others "met for consultation" at Owen's Chapel. It was

agreed that when a person gives his full time to the church, his temporal wants should be supplied by the congregation. Shortly afterwards, the Owen's Chapel congregation, with the help of others, purchased a home for Sewell on the Franklin Pike south of Nashville.

During the war, Sewell conducted no meetings but supported his large family by farming. When the war ended, he made arrangements to continue his preaching work. But as time passed, Sewell's concern for his family increased. The burden of rearing the children was left to his wife since he was away from home almost constantly. The children were small and needed their father. He decided to start a school so he could educate them, and spend more of his time with them.

Lipscomb, sensing Sewell's problem, felt the proper solution lay in Sewell's joining him on the **Advocate.** Sewell agreed reasoning that if he continued teaching school or farmed, he would have more time at home, but would be hindered in devoting any major portion of his time to the Lord's work. By working with the **Advocate** he could not only spend his time at home with his family, he could be reaching people with the word of the Lord. Besides, he could help free Lipscomb to do more traveling and preaching. The arrangement seemed ideal, so by the close of 1869, E. G. Sewell moved to Edgefield, across the river from Nashville, and the first of the following year started his long editorial career with the **Gospel Advocate.** For the next half-a-century the names, "Lipscomb & Sewell" were household terms in many homes in Tennessee.

With a feeling of relief, Lipscomb announced at the beginning of 1870 that the Advocate now had its own office on the third story of a building at 37½ Union St., between College and Cherry. The fact that the subscription list was higher than ever and that E. G. Sewell had now joined the **Advocate** cheered his sagging spirits. Lipscomb welcomed Sewell to the work saying,

> Bro. Sewell will give personal attention in the office. He is not afflicted so much with bad bile as we are, but has a little more of the **suaviter in modo.** so that those who object to the Advocate because of our being a little too sharp may not have objections to the same extent.

> But brethren whatever our faults have been we tried not to hide them from ourself and have tried to cure them as we could.[22]

Coinciding with the beginning of the Gospel Advocate in 1866 was the outbreak of a never-dying conflict with the missionary society. Lipscomb's serious doubts as to the scripturalness of the missionary society for several years had now reached a point of settled conviction. However, both Lipscomb and Fanning hoped that the **Advocate** would be used for a free, dispassionate discussion of the whole question, each hoping that through this means unity of action could later be achieved. But when a prospectus of the **Advocate** was sent to G. W. Elley and Thomas Munnell in the fall of 1865 requesting their assistance in the circulation of the paper, both men replied that it was their understanding that the **Advocate** was opposed to the Society, **and** if that were the case, they could not encourage its publication. Such an imperious spirit was hardly palatable to either Lipscomb or Fanning.

Fanning asked that the whole question be thoroughly investigated saying, "A large amount of the talent of the brotherhood seems to question the authority of your proceedings, and many good men, who are not mere youths, really believe the tendencies of your labors are not favorable to spiritual progress."[23] The reply angered Elley and Munnell. Elly insisted that the matter was of no great significance, and urged brethren to avoid a fuss about nothing. But Fanning was quick to point out, "You thought it sufficient magnitude, to attempt privately to extract from us a pledge to advocate the authority of a church-creating, church-regulating, and church-saving society, not recognized by the Spirit of God, upon the peril of disfranchisement by you and the secretary of your body." Fanning persisted,

> Plainly, deliberately and firmly we declare to all whom it may concern that it is our solemn conviction that the adoption or substitution of any expedient, society or plan for Christian work besides the 'kingdom not of this world,' is an insult to God, and a disgrace to the Christian profession.[24]

[22]Gospel Advocate, **1870, p. 18.**
[23]Gospel Advocate, **1866, p. 83.**
[24]Gospel Advocate, **1866, p. 122.**

It was a bold stroke, and the war was on! The objections to the Society narrowed down to the following: (1) It was a human institution, organized by the wisdom and power of man and guided by the spirit of man to do the work God gave the church. The implications were far reaching. First, it is implied that the church as God gave it was and is incapable of doing the work God gave it to do. This in turn reflects upon the wisdom of God and puts man's wisdom above God's. Second, it is implied that the Bible itself is not an all-sufficient guide in religion. The school of thought that would tolerate the existence of a Society unknown to the word of God would in time cast reflections upon the inspiration and authority of the scriptures. (2) It was an institution whose logical end would be toward authoritarianism. If the Society long continued, it would rob the churches of their independence and become the official voice of the brotherhood. These accusations appeared in the discussion that followed.

The first objection stated above constituted the issue on the missionary society. In the spring of 1867 Thomas Munnell and David Lipscomb conducted lengthy discussion on the question, surveying the objection together with its implications. It must be frankly admitted that the problem facing the society men was the question: if the society be objectionable because it is a human institution doing the work of the church, where must the line be drawn? Isaac Errett quipped sardonically to Tolbert Fanning that he could never take his objections to the society seriously as long as Fanning persisted in establishing a university in middle Tennessee, a human institution to do the work of the church. Thomas Munnell pointed out to Lipscomb that the **Gospel Advocate** was nothing more than a "publication society"; and the proposed university and Franklin College were "educational societies." On what ground was it to be concluded that a "missionary society," because it was a human institution doing the work of the church was wrong, and a "publication society" and an "educational society" right?

It is not likely that either Lipscomb or Fanning realized at first how heavily this problem weighed with society men. Both men tended to think of these objections as merely quibbles and

hastily cast them aside. Fanning insisted that operating a school belonged to the "worldly side" of a man, like running a farm or working in a bank. One needed no more Bible authority to operate a farm or a bank than he needed to operate a school. The fact that was so easy for many to forget was that teaching the Bible was the dual responsibility of both the church acting as an aggregate body, and of individual Christians acting as individual Christians. Farmers who taught the Bible while operating their farms, bankers who taught the Bible while operating their banks, and teachers who taught the Bible while operating their schools were all fulfilling their individual responsibility as Christians. Nor were they doing the work of the church when they did so. Orphanages were later encouraged on the same ground. They were not doing the work of the church, but the work of the individual Christian. So said Lipscomb.

Thomas Munnell's question about educational enterprises Lipscomb answered by saying,

> While they are entirely irrelevant questions, we still will respond, that general education is not a work God has committed to the church. If Bro. Munnell will examine the proposed operations of the school at Franklin College, before the burning of the building, he will find that it was announced that **religious** instruction and training for those designing to preach and others would be furnished by the **church**—not by the humanly organized board of curators.[25]

It should carefully be noted that Fanning felt the force of the Society's objection far more than he was willing to admit. This is plainly evidenced by the fact that the teaching of the Bible with a view to training men to preach was put, not under the Board of Curators of Franklin College, but under the church that met at Franklin College.

Lipscomb answered Munnell's charge that the **Gospel Advocate** was a publication society, a human institution doing the work of the church, by saying,

> So far as the publishing of a paper is concerned, it is nothing more than teaching, exhorting, reproving by the written **word** instead of the spoken. The Apostles set us

[25]David Lipscomb, "Discussion - Missionary Society," Gospel **Advocate,** Vol. IX - No. 13, (March 28, 1867) p. 248.

> the example of doing this. Printing is nothing more than the multiplication of the copies of the written word. Who says we have no example for this? It has no organization about it, but is the work of an individual in the church and responsible to the church.. . . Now the editors of the Advocate are each responsible to the church of which he is a member for what he writes and does.[26]

The question of how congregations may cooperate in their work and still maintain their independence is not only one of the oldest to come from the restoration movement but the most enduring. Munnell failed to see how the world could ever be converted unless the churches organize themselves into some body, but the adamant Lipscomb insisted, "Our faith is of that character, that we believe if God has proposed to convert the world through the agency of the church, although I may fail to see **how** he will do it, nevertheless, he is able to remove the difficulties and my duty is in simple, trusting faith to do what he has commanded me and leave the result with him.[27] "The Societies," he wrote, "are the outgrowth of a zeal that we think is misdirected. We believe that their organization is an assumption of power not warranted by the word of God."[28]

The **Advocate** succeeded admirably in getting men to think. John T. Poe wrote to Lipscomb late in 1869 from Huntsville, Texas saying that many of the brethren in Texas thought Lipscomb was inconsistent because he always pulled down cooperation meetings without offering any better plan. Poe wanted to know what Lipscomb's objections were to the cooperation of churches sending out the gospel, and how the churches could work most efficiently to evangelize. Lipscomb replied by Insisting that when two persons work in harmony with the same set of laws, they necessarily cooperate, though they may do it unconsciously or unintentionally. There is a difference between cooperation and organization. Two neighboring farmers work. One has work to do that he cannot do himself. So he asks his neighbor for help. Each, pursuing his own course, cooperates. Organization,

[26]**Gospel Advocate, 1867, p. 249.**
[27]David Lipscomb, "Discussion—Missionary Societies, No. 2," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. *IX* - No. 12, (March 21, 1867) p. 281.
[28]David Lipscomb, "The Missionary Question," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. IX—No. 2, (Jan. 10, 1867) p. 27.

on the other hand, demands a human head and human laws. The congregations of the Lord are organized cooperative bodies, ordained of God. All work in these bodies is true cooperative work. Every individual in any part of the world, working in true cooperation in these bodies is cooperating with every other. "We sincerely and earnestly believe," Lipscomb wrote, "All organized bodies for religious purposes outside of, within, above or below the congregations of the Lord are sinful and treasonable."[29] When each congregation works in harmony with the laws of God without even any reference to what any other congregation does, each necessarily cooperates.

But, when a church finds a work to do which it cannot do alone, how shall it act then? Lipscomb replied,

> Precisely as the family acts, which finds itself unable to roll its own logs, raise its own house, harvest its own grain or pick its own cotton. Let it make known its weakness and wants to its nearest sister congregation or congregations. And let these congregations without any human organization say whether they will aid the one asking aid or not and send the aid to sustain the teacher, or feed the poor, as congregations without the intervention of any human organization. So soon then as the work is done each congregation is left perfectly free to pursue its own course without any entangling alliances, with burdensome and frail human machinery or with its sister congregations.

When the Society announced early in 1866 that it would get out a new Christian Hymnal and turn the proceeds over to the Society, Lipscomb objected on the ground that this would encourage the tendency toward consolidation, usurpation, and corruption. If the Society were given a large sum of money in a permanent fund, it could go to endless extremes with no check on it possible. So Lipscomb now found himself embroiled in the Hymn Book Controversy with the Society.

In the fall of 1863 a letter had been sent to Alexander Campbell saying there was a great desire for a new Hymn Book. The writers feared that this demand would result in the compilation of several hymn books, and if this should happen, it would "de-

[29]David Lipscomb, "Cooperation Meeting," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XIII—No, 2, (Jan. 13, 1870) p. 27, 8.

stroy the unity and harmony in worship, by which, as a people, we have hitherto been characterized." To "avoid this calamity" and "desiring to forestall these individual schemes," the letter suggested that Campbell turn the copyright of his hymn book over to the American Christian Missionary Society "that its profits may go to the support of missions"; that a committee be appointed to undertake its revision, and the announcement of this be made soon. The group selected Isaac Errett to correspond with Campbell about the effort. Campbell agreed with one exception: he wanted the ownership kept free of the missionary society and modified the plan by making the deed of the copyright to five trustees, not officially connected with the Society. The missionary society was to get only that amount of the profits that the trustees assessed.

The work of revision continued, and by late in 1865 the new hymn book was out. The American Christian Review complained that it was too big and too costly. A short time later, James Beatty of Toronto, Canada published a Canadian Hymn Book which despite the criticism of a "sprinkling of bad poetry and questionable doctrines" was conceded by the **Advocate** to be an improvement over the Society's book. The Gospel Advocate pushed this book and received threats and warnings by the Society men for doing so.

It was a bold move for the **Advocate** in its infancy to oppose with such vehemence the whole Society world—the Society itself and the' **Christian Standard.** But, as Lipscomb put it, "It is our fortune or misfortune to have a strong confidence in God, and His appointments, a weak, very weak faith in man and his institutions," In this course his sails were set.

CHAPTER IX

"... A PLAIN AND UNASSUMING MAN ..." (1871 - 1875)

When the esteemed Benjamin Franklin, editor of the **American Christian Review,** conducted a meeting at Franklin, Tennessee, in 1875, he met David Lipscomb for the first time. Lipscomb was Franklin's kind of a man—"plain and unassuming with the simplicity of a child." There was no danger, Franklin reflected, that Lipscomb would ever become a "**clergyman.**" He lives in utter disregard of the notions of the world," he noted, "puts on no airs, wears just such coat, hat and pants as suit him." He noted that Lipscomb was a man of great power and influence, and "greatly devoted to the cause." Indicative of his influence was the general trend in the churches of middle Tennessee. Most of the congregations were dubious, if not violently opposed, to any human organization to do the work of the church. Ben Franklin observed this tendency with pleasure, and wrote: "The brethren in Tennessee have not received the supplement to the last commission, to 'observe all things whatsoever I have not forbidden.' but are simply under the old commission, 'all things whatsoever I have commanded'."[1]

David Lipscomb's persistent opposition to all human organizations of a religious character won him many friends but equally as many enemies. He was not a suave, debonair type but the rugged individualist who knew no other way to oppose what he conceived to be wrong but to speak out bluntly and boldly. Honestly recognizing his own limitations, he often wished he had more urbanity and elegance. Still, he would never pretend to be what he was not.

> Of course, (he wrote) every man has his own way of opposing error. One with a well-rounded character and equable temperament will do it frequently in a smooth inoffensive style. Others of us with more sharp angularities of character and asperity of temper will do it in a rougher and more acrimonious manner but that work must be done, smoothly or roughly, or the truth of God is

[1]Ben Franklin, **American Christian Review,** 1875, p. 220.

> destroyed. It is frequently more thoroughly done when done by a temperament not too suave.[2]

The existence of the missionary society Lipscomb sincerely believed set the restoration movement in retrograde. He was determined to oppose this with all of his power, and wrote:

> We have adopted a principle of fealty to God, which is expressed in the faith which says, God is served in his own institutions and works through his own appointments, unpolluted by human touch, unaffected by human amendment or change. They are the embodiment of God's wisdom, the medium of his exertion of power. The addition of these functions and organizations is a violation of this principle, is an abnegation of this faith. It is wrong. Whoever doubts the sufficiency of his institutions, questions his wisdom and power. It is a betrayal of distrust in God. We must have a pure church, without human additions and corruptions. I will have part in no other. I cannot see the good institution thus violated, and hold my peace. I dislike controversy. My deep sorrow at the presentation of such propositions is a clear and satisfactory evidence to my own mind of this. Every drop of blood in my body, every principal of fealty to God in my soul forbids my remaining silent. I know I am right; I know even though I should stand alone, the principle will live. It honors God. The opposite dishonors him.[3]

The American Christian Missionary Society emerged from the Civil War severely battle-scarred and facing a dubious future. When in the heat of the war, it passed the famous "war resolutions" denouncing the South and pledging loyalty to the North, it dealt itself a hard blow. Temporarily at least this spelled its doom among southern brethren. W. K. Pendleton had counselled against the resolutions and after the war admitted they constitute a colossal blunder. Although it would be wrong to imagine that southern opposition after the war came because of the prejudice created by the war resolutions, it would be equally wrong to imagine that this factor did not exist. For five years after the war, it was uncertain whether the Society would live or die. More trouble came for the society when Ben Franklin put the weight of the **American Christian Review** against it shortly after the war. The **Christian Standard's** defense of the

[2]David Lipscomb, "The Christian Messenger," **Gospel Advocate, Vol. XVII** - No. 8, (Feb. 18, 1875) p. 178.

[3]David Lipscomb, "West Tennessee Cooperation Meeting," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. **XVI** - No. 26, June 18, 1874) p. S93.

society gave it much needed support but not enough to make its supporters overly optimistic. Backers of the organization saw by 1869 that it was necessary to bring together all the opposing forces in the brotherhood if the institution was to continue. At the convention held in Louisville, Ky. in 1869 the famous "Louisville Plan" was projected with a series of boards from the national on down to the district. The highly theoretical plan called for the contributions to be sent to the lower boards, which would keep one-half of the proceeds, and send the rest on to the next board above, which would in turn keep a part, sending the remainder on up to the top. Some of the leading preachers in the brotherhood widely acclaimed it as though it was the epitome of their dreams.

Benjamin Franklin, always desirous of being conciliatory without compromising the truth, was led to believe that the "Louisville Plan" spelled the death of the Missionary Society. He urged all to get behind the move, insisting this was not a case of a human organization doing the work of the church, but simply a plan whereby the churches could work. For the first time since the war, the future looked bright. With Franklin at last reconciled and most of the brethren behind the move, nothing could stop it.

David Lipscomb, however, was adamant. He was one of the few who failed to see that the element of human organization was absent. He was as much opposed to the Louisville Plan as he ever had been to the old Society, and said so quite frankly.

> I am just as sure that the scheme is weak and impracticable as I am of anything undemonstrated. I am sure every congregation in the land will do ten times as much acting for itself and controlling its own means as it will to have its means sent up to Cincinnati and other places to have a board at Cincinnati and other points tithe and control it. This, the Plan contemplates. We feel sure that thousands of good brethren all over the country feel just as I do, that it is anti-scriptural in organization, subversive of the work and organization of the churches, inefficient in operation and corrupting in influence. Believing this, our consciences demand we should protest earnestly against it.[4]

[4]David Lipscomb, "Mississippi and Louisville Plan," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XIII - No. 2, (Jan. 12, 1871) p. 38.

The Louisville Plan was shortlived. Franklin soon realized that the plan was as much a human organization as the old American Christian Missionary Society. He backed off from it, and soon the bellicose **Review** was again opposing the society. Even to its strongest supporters it was evident that the plan was not workable. By 1874 to all practical intents and purposes it was dead, and the Foreign Christian Missionary Society phoenix-like, arose from its ruins. From henceforth The Missionary Society was determined to ignore all opposition.

Although David Lipscomb and the Society had definitely parted ways by 1874, Lipscomb could not be finished with the question of how congregations may cooperate to preach the gospel. He was to meet this problem at almost every point where he made an attack on the Society. Meanwhile, his thinking on the subject was developing to the point that he frowned even upon the old "Consultation Meetings," long so popular among the brethren in middle Tennessee. George W. Abell called such a meeting at Murfreesboro to begin on October 10, 1874. Lipscomb arrived a day late. He spoke out little, taking part only in the discussion on "Ordination." He came away doubting the propriety of consultation meetings more than ever. "It was pleasant," he mused, "to meet with brethren and confer with one another. We heard not an unkind work spoken by any one—but if ten protracted meetings had been held in ten different, destitute neighborhoods—we believe less harm and much more good would have been done." Lipscomb's feeling this way aroused Abell's ire. He wrote a vitriolic note, accusing Lipscomb of being a pope and issuing orders from his headquarters at the Capitol. He advised Lipscomb the next time there was a consultation meeting to stay away. Lipscomb refused to be offended and instead, availed himself of the opportunity of doing some teaching on "Congregational Cooperation."

> But we believe in co-operation, co-working with God. Every man who obeys the commands of God or induces another to obey them is a co-worker with God. He not only cooperates with God but he cooperates, works together with every other being in the universe, in heaven or on earth that obeys God. God superintends that co-operation, God guides, directs, is the Head of that coopera-

> tion. That cooperation requires only that we obey God, walk by His law, do his bidding, operate his institutions, and we are in perfect accord and harmony, in complete and full cooperation with God and with every being in the universe who is in harmony with the will of God. This cooperation is effected not by forming new institutions, new organs, new functions, or new combinations of God's institutions, but by unfaltering fidelity in the institutions of God. To form new institutions, to change or modify God's institutions, to create new functions not formed by God, is to operate without and against every being in harmony with God. For God operates only through his own laws, his own institutions, his own appointments, not through those of others. Cooperation with God is working through God's institutions, organs, functions without changes or modifications.[5]

E. B. Cayce of Franklin, Tennessee, slightly irritated at Lipscomb's dubiety of consultation meetings, inquired of him to speak

> plainly, clearly, definitely, **what** these 'heaven-appointed' agencies **are** and how the simple congregations can help, assist, or cooperate together without some kind of consultation together, or communication with each other. Now if consultation or communication is essential to cooperation, how is it supposed to be brought about? . . . Tell us plainly, are' you opposed to all consultation meetings—and are you opposed to the cooperation of churches in the great work?"

Lipscomb picked up the gauntlet so defiantly hurled before him, saying,

> ... If our brother is a teacher in Israel and has not yet learned what the agencies and organs connected with the church are, we are hopeless of informing him in anything we write. They are the church, simple and pure, with all its ordinances observed and its members each working in his proper position and with true diligence in the church of Christ. There is not a single congregation meeting or organization between the churches, or over the churches or under the churches in all these appointments. Not one. Nor can they be added without treason to the Master.
>
> The simple congregations can cooperate, help, assist, by each of them doing just what the Master commands them. We have strong and implicit faith in the concert, harmony, cooperation, success that arises from all obeying implicitly the laws of God, the commands of the great captain. If we will do that, without care on our part, not a jar, not a discord will be found in all the movements

[5]David Lipscomb, "Cooperation Again," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XVI - No. 29, (July 23, 1874) p. 677, 8.

> of the King's armies. They will all work harmoniously, effectively, successfully. All the churches in the world thus cooperate under the Divine Head.
>
> . . . What are usually termed cooperations are really not cooperation of churches. They are organizations, combinations that do the work of churches. So destroy all church operation and cooperation. There can be no cooperation without operation. Operation is working. Cooperation is working together to the same end. Two churches, both working by the same law, for the accomplishment of the same end are cooperation.[6]

Evangelistic Work

Meanwhile, Lipscomb divided his time between editing the **Advocate,** preaching, debating, traveling and farming. With the memory of the preachers he knew in his boyhood days still with him Lipscomb went about preaching in the same unostentatious manner. A shade tree in the summer time, a school house, a store building—anything that would accomodate a small audience was utilized. He looked with disgust upon what he thought might be a professional clergy arising among the brethren. Men that would refuse to preach unless they could be guaranteed a large audience, an elegant meeting house, and a nice salary were unworthy to be called preachers in his opinion. His strong feelings on this point were succinctly expressed. Yet as often as not he was misunderstood. It was a hard point on which to be sufficiently definitive. It was inevitable that some of his readers would conclude that he did not believe that preachers should be paid, or that it was wrong for the preacher to have an understanding with a congregation as to the amount of his pay. When T. W. Caskey misunderstood him, Lipscomb wrote laconically, "In the last place, Brother Caskey nor any one else ever saw or heard a syllable from us opposing a brother who depends upon a congregation or congregations for support, having an understanding with the congregations as to what will support him."[7] Some congregations took advantage of Lipscomb's chastisement of the mercenary preachers to withhold adequate support. A miserly spirit was

[6]David Lipscomb, "Cooperation Again," **Gospel Advocate, Vol.** XVI - No. 29, (July 23, 1874) pp. 677, 8.
[7]David Lipscomb, "Plans," **Gospel Advocate, Vol.** XVII - **No.** 2, (Jan. 8, 1875) p. 37.

encouraged among the churches. Not too blandly did J. M. Barnes try to correct the evil.

> The idea that a poor preacher with a family, a helpless family should sow the seed of the kingdom at his own charges, whilst the fat farmer, merchant or man of some other calling hoards up his overplus, is absolutely absurd and brother Lipscomb never taught it. But in case no help comes the preacher should do all he can anyhow.[8]

Lipscomb's objection was against allowing the preacher to become dependent upon the congregation, "against his putting himself in a position to lose his manhood, forfeit his own self-respect and the respect of the brotherhood, and the world." When a preacher (or as Lipscomb preferred to call him, a "teacher") refused to preach unless he was paid, "the sooner he quits preaching the better for the church." It was too easy for people to overlook a similar chastisement given to the congregations.

> We have insisted, to this end, he should labor to the extent of his ability in teaching the world the way of salvation. While insisting on this, that the teacher himself may be worthy, without blame, giving no ground of excuse for the church refusing to support him, we have insisted that the individual or the congregation that would see him go at his own charges, that would refuse to fellowship him in the labor, that would fail to aid his family while he was working for the Lord, and thus becoming sharers and partakers in his labor, in the Lord's labor, is utterly unworthy to wear the name Christian. If there is truth in the Bible, God will spew such out of his mouth, will reject as saying and doing not, as hearing his commands and refusing to do them, as drawing near with their mouths while their heart is far from him, as refusing to become co-workers with him against the evil one, as refusing to hearken when he called.[9]

By 1871 the cause was young in middle Tennessee. It was a time for planting the seed, to lose no opportunity no matter how humble to preach where a few people would gather to listen. Despite the fact of the **Gospel Advocate's** moving to 36 Cherry Street, between Union and Church, and setting up a first class printing office, at the same time Lipscomb found time to go

[8]J. M. Barnes, "Away Up In Tennessee," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XVI - No. 1, (Jan. 1, 1874) p. 13.

[9]David Lipscomb, "Support of Teachers," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XVI - No. 6, (Jan. 29, 1874) p. 105.

to McMinnville for a meeting. The meeting started on Saturday, March 18, and continued a week. Rain fell in torrents. The next month he spoke ten nights at Pleasant Hill schoolhouse in Davidson County, baptizing twenty people, four from the Baptists. Later, he secured the use of an old tavern near Donelson and went back and forth from town each night to preach. One night during a sermon, a rich but dissipated old bachelor walked to the front. Reeling in drunkenness, he looked at Lipscomb and said, "You're a good 'un!" Lipscomb spoke to him gently, got him to sit down, but the remainder of the sermon the drunkard continued nodding and drinking.

The summer months drifted past and Lipscomb was hampered by the return of his old trouble. It was bad enough to be bothered with a sore throat, but to cough continually made it worse. But there was still good to be done. E. G. Sewell was preaching away in the Odd Fellow's Hall in East Nashville. It was a happy relief to Sewell for General R. M. Gano to come from Texas for **a** gospel meeting. Gano, son of Kentucky's illustrous John Allen Gano, had graduated with honors from Bethany College, studied medicine, and had begun his practice at Baton Rouge, Louisiana. While practicing there, he had organized a small band of disciples who "kept house for the Lord." When Gano later moved to Grapevine, Texas, the citizens were having trouble with the Indians. Gano organized a military band and defended the settlement. In this way his military life began. Later he was elected to the legislature of Texas. When the Civil War broke out, he was made a General in the Confederate army, spending most of his time in Middle Tennessee, at Gallatin, Hartsville and Lebanon.

Lipscomb himself welcomed General Gano's meeting. Horace G. Lipscomb and James F. Lipscomb were both making their home with David and Aunt Mag. So also was Mrs. L. V. Clough, Aunt Fanny's daughter, widow of Colonel Clough who had been killed at Fort Donelson. Lipscomb and Gano were often together during the meeting, and the association was pleasant. Lipscomb bragged to the General that he had never smoked a cigar, drunk a cup

of coffee, drunk spirits or taken a chew of tobacco. Gano replied that he not only had refrained from these things but in addition, had never touched tea. That stopped the bluster! During the meeting, Horace, James, and Mrs. Clough were all baptized.

Ill health slowed Lipscomb down but did not stop him completely. Improvements were continually being made in the Advocate, and that fall, in an effort to increase the circulation, it was announced that the subscription price would drop from two dollars and fifty cents to two dollars for the coming year, 1872. There was still some preaching that almost had to be done. On October 21, he went to Williamson County to baptize a sick lady. An old classmate of Lipscomb's at Franklin College, Mary Phillips, heard Lipscomb was coming and met him at the water, where she was baptized. Although he had started the year 1871 with good health, his throat had bothered him nearly the whole year. He had done on the whole little preaching.

He started the year, 1872 with the determination to be more quiet, travel and preach less, and spend much more time in studying and writing. "We find a continual need," he mused, "of a more faithful, earnest study of the word of God—more familiarity with its precepts and a fuller drinking in of its spirits." But he was to find that the year was to be one of the most active he had ever spent.

It was inevitable that the year would hardly begin until he would be engaged in his first debate. The summer of 1870, Lipscomb had agreed to meet the truculent G. W. Griffin, a baptist preacher of Wilson County. But he heard nothing more about it. The next summer when E. G. Sewell spoke several times at Laguardo, Griffin repeated his defiance, and was challenged to debate. He accepted but insisted that the discussion should be held at Gallatin, not Laguardo. It was agreed that David Lipscomb should be his opponent, and the discussion should be held in Gallatin, beginning on Monday, January 15, 1872.

Lipscomb's apprehension as he awaited the discussion was not without some basis in reason. He had not only never held a debate, but had never heard one, nor had ever read one com-

pletely. His natural modesty told him that he could not debate, so he proposed to Griffin that they conduct the discussion in the backwoods somewhere so nobody would hear it, and let him see if he could debate. Griffin understandably refused. Lipscomb faced with little time to prepare, decided to use the debate as an experiment to see if he possessed any powers in this type of encounter. For himself Lipscomb attached little public significance to it.

But it was not so with the general public. The **Nashville Union And American** reported the day after the debate began, "Large crowds attend the meetings, and the excitement runs so high that it is expected before the close, both parties will be fighting mad." Speeches were delivered each morning beginning at ten o'clock in the Baptist meetinghouse. Lipscomb had sought the aid of T. W. Brents and Jesse L. Sewell as counsellors, while S. A. Kelley agreed to be his moderator. The first proposition which forced him into the awkward position of affirming a negative, read: "The kingdom of Christ was not set up or opened on earth to the sons and daughters of Adam, until the death of Christ."

Lipscomb crowded as many arguments as he could make in his first speech. Griffin in reply selected the weakest and the least clear arguments to answer, shrewdly ignoring the most forceful ones. Lipscomb learned a lesson which he often passed on to debaters, viz.: use few arguments but make them strong and clear. Afterwards, Griffin asserted that Lipscomb was not a learned man and a poor speaker, but still compared the debate to the Campbell-Rice discussion, and said the strength of "Campbellism" had been seen here. J. R. Graves was the only Baptist preacher to attend. When Lipscomb offered to debate Graves, the slippery Baptist declined saying Lipscomb had been beaten, and he would meet only a "live man." His choice was Moses E. Lard. Lipscomb wondered. Lard, it was known, had no particular reputation as a debater, and had even advised Tolbert Fanning against meeting Graves because of the latter's lack of scholarship and gentlemanly bearing. Actually, Graves knew Lard would never meet him, so felt safe in selecting him.

During each night of the debate, W. H. Hopson preached for the brethren in Gallatin, so the whole event proved to be more significant than Lipscomb had expected.

Texas Trip

The spring of 1872 found Lipscomb still faced with the task of taking another trip to Texas. For the past five years Texas brethren had been urging him to pay them a visit. Each time he had thought of going something occurred to make the trip impossible. But matters were now in better shape. The necessity of caring for a large family made it necessary for Sewell to stay close to home. Lipscomb had talked things over with Sewell and they had come to an understanding that Lipscomb should be free from many financial worries and office duties connected with the **Gospel Advocate.** Lipscomb would agree to read his own proofs at home, but otherwise all mechanical duties should be turned over to Sewell. Sewell, agreeing to such an arrangement for 1872, later refused to repeat it. So as things worked out, Lipscomb was freer now than ever for his trip to Texas.

The time for departure was set for Monday evening, May 27th. The day before, Lipscomb went out and spoke in a schoolhouse south of Nashville near the residence of a Henry Compton. Old Compton, a quartermaster under General Andrew Jackson in the war of 1812, had moved to Davidson County in 1806. Compton heard the primitive gospel for the first time when he listened to Lipscomb in 1871. He remarked after the sermon, "I never heard preaching of that kind before, but it is true." He proposed to build a good meetinghouse at his own expense if Lipscomb would preach there regularly. So then, when Lipscomb went out to Compton's schoolhouse on Sunday, May 26, he spoke on the necessity of consecrating one's life to God. Compton inquired if one who lived a good moral life, never wronging his neighbors, would go to heaven. Lipscomb cited the case of Cornelius, and drew a lesson or two from the life of Christ. He asked Compton to go home and study these Bible lessons. It was two years before Lipscomb heard from Compton again, but

then a message came asking Lipscomb to come out and baptize him. That was July, 1873. The next month Compton died at the ripe age of ninety-nine.

On Monday evening, according to plans, Lipscomb, Aunt Mag and his father-in-law, Henry Zellner left Nashville on the Decatur Railroad for Texas. They travelled through New Orleans and Galveston. After a few miles of travel at night, Lipscomb complained sardonically that man was made to **rest** at night, not **ride.** At New Orleans they laid over eighteen hours, spending the time in a rented room in the French quarter of the city. On Thursday they crossed the Mississippi River, changing cars from Galveston. A part of the way they went by steamer. Brother Zellner became sea-sick, but Lipscomb found the sea breeze invigorating. Arriving at Galveston in the morning at nine o'clock, they left in the afternoon on a train for Bryan. It was hot in southern Texas, and off in the distance, they could see a large prairie fire. As the train moved over the rails, they stared in amazement at large herds of cattle.

Bryan had been the place determined by Texas brethren for their State Meeting. It was a new town of less than three thousand people and not yet three years old. It was three o'clock in the morning when the train arrived. The next morning the meetings were already under way before Lipscomb appeared. The discussions centered on the subjects of general evangelization and plans to establish a paper and a Bible College. Carroll Kendrick then made his home in Bryan. He had read the **Advocate** enough to know that the general tone of it did not appeal to him. Lipscomb's views on the Christian's relation to civil government were totally at variance with his own. Besides, Kendrick had been working hard to build up a state missionary organization in Texas which he envisioned would be stripped of some of the objectionable features of other state organizations. Kendrick, therefore, was not too happy that morning when Lipscomb appeared at the State Meeting.

Lipscomb remained quiet until he was asked to speak. Then he spoke his frank convictions on missionary societies. He re-

ferred to the Louisville Plan, insisting that those favoring it had ostracized those against it. He spoke of some general weaknesses in the church, one being the tendency to work exclusively to get people in the church, expending almost no effort to perfect the saints. Lipscomb asserted the **Gospel Advocate** was trying to correct this.

Kendrick grunted, scowled and frowned in displeasure but said nothing. In the summer of 1836, at the age of 21, Kendrick had ridden horseback three hundred miles to attend the first "State Meeting" he ever heard of. It was held at Harrodsburg, Kentucky. Barton W. Stone and John T. Johnson had been the speakers. Kendrick himself spoke briefly with great embarrassment on "True Wisdom." Ever since Kendrick had been a friend of the State Meeting idea. Texas was a young state in 1851 when Kendrick moved out to improve his failing health. But there were few congregations anywhere in the state in those days. In the twenty years that followed, Kendrick's leadership was strongly felt, but since the war he had observed it was becoming increasingly more difficult to sell the brethren on missionary plans. The reason he knew: it was David Lipscomb's opposition to these plans.

Kendrick's cheerless greetings froze in icy petrification. Lipscomb saw Kendrick as a man jealous of his brethren, trying to rule over them, and filled with petty ambition. As much as possible Kendrick avoided Lipscomb. He made no overture to invite him to his home, but somehow Lipscomb received an invitation to speak at the regular services of the church on the Lord's Day. Lipscomb felt Kendrick's coolness at the morning service. He chose an old sermon, based on Ephesians 4. In preaching this sermon, Lipscomb normally said something about men going in debt and not paying their way out. Knowing Kendrick was in debt, he left out that part of the sermon. At the evening service, Kendrick warmed up slightly, and even complimented the morning sermon. The coolness, however, was growing embarrassing, and Lipscomb made arrangements to leave on Tuesday—a little earlier than he had planned.

From Bryan Lipscomb went to Houston. There was no congregation in that city of 8000, only a few of whom were disciples. Traveling up the Great Northern Railroad, they went next to Willis, and from here by private conveyance to a place called Bethany, six miles away in Montgomery County. He preached there twice. On Thursday he proceeded to the town of Montgomery, finding a small and "almost lifeless" body of disciples. He returned to Willis, going from there to Huntsville in Walker County. He visited a high school for girls operated here by a Dr. Saunders. After preaching for the church five times, he left for Brenham going by way of Houston.

His arrival in Houston was on June 14. The night was spent in the "Hutchins' House," but it was too expensive for Lipscomb, so he left the next day for Brenham. An annual feast of the German population had closed in Houston the day before, so the train to Brenham was loaded with loud, frolicking German people, drinking beer and making love.

His travels and preaching in Texas continued with little let-up. At the Concord Church near Brenham he preached seven times, and eight were baptized. He preached next at Giddings, then at Lexington, and at Cameron. He was so tired when he arrived at Cameron that he rested there four days. He left Cameron on Wednesday, July 3, for Waco. Lipscomb spoke three times to this congregation of a hundred members. On Monday he set out for Fort Worth, but twelve miles out, was met by H. D. Bantau and stayed with him through Wednesday.

In 1872 Fort Worth had a population of only six or seven hundred people. Addison and Randolph Clark, sons of J. A. Clark were operating a school there. Lipscomb preached in the town fifteen times with sixteen or seventeen additions. One was a little eleven year old girl, Jennie McNeley, whom he baptized in Clear Fork Creek. The last Saturday of the month he attended a meeting near Dunnville in Tarrant County held under a brush arbor. The next week he was at Grapevine Prairie where he spoke seven times. He baptized two on Tuesday morning just as he was preparing to depart for Quitman in Wood County. But

first he went back to Fort Worth. This time he was challenged for a debate by D. D. Sweindall, a Baptist preacher, but nothing came of it. He visited Thorp Spring, taking dinner in the home of P. M. Rawlins and family.

Lipscomb passed through Dallas, then a small place noted only as a railroad terminus. Pressing on through Rains County, he arrived at Quitman in Wood County. There were only two or three members of the church there, but he spoke twelve times in the Baptist meeting house. Going north from Quitman, they took a zig-zag course through Titus and Gowie Counties, crossing the Red River at Lanesport and entered Little River County, Arkansas. They passed Mt. Pleasant, "a pretty little place upon a hill," but did not stop.

It had been a busy time, but the going now was slower, allowing Lipscomb time to reflect upon what he had seen and heard. They drove a wagon drawn by a pair of Mexican mules, and carried a buffalo robe and a pair of blankets. They camped out at night, using for a bed a blanket thrown over a layer of pine branches. The country was sparsely settled. Food for the mules was hard to find. They drove to Lanesport through a thick grove of red oak trees, and camped one night at the edge of the river.

They came to Rocky Comfort in Little River County, Arkansas and met John Read, formerly of Rutherford County, Tennessee. He was county treasurer. Lipscomb spoke four times in the court house. Read's wife rode on with them six miles before they came to "a certain water." Lipscomb baptized her and she returned home rejoicing. They rode on to Hot Springs. Cabins were few; people were poor. At one cabin Lipscomb came upon an old man reading aloud to a group of five or six people. He was reading from Ben Franklin's **Gospel Preacher,** a book of sermons. At a little village called Amity, Lipscomb stepped into a whiskey store, and was surprised to see a fiddle lying on top of a copy of the **Christian Standard.** They stayed at Hot Springs three or four days before going on to Little Rock, a town only a year or two old. They stayed with a Brother Holland several days, during which time Lipscomb spoke three times. Taking

the train from Little Rock back to Nashville, they arrived home in 36 hours. They had been gone three and one-half months. Lipscomb had spoken one hundred times in all with seventy-five baptisms.

As Lipscomb sized up the situation in Texas, the trouble in the church was still an outgrowth of the war. People with southern sympathies did not want to hear preachers who had opposed them. In the excitement of the war one class of "Christians" had made attempts to kill or hang other brethren of different political views. Now that the war was over they were still hurling charges at each other. Preachers were accused of swindling the state during the war, and living off the fruits of their gain. Grim suspicions were everywhere. It would take time, and a little more Christianity, to heal the troubles in Texas.

Picking up where he left off, Lipscomb continued his preaching nearer home. On Sunday, September 15, he preached at Odd Fellow's Hall in Edgefield in Sewell's absence. He conducted a meeting in Watkin's Chapel, a mission house built by S. Watkins in northwest Nashville for the benefit of his laborers and tenants. The rest of the year was normally spent—writing, preaching, and farming.

Meanwhile, Lipscomb kept a close eye on brotherhood issues and activities. The **Apostolic Times,** the **American Christian Review** and the **Christian Standard** were full of news about the recent happenings at Kentucky University. Regent John B. Bowman had snatched the dying Bacon College from certain death by selling the citizens of Kentucky on the idea of making it into their state university. The brethren's fears were pacified when they learned that the religious emphasis of the school would be toward non-sectarianism. They were no sect, that they knew for sure. Then came the war. John W. McGarvey moved to Lexington, and with the close of the war, became connected with the school. A coolness developed between McGarvey and Bowman, that was climaxed when Bowman fired McGarvey from his faculty. What had happened, brethren inquired? McGarvey and his friend, Moses E. Lard, decided to let the brethren know. In-

stead of the school being run in the interest of primitive Christianity as the brethren believed it was, Bowman insisted that teaching peculiar to the brotherhood be forbidden. There was an awkward tie between the brotherhood and the state. The citizens of Kentucky thought McGarvey a man of a narrow and sectarian spirit, and irately demanded the connection of the school with the "Christian churches of Kentucky" be severed. Bowman himself was in the awkward position of trying to satisfy both the state and the brotherhood. Sooner or later the situation was bound to come to a head.

But the trouble had serious and far-reaching effects. Ben Franklin cocked an eyebrow. The same men who backed the Missionary Society were behind Bowman and Kentucky University. Franklin, having already washed his hands of the society, now did the same with the Bible College. Before the trouble at the university was ever finally settled, Franklin died. He was a man with a magnetic personality, able to rally to himself the strongest loyalties from his friends. During these troubled days, he planted these suspicious and doubts in the minds of others.

Lipscomb himself said little about the troubles at the university except to blame them on politics. He reaffirmed his belief that schools to educate young preachers for the ministry were radically wrong and injurious to the church. Later he was to be reminded of those statements and accused of changing his position.

The question of instrumental music was now looming more ominously before the brethren. The **Advocate** remained relatively silent on it, hoping that the discussion in the other papers would be sufficient. Finally when it became necessary to speak out, Lipscomb wrote:

> The New Testament is at once the rule and limit of our faith and worship to God. . . . Our rule limits man's worship to the exercises approved of in the Bible. . . .
>
> Prayer, praise, thanksgiving, singing and making melody in the heart unto the Lord are acts of worship ordained of God. But no authority do we find for the organ . . . Again, if we open the door to expediency, where shall we close it? Why stop at the organ? If we can make

> an inanimate object as the organ answer as a substitute for singing, why will not one do for praying? Counting beads is the same character of substitute for praying that the organ is for singing. . . .
>
> Whatever Jesus found in Judaism that he approved, he retained in the Christian worship. Whatever he disapproved, he left out. He found the organ in use among the Jews. He left it out, failed to adopt it in the Christian worship. When Christ dropped it out, who dare place it in?[10]

Busy Days

Early in 1873 Lipscomb attended the debate at Flat Creek in Bedford County between T. W. Brents and Jacob Ditzler. Later in the year he negotiated for the debate to be repeated. The debate was held in mid November at Fayetteville and repeated shortly afterward in Franklin.

The inevitable question of congregational cooperation was never far away. A meeting for consultation and cooperation was called for Clarksville, Tennessee, April 24-28. Lipscomb published the announcement and attended the meetings. He went with certain misgivings, but knowing the brethren were sincere and meant well, he had announced it. Later, his uncle, Dr. D. M. Lipscomb of Grapevine, Texas wrote him, questioning his procedure. Lipscomb felt that if sufficient patience were used, the whole question of consultation meetings would eventually be settled in brethren's minds.

Nashville suffered another terrible scourge of cholera in June. On Sunday, the twenty-second, 64 people died. Between June 7 and 21, there were 397 deaths. Business was almost completely shut down. Even the **Advocate** missed a week of publication. Again Lipscomb worked hard to help relieve the suffering.

Later in the year, J. M. Barnes made another trip to Nashville from Alabama. Lipscomb and Fanning were out at the fair grounds at a stock sale when he arrived. Later in the day he drove his buggy to Lipscomb's "romantic home" down the Cum-

[10]David Lipscomb, "The Organ In Worship," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XV - No. 36, (Sept. 11, 1873) pp. 855, 6.

berland. Barnes "took supper" in Edgefield with Sewell, Lipscomb and James Scobey being present. Scobey talked of plans to start a female institute, and Lipscomb suggested Murfreesboro as the best place for it.

The **Gospel Advocate** had weathered the crisis and was still growing despite the panic. Sewell and Lipscomb had talked over plans to enlarge their business into a publishing house. Sewell let his readers in on the secret saying, "The subject of a publishing house to be owned and conducted by our brethren, and situated in Nashville, has been considered and talked of by some of the brethren recently, and so far as brethren have spoken on the subject, there is a desire to have something of the kind." T. W. Brent's material, formerly printed in the "Alien's Department" of the **Advocate** had been printed as a tract but there was a wide-spread desire to have it in some more permanent form. Now for the first time the **Advocate** was in a position to put the "Gospel Plan of Salvation" in book form, and plans were made toward that end.

The next year the **Advocate** added a colored boy, Edward Jackson from Virginia, to do janitor work at the office. He was very efficient "especially when there was any backsheesh circulating." Jackson, a devout Methodist, had two outstanding qualities: he loved to debate on the Holy Spirit, and equally as well, liked his dram. He liked politics, and during the parades in the city, would walk two blocks ahead with his pockets full of rocks, ready to dispatch any opponent quickly. Jackson died in three years, and the **Advocate** office lost some smiles. Corpulent Horace G. Lipscomb moved into the **Advocate** office in 1874 to edit the "News Section" of the paper, so the organization was gradually improving.

The spring of 1874 Lipscomb's old trouble returned. The second Sunday of April he visited with the Olivet congregation near Glasgow, Kentucky. He met A. Alsup, Jr., W. C. Huffman and several other preachers. When he returned to his home, he was sick, and for the next month spent most of his time in bed. He was just gaining back his strength when the shocking news

reached him that Tolbert Fanning had been seriously injured and was not expected to live.

Nature plays strange tricks! It is ironical how one's strength can often be the cause of his downfall. Tolbert Fanning's indomitable will had driven him in places where angels feared to tread. But eventually it brought about his death. Going to stall one morning to see one of his prize bulls, he ordered Frank Manier, a stable-worker, to lead it out. Frank, obviously afraid, refused. This vexed Fanning, so he walked into the stall to lead the bull out himself. The mad animal lunged at Fanning and almost killed him on the spot. Miraculously, Fanning escaped. He lingered for a few days, and thought he was improving. He did improve enough that one morning he walked back to the stall from his home. On his return, he climbed some steps and felt something inside him tear. This was on Thursday morning. He suffered immeasurable agony until the next Sunday.

Early on Sunday morning, May 3, Fanning predicted to the doctor that he would die before the day was past. A worship service was held in his home that morning. At 12:30 p. m. he died. P. S. Fall preached his funeral the next day. David Lipscomb had lost a close friend.

The greatness of Tolbert Fanning has long been recognized by students of the restoration movement. Unfortunately, little has ever been written of his life. This is largely Fanning's doing. He seldom spoke of his accomplishments, even to his wife. Charlotte Fanning, shortly after her husband's death, announced she would write her husband's biography and sent out a call for material. She never succeeded in writing a biography because there was not enough material to do so. C. M. Wilmeth announced in the fall of 1885 that he was gathering material for a "Life Aid Times of Tolbert Fanning," and asked for facts and incidents to assist him. His effort, too, ended in failure. This has been the experience of all men who have tried it.

It rained in Nashville on Saturday, May 2, but from that day to August 26 not enough rain fell to settle the dust. Meanwhile,

Lipscomb slowly recovered, and by July was preaching again. He spoke at Leiper's Fork In Williamson County on the first Sunday of the month. The last week he baptized four at White's Bend, eight miles from home. The first of August he visited the congregation at Roan's Creek in Huntington County. The remainder of the year he filled preaching appointments nearer home, preaching for E. G. Sewell at Edgefield the first Sunday of October. The following June his meeting at Franklin, Tennessee, resulted in eight additions.

These were years of humble beginnings, highlighted by the patient work of faithful men who had learned never to despise the day of small things. Coming generations would see more clearly the fruit of such labors.

CHAPTER X

"... HE DON'T MEAN IT ALL ..."

The cause of Christ was on the march but the advance was made amid an atmosphere of caution. It was a time for careful analysis brought on largely by the rapid internal changes. Thomas Campbell's old motto: "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent" had for many years been used to show that nothing may be introduced into the work and worship of the church which is not specifically authorized in the word of God. The rise of the missionary society and the growing use of the instrument in worship made it necessary to forge a new interpretation of the old motto. This W. K. Pendleton did in his historic speech of 1866 by declaring that all Campbell had in mind was to point his remarks against creeds and confessions of faith, "against the assumptions of sectarianism, and the decrees of councils." This motto, asserted Pendleton,

> was intended to deny that these unauthorized ecclesiastic dictators had any right to 'impose articles of faith,' 'terms of communion' or 'rules for the constitution and management of the church, save what is expressly enjoined by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles, either in express terms or by approved example'."[1]

In an area where the Bible is silent no man has a right to impose his own canons upon the church. Here, then, was a new interpretation of an old motto.

An era of confusion was born, characterized by earnest efforts to be properly definitive on basic principles. It would show a lack of understanding of human nature to be surprised at the vast scope of objections raised against the Sunday Schools, lesson leaves, Bible Colleges, located preachers, etc. Were all of these things objectionable for the same reason the instrument and society were? If not, where were the differences? Those of the W. K. Pendleton type of mind, of course, had no serious concern, for if the instrument and society could be added without any scruples over biblical authority, other things could.

[1]W. K. Pendleton, "Address," **Millennial Harbinger,** Vol. XXXVII - No. 11, (Nov., 1866) pp. 503, 4.

David Lipscomb watched with some concern the development of some extreme attitudes. In some cases the quarrels were over mere names instead of work. As the "Sunday Schools" became more popular, they were denounced by well-meaning men. E. G. Sewell, in explanation of their true character, wrote in the **Advocate** in 1876:

> What is called the Sunday school should be simply an occasion for Christians to teach the Christian religion to their own children, and the children of their neighbors, so far as they can, and beyond that there is no authority for anything of the sort in the Bible. There is no authority in the Bible for any separate institution in the church, called a Sunday School, and every congregation in Christ should guard most scrupulously these points, and see to it, that no such things exist in their midst. We think if Christians will bring their own children together, and the children of their neighbors, on the Lord's Day, and teach them the plain truth of the Lord's word, it affords them one of the very best means of spreading the truth, and making converts to Christianity.[2]

When L. L. Hurt wrote Lipscomb, asking for an article on the "Sunday School," saying he knew of no authority for it, Lipscomb responded:

> There is just the same authority for teaching old and young the Bible in classes or in a school on Sunday at church, as there is for preaching sermons. God requires the Bible to be taught to the old and the young. He has not ordained any specific mode of teaching, but has set the example of teaching in the public sermons, by questions and answers, by reading the Scripture to one or more, or letting them read it and question them in reference to its meaning, or by simple verbal statement to one or more.
>
> It is the duty of the church to teach children and old people who can be induced to attend the meeting. It is right to teach them in the way it can be most effectively done. We have not had any doubt for years that the most effective way of teaching people the word of God, if they will study, is to take them in classes, read and study the word of God . . .
>
> We become habituated to certain modes of procedure, and unconsciously come to think them divine, and others to which we are not accustomed we think them human innovations . . . This arises from an unconscious self-

[2]E. G. Sewell, "Queries," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XVIII - No. 17; **(April** 27, 1876) p. 400.

> sufficiency, satisfaction with self and our ways. This feeling is a great hindrance to the truth.[3]

In perfect agreement with Sewell, Lipscomb taught "we have always opposed the organization of Sunday-schools outside of and apart from the church. The church is God's appointed institution for teaching and converting the world."[4] For the most part, then, it took a studied effort to avoid being frightened by names. It was necessary to correctly understand the nature of these objectionable practices.

As his influence broadened, Lipscomb's judgment was sought on a wide variety of biblical questions. A man wrote inquiring when the Sixth Seal of the book of Revelation was opened. Lipscomb replied:

> We say to this brother, and to all, we have not a single idea as to when the first, second, third, fourth, fifth or sixth seal was opened, or whether any of them have ever been opened . . . There are a few plain truths here and there in the book of Revelation that I can understand. But as to the interpretation of the prophetic types we have not an idea. We have read several works on the subject and are well satisfied not one of the writers we ever read knew a particle more on the subject than we do. Indeed I do not think they knew so much. I know enough to know that I know nothing about them. They did not know so much or they never would have written on the subject.
>
> Brethren, let us study and learn and practice and teach the portions of the Bible that teach us our practical duties and not be wasting our time on vain speculations.[5]

The **Gospel Advocate** continued to occupy a large portion of his time, as continual efforts were made to improve it. W. Y. Kuykendale wrote saying many people were objecting to so many lengthy, wordy, letters. Horace G. was specifically assigned the job of editing the Church News to prevent this. Through the year, 1876, plans were formulated to improve the mechanical make-up. Lipscomb had been dissatisfied with the small "book

[3]David Lipscomb, "Queries," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. **XXII** - No. 4; (Jan. 22, 1880) p. 56.
[4]David Lipscomb, "Sunday-Schools," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXI - No. 25, (June 19, 1879) p. 391.
[5]**Gospel Advocate,** 1876, p. 162.

form,'" thinking it too thick and clumsy to handle. It was decided that beginning with 1877 the pages should be larger, and have less margin. With the smaller pages Lipscomb had been forced to leave out much advertising and reading material. Some had refused to write because of the long delay in the printing of their material.

Still other improvements were in store. The **Advocate** was too loaded with heavy material. In short something specifically was needed for the women. Then too, in keeping with Lipscomb's belief that the Christian religion helped an individual both in this world and in the next, it was decided to give a part of the paper to an "Agricultural Department," to make it more appealing to the farmer. Because of its opposition to the missionary society, the circulation of the **Advocate** was hurt in some places, particularly in Texas, but no lasting harm was done, and the paper continued to grow.

Late in the spring of 1878 Lipscomb suffered by the return of his old illness. He was scheduled to begin a meeting at Watertown in Wilson County on June 10. But just before he was ready to depart, he contacted a severe cold which was accompanied by hemorrhages and soreness of lungs. T. W. Brents happened to be near Watertown at the time, so conducted the meeting for Lipscomb. At times it was impossible for him to speak at all, but before the summer ended he was well enough to conduct at least one meeting at Bean's Creek in Franklin County.

J. M. Barnes was "Away Up In Tennessee" at the time, and joined Lipscomb two days before his meeting closed at Bean's Creek. It was a glad reunion for Barnes. He knew Green Willis who lived only a few hundred yards from the church building, and was also well acquainted with George Martin. A new town less than three years old, had no "congregation of the Lord's people" in it, although a few were meeting regularly in the county.

In Lipscomb's absence the invitations to the Consultation Meeting were printed in the **Advocate.** Brethren looked forward to the tenth day of November, the day set for the meetings to begin.

William Lipscomb received his invitation through the mail, and defiantly announced to Kelley his opposition. William, while not as aggressive as his brother, David, in some respects had a keener mind. He himself had been wresting with this problem of the church, in the universal sense, acting and had come to some positive convictions that the brethren were in fundamental error on this point. A year before he had gone to Murfreesboro with a desire to establish a college for young men. He called it "Stonewall College," and boldly announced, "The school is the property of no 'brotherhood,' nor will it be while we have control of it. Yet the Bible is read and studied and its authority as man's only guide is continually upheld." So then, upon receiving Kelley's invitation, William made it clear that he regarded these Consultation Meetings as sectarian in character. "It is an effort to combine the congregations of Christians into a party, 'brotherhood' or 'people' in the support of some matters of general interest." William's succulent remarks bordered on the ridiculous, so far as Kelley was concerned, and the result was a lengthy discussion between the two men.

Seventy-five or eighty brethren attended the meeting. V. M. Metcalfe, of Hopkinsville, Kentucky, E. M. Hussey, of Mooresville, Alabama; John R. Weaver, of Ozark, Missouri; and Joseph Franklin, of Anderson, Indiana, were among the number present from out of the state. Franklin, then in an evangelistic meeting in Sumner County, dropped over to listen to the deliberations. T. W. Brents was present. He remained after the session had ended and preached for Church Street several nights.

David Lipscomb was late in arriving at the Consultation Meeting, coming in in the middle of the first session. W. D. Carnes was presiding at the session, and, at the moment of Lipscomb's arrival, T. W. Brents was speaking. Brents was setting forth the intention of the meeting as being, not one of delegates of church representatives, not to pass resolutions, but to investigate the Scripture and worship and pray together. Each congregation represented was asked what it was doing to sound out the word. It took some time for each to relate the story of their work. Lips-

comb was not there at the time these congregations reported, but later insisted, if he had been, he would have objected since this was not the reason for the meeting, and the congregations were thus unprepared to report. Brents accused the brethren of failure to support their preachers and used himself as an illustration. Joseph Franklin gave a short talk, merely calling attention to the potential dangers of the meetings. Franklin, son of Elder Ben Franklin, met Lipscomb for the first time, and later reported to the readers of the **Review,** "Bro. 'Dave' has a mighty fine way about him, but he don't mean it all."[6]

Nevertheless, Lipscomb was critical of the meeting, and his criticisms offended W. D. Carnes of Burritt College, who insisted that since the brethren had always had such meetings, there could be nothing objectionable to continuing them. Kelley somewhat rudely told William after the meeting to "attend to his own business" and not bother the brethren with his "whims." But the criticisms had their effect, and brethren in middle Tennessee heard no more of them. Kelley, notwithstanding, was an able man. Although his stay with Church Street was brief, his policy was one of busy activity. T. W. Brents' meeting, begun after the Consultation Meeting, continued until Sunday night, December 2. The following week Moses E. Lard was scheduled to begin an evangelistic meeting with them but his arrival was delayed until Tuesday evening, December 11. Lard, since leaving the presidency of Kentucky University, was spending his last years in evangelistic work. He had finished a meeting shortly before with the Walnut and Fourth Street congregation in Louisville in which he preached twenty sermons and baptized eleven. Lard's sermons on "Sin—What Is It?", "The Divinity of Christ" and "Election" were considered outstanding.

Lipscomb missed most of Lard's meeting, being in Kentucky preaching. On Sunday, December 9 he preached at Hopkinsville, Kentucky. R. C. Cave, the president of the female college there, was also the preacher for the church. Noticing that the brethren stood for prayer, Lipscomb voiced his disapproval.

[6]Joseph Franklin, "Incidents of Travel In Tennessee," **American Christian Review,** Vol. XXI - No. 2, (Jan. 8, 1878) p. 9.

> We do not say prayers made standing are not acceptable to God, but we say it is not the position approved in the Bible . . . Whether it be force of habit or not, I cannot tell, but I never can feel very humble and prayerful in a standing position.[7]

The week following Lipscomb spent in the company of V. M. Metcalf, visiting congregations in the area, going especially to the Concord Church in Christian County. By the end of the year he was back home, and busy again in moving the office from the corner of College and Union Streets to No. 8 Union Street, three doors from Market. At the beginning of 1878 the **Gospel Advocate** office was now on a first floor.

If David Lipscomb had any doubts that he was getting older, he might have stopped them by noticing the changes in his family. On February 13 Enoch Francis Breedon died at Hunt's Station. He returned to his home after five years in Texas in January, 1878, contacted pneumonia, and was in a serious condition. He wanted to be baptized. Warnings were given that he would die if he were exposed, but he insisted. He died shortly after he was baptized. Two months earlier an uncle, William, died in Franklin County, "an honorable, high toned man, hospitable after the old Virginia style, a zealous member of the old Baptist Church. ..." Meanwhile, brother William's wife had died on January 26, 1875, and William was proposing marriage again. On June 19, 1878, he married Miss Allie Hudson, James E. Scobey performing the ceremony.

J. W. McGarvey's trip to Palestine was watched with considerable interest by the readers of the **Advocate.** During the summer, some of McGarvey's old students had conceived the idea of sending McGarvey abroad. In August, the idea was made public at a Kentucky State Meeting. The agreement was that three thousand dollars should be raised and turned over to McGarvey for the trip. Afterwards, he was to write the most saleable book possible, and turn the manuscript over to the donors of the money, who would in turn be repaid by the profits of the book. W. B. Taylor of Elizabethtown, Kentucky was at the

[7]David Lipscomb, "A Visit To Hopkinsville And Vicinity," **Gospel Advocate,** (1878) p. 21.

meeting and expressed a wish to McGarvey to go with him. He thought little of it until the first of the following February when he received a letter from McGarvey asking him to go. On Saturday, March 1, Taylor told his family goodbye and left for Palestine.

That same day two hundred brethren met at McGarvey's home in Lexington and wished him well on his trip. The next day the two congregations in Lexington worshipped together and McGarvey preached a farewell discourse. The services were sketched in gloom. W. H. Hopson read Psalm 133 and led a prayer. McGarvey read Acts 21:8-14, and explained that in twenty-eight years of preaching he had never taken a vacation. His reasons for going to Palestine were, first, for self-improvement; second, to be a better teacher, and third, to add something to the vast store of evidences in favor of the Bible. Hopson, moved by McGarvey's comments said, "His faith is simply sublime."

McGarvey and Taylor went from Philadelphia to Liverpool, London, Paris, Rome, Brundisium, Alexandria, Joppa, Jerusalem, Constantinople, Athens, Venice, Milan and Geneva. While McGarvey kept the readers of the Christian Standard aware of their movements, Taylor did the same for readers of the **Advocate.**

While plans were being made for McGarvey's trip abroad, Lipscomb continued his preaching with his health still threatening. Most of the summer he preached in Davidson County. In September and October he spent a week each with the churches at Knob Creek in Maury County and Shady Grove in Hickman County. At Knob Creek nine young persons made the confession. He met here with Brethren Lee and Sewell as well as E. P. Frazer, the local preacher. He had some time to renew his old acquaintance with R. B. Trimble. Bob was preaching under a brush arbor at a Brother Reynold's home near Columbia. The last night at Knob Creek Lipscomb delivered a special sermon for the colored people which offended some of the whites. At Shady Grove, where there was a Mormon settlement, Lipscomb started preaching on Saturday night and continued through the next Thursday. But during all this time his health still threat-

ened. A part of September he was down with "ague and fever." The last week of the year he was threatened by an attack of hemorrhage of the lungs. But despite his threatening health, he continued his work.

The new year was begun with prospects very dim for good health. For four months he did little but cough and spit "until it seemed nothing could be left of us." This was his most serious illness in years, and two or three times he gave up all hope of recovery. Some of his very closest friends shook their heads in doubt. The first of April his condition took a turn for the better. His coughing subsided and his appetite returned. He picked up weight and energy. The doctors said his condition was similar to asthma. The many letters that poured in from friends were kindly received.

Lipscomb finished out the year close to home, doing little preaching. The first week of September he and E. G. Sewell spent together with the old Salem church down home in Franklin County. Lipscomb returned to perform the wedding ceremony for Sewell's only daughter, Emma, to S. L. Dodd at the Sewell home in Edgefield. The same night Lipscomb returned to his home to learn that Brother Kelley had died. It was a surprise. Kelley was only forty-one years old, lacking a few days. An Irishman, he had been baptized by John T. Johnson while he was a student at old Princeton College in Kentucky. He had been a close friend of I. B. Grubbs who had pushed Kelley forward.

But things were changing! Just a year before Elder Ben Franklin had died, and Lipscomb thought the cause could ill afford to lose him. A new corps of talent in preachers was pushing to the front, and the south was to be blessed with a rich supply of them. Although Lipscomb could not have known it, he had weathered his last serious siege of illness. He would be better able to serve the Lord in the future than at any time in the past. And with the rising crop of new workers coming up around him, Lipscomb was to forge ahead into a place of leadership and influence of which he had never dreamed.

CHAPTER XI

A LABOR OF LOVE

By 1880 the Gospel **Advocate** had weathered its financial storm, thanks to the frugal management of David Lipscomb, and was headed toward calmer waters. At the close of the previous year Horace G. Lipscomb resigned as office editor to go into the hardware business in Nashville, and A. M. Sewell took his place in the **Advocate** office.[1] The paper was growing side by side with the cause in the South. Indeed, there was scarcely a Christian home that did not know the names, "Lipscomb and Sewell" as household terms.

Staunch supporters of the missionary society and instrumental music, the "new look" in styles of work and worship, had been predicting for years the early demise of the **Advocate.** It was unthinkable, as these men viewed the problem, that even the people in the South would not want to keep up with the times. Lipscomb's simple ways might have been condoned in the hills of Franklin County before the war, but the times were passing him by. It was only a question of time until the **Advocate** would fold up, and when it did, as these men gleefully envisioned, it would be a happy day.

But the fact was, the **Advocate** was showing more life than ever, and the prophets of doom needed an explanation for their unhappy predictions. By the spring of 1880 the report was circulated in the **Christian Messenger, The Christian,** and **The Apostolic Church** that Lipscomb was a wealthy man, owning a plantation worth forty thousand dollars. This, they conceded, was why the **Advocate** had lived so long.[2]

Actually, Lipscomb's debt-free farm was valued at five thousand dollars. Since 1867 not an issue of the **Gospel Advocate** had been printed but there was enough money on hand to pay for it. Since 1877 Lipscomb had been able **to** pay fair salaries to all

[1]**Gospel Advocate,** 1879, p. 822.
[2]**Gospel Advocate,** 1880, p. 243.

employees of the paper. In explanation of his course Lipscomb wrote,

> If our readers will pardon our apparent boasting, we say modestly, that we have preached much to the poor, have given of our means to the cause of God and humanity, have devoted much of our time to the study of God's word and the good of our fellowman, and yet we have by the blessing of God, been enabled to pay for a home for our family. We have cultivated simple tastes and lived within our means, as every Christian should do . . . More reproach is brought upon the cause of God by teachers and taught living beyond their means, involving themselves and their brethren in debt, and leaving others to suffer from their improvidence. A preacher, like any other man who gets in debt and fails to pay, soon becomes demoralized, and indifferent about paying—becomes, indeed, dishonest.
>
> We have never been willing, when not actively engaged in preaching to sit around on our professional "dignity, but have labored at whatever work presented itself to make a living. Let all our preachers act in this way, and persevere in it, and they will have a living, they will have something for him who is in need, and may have, if not a 'forty thousand dollar farm,' a comfortable home. We have never had any trouble in making a living and preaching as much as a man is able to do, when we have kept out of debt. We have not always done this, and have justly suffered for violating the law of God.[3]

However serene the times were financially, the Advocate's policies laid out for it a stormy course ahead. James A. Garfield, a member of the church and United States Senator from Ohio, was nominated by the Republican Convention in June, 1880, for the presidency. Brethren went wild in their enthusiasm.

Lipscomb saw an excellent opportunity to reaffirm his convictions on the Christian's relation to civil government. He taunted his southern brethren by using their arguments against them. Each time he had insisted it was the duty of good men to run for office and good men to vote to get them elected. Now, said Lipscomb to his brethren in the strongly Democratic South, will you vote for a Republican, James A. Garfield, who is as everyone knows as nearly an ideal Christian man as anyone in politics could be, or, will you vote against him because he is a Republican? It was a hard rub and his politically minded readers felt

[3]Gospel Advocate, **1880, p. 243.**

it. An old man from Texas ordered his subscription to the paper cancelled, insisting he was tired of its "Black Republicanism." Actually Lipscomb was no more of a "Black Republican" than he was a Democrat. What he was trying to show was that in reality men were motivated by political prejudice. The contention that Christians should vote in order to put the best men in office was better in theory than in practice. Politics being what it was, it was hard for men to see that the "best men" do not belong to their particular political party.

What of Garfield's course of action? Did it please God? Lipscomb asked this question, answering it sardonically. At one time Garfield had every prospect of making an outstanding gospel preacher. But he abandoned the pulpit for a place in politics. Is service in the kingdoms of this world more honorable in God's sight than service in the kingdom of Christ? Lipscomb chided his brethren, "It is strange when the church counts him who turned from service in her offices and works, to the work of the world, worthy of so much more honor than those who serve faithfully in her sanctuaries."[4] Garfield's course, he roared, "was one of dishonor to the church." "With ability and assured success as a servant of that church, he surrendered it for service in the worldly kingdom."

John F. Rowe, now editor of the **American Christian Review,** read Lipscomb's criticisms with displeasure. He wrote: "And yet we would be glad to discuss with some good man the propositions from a scriptural standpoint: 'Is it right for a Christian to hold office in a Civil Government?'" Lipscomb, realizing that the challenge could only be directed to him, accepted, but at the same time explained, "Bro. Rowe and I both write with a sharp pen sometime, but we both know how to receive trenchant strokes without letting it stir up bile."

The airing of the question stirred up considerable interest from every corner. T. R. Burnett of Bonham, Texas, editor of the Christian Messenger, regarded Lipscomb as a curious specimen,

[4]David Lipscomb, "Hero Worship," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXIV, No. 30, (July 27, 1882) p. 467.

in admitting that Garfield was an "earnest, intelligent, and religious character," and, said the Messenger, it is strange that "although he will not vote for him, or any other man, yet if he did not think it a sin to help elect good men to office, he would vote for Garfield with as 'little hesitancy as he would pray to the Father in heaven'." "Bro. Lipscomb has got it pretty bad for a man who never takes any part in politics," Burnett quipped.

But Lipscomb was adamant.

> I now say (he drawled emphatically) that I firmly believe that his election would be a source of great corruption and injury to the church of Jesus Christ. I would be glad not on political put purely on religious grounds, to see him and every other member of a church of Christ who aspires to office, defeated—so badly defeated, too, that it will crush out all hope that any one of them can ever be elected, and so to drive out all thought and aspiration for political office."

Burnett himself was a curiosity to Lipscomb. The editor of the **Messenger** advocated electing religious men to office to purify it. Burnett knew Garfield was a good, religious man; yet he refused to back him. Why?

> Is it because he thinks more of his politics than his religion? Or is it because Garfield is unpopular in Bro. Burnett's section, and if he were to act out his principles, it would cost him a few subscribers, and he stifles his convictions rather than lose these?"[5]

Earlier in the year, Joseph Franklin, son of Ben Franklin, had been added as an associate-editor of the **Gospel Advocate,** his articles appearing regularly on the front page. Lipscomb's blasts during the summer against Christians' voting upset Franklin so by September he announced he was withdrawing from the paper because of the differences on this issue. Lipscomb regretted Franklin's move, saying he knew all the time that Franklin had not agreed with him. "While we believe we are right in this matter and expect, as providential occasions seem to demand it, to urge the truth of it on the readers of the **Advocate,**

[5]David Lipscomb, "Religion And Politics," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXII - No. 37, (Sept. 9, 1880) p. 681.

it has never once occurred to us to make it a test of fellowship in any work.[6]

Through the fall and winter of 1880, Lipscomb and Rowe discussed the question, "Can Christians Vote and Hold Office?" The articles of each were carried in both the **Advocate** and **Review.** Lipscomb maintained the kingdom of the Messiah was to break in pieces all the kingdoms of this world. But God "will never destroy them by Christians entering into them, supporting and building them up, and if Christians are in them, they must share the destruction." His chief point of emphasis was that "God's children ought to labor to build up and spread this divine kingdom, and that they should not waste their energies, divide their allegiance with and devote their time, money, affection and talent in building up and sustaining kingdoms which are not of God's choosing and which God has declared he will destroy." When the discussion ended, W. B. F. Treat, while he did not agree with Lipscomb and also possessed a strong personal dislike for Rowe, declared that Lipscomb showed more familiarity with the subject than Rowe.

During these years, it was the custom of the **Gospel Advocate** to step out of one controversy into another. When Lipscomb added the bellicose James A. Harding to his editorial corps at the beginning of 1882, it was a case of bringing up some heavy artillery for the conflict. The dynamic Harding abounded in both faith and courage. Eight years before, Harding had gasped in unbelief when old man John Adams commanded him to get his Bible and go out and hold a meeting. Harding preach the gospel!! He had never thought of such a thing, and moreover, was positively sure that he could not do it. Adams angrily roared that Harding had been reared in the church, had attended Bethany College, and if he couldn't preach by now, he ought to be killed, and for him to "shut his mouth," get his horse and go hold that meeting. This was the last time Harding refused to preach.

[6]David Lipscomb, "Withdrawal," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. **XXII** - No. 38, (Sept. 16, 1880) p. 597.

The fall of 1882 Harding attended the annual meeting of the missionary societies at Lexington, Kentucky. Isaac Errett presided. Errett, bent upon raising money for the organization, appealed for "life memberships." When he appealed for children to become life members, Harding had enough. Later Errett explained that his appeal was done in a joking manner, but whether so or not, Harding failed to see the joke. Harding fearlessly assailed the society, Errett, F. M. Green, and anyone else. It was a vitriolic affair while it lasted since Harding would not meet defeat.

Shortly afterwards, Lipscomb engaged Isaac Errett in a bitter controversy over the hymn book. Normally Lipscomb frowned upon tactics of character assassination in controversy but all of his pent-up dislike for Errett came out in 1883 during this controversy. He charged that a whole host of brethren, including Ben Franklin, had no confidence in Errett. Fanning had called Errett a "trickster." The elders of the church in Detroit where Errett preached during the war had no confidence in Errett when his ambition or interests were at stake. James W. Goss had said of him, "he is full of treachery—he won't do." L. L. Pinkerton had charged that Errett would back down on principle for the sake of popularity and gain. Lipscomb flatly declared that Errett's character was not good for firmness and principle when these came in the way of his own personal interests.

The occasion for all of this was Errett's announcement that the Standard Publishing Company would bring out a hymn book. Lipscomb's mind reverted to the days at the close of the war when Alexander Campbell had signed over his hymn book to a committee of brethren. Actually, it was tantamount to putting the ownership in the hands of the society. Errett, a leader in influencing Campbell to sign over his copyright, had argued that it was absolutely necessary to the unity of the church to have unity of worship, and the latter could not be maintained unless the brethren all used one hymn book—Campbell's. Accordingly, the **Standard** and the Society opposed vigorously the publication of any other hymn book. Lipscomb by selling a hymn book

printed in Canada had been visited by some of the ire of these men.

Fifteen years later the picture changed. In the summer of 1882 J. H. Garrison, editor of **The Christian** in St. Louis and B. W. Johnson, editor of **The Evangelist** in Chicago decided to join their papers under the name of **The Christian-Evangelist.** The following year the **Christian-Evangelist** published the old hymn book, and immediately, Errett announced that the Standard Publishing Company would publish a different one. Remembering Errett's former attitude, Lipscomb conceivably suspected foul play. Many charges, aside from the main issue, were hurled back and forth between Errett and Lipscomb. Neither man ever backed down.

Evangelistic Work

Lipscomb's problems and controversies centered around the **Gospel Advocate** by no means exhausted his labors. His work of preaching, farming, or generally looking after some good work occupied the remainder of his time. On the whole his health was good. The first week of June, 1880, he was sick, but other than this, nothing bothered him. The perennial suffering of his old friend, N. W. Smith of Ringgold, Georgia, added a responsibility upon him to look after him. J. M. Barnes this time took the lead, and pled through the Advocate for help for Smith. One hundred nineteen dollars and fifty cents was sent to the Advocate office. Lipscomb sent a part of the cash on to Smith, and with the remainder bought a good Morgan horse, five or six years old. The railroad agreed to take the horse to Chattanooga for half fare, so Lipscomb sent Smith a horse to enable him to plant a crop the coming spring.

The controversy with Rowe made Lipscomb want to stay close to home in the fall of 1880. He preached to large crowds out at Donelson part of the time. Just before Christmas he performed the wedding ceremony for his nephew, David Lipscomb, Jr., to Miss Fannie Moore at the bride's home at Bell's Bend.[7]

[7]**Gospel Advocate, 1881, p. 11.**

Periodically, Roman Catholicism puts on a vigorous campaign to gain America only to check its activities some when they have raised too much opposition. During 1880, and the year following, it was noticeable that this was being done. The **Advocate** gave more than usual attention to Roman Catholic claims. In the spring of 1881 Lipscomb received a letter from a Brother North in Lawrence County, asking if he would meet a Roman Catholic priest in debate. Lipscomb agreed provided the priest would be of reputable character, and provided the discussion would be heard by several Roman Catholics.[8] Nothing was ever heard of the debate.

Reviewing the work done in Tennessee during 1880, Lipscomb felt some satisfaction with the growth of the churches. F. M. Green, secretary to the Foreign Christian Missionary Society had charged that the churches under the influence of the **Gospel Advocate** were doing very little work. This charge, reaffirmed so often by the society, was irritating to Lipscomb. "Our readers," he wrote, "are not aware of the frequency or the character of the thrusts made at us as doing nothing. Secretary Green some months ago published that the churches under the influence of the **Gospel Advocate** were doing nothing, as compared with others. We have known all the time this was not true."[9]

The following spring and summer Lipscomb stayed busy in meeting work, but in October his lungs and throat gave him so much trouble that he cancelled all meetings scheduled for the fall. The third Sunday of May he preached at Rough Rock in Davidson County. Early in August he spoke at River Station in Maury County, and the last of the month conducted a meeting at Rising Fawn, Georgia. He returned to go to the Bellwood congregation in Wilson County early in September and conducted an interesting meeting.

The meeting started on the first Sunday of the month, and Lipscomb spoke on world powers as opposed to the kingdoms of

[8]**Gospel Advocate,** 1881, p. 358.
[9]David Lipscomb, "What Will We Do For The Year 1881?", **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXIII - No. 9, (March 3, 1881) p. 132.

Christ. The next morning, E. A. Elam, a young preacher then working with the church at Lebanon nearby, was walking down the street when he met a member of the Bellwood congregation. Elam had never met Lipscomb, so asked about the meeting. The old brother roared his disapproval of Lipscomb, and added: "If you do not come out there and help that old terrapin out, we will have no meeting." Near the close of the meeting Elam attended. On the way he met the same old brother and again inquired about the meeting. He threw up his hands and exclaimed: "The best you ever heard; that man knows everything! He teaches the men how to farm and attend to business, how to love their wives, and how to meet their obligations generally, and the women how to make good bread, how to keep house, and how to manage their children. You just never heard the like!"[10]

This was a characteristic reaction to Lipscomb. Men who met him for the first time were often violent in their dislikes. The sardonic old man was too sour and gruff to suit many. But upon knowing him better, they became his most ardent admirers. In the fall of 1881 young Fletcher D. Srygley started the road of these changing emotions.

Srygley, a pupil of T. B. Larimore, like his teacher was not as opposed to missionary societies as Lipscomb. The fact that Alexander Campbell, Walter Scott, D. S. Burnet, Moses E. Lard, J. W. McGarvey and others favored the society, carried great weight with Srygley. Lipscomb, totally lacking in suaveness and urbanity, was slightly repulsive to Srygley. The skirmish that followed was harsh but brief.

Srygley insisted that whether we work through the church or the society is a matter of opinion and advocated "the utmost freedom consistent with purity of faith must be granted." He defended "conventions" provided they were simply meetings for brethren to study the Scriptures and excite one another to more missionary zeal and devotion. Lipscomb, pondering Srygley's early articles concluded that "no man could write with profit on a subject that he so little understood." Srygley spoke of "nar-

[10]**Gospel Advocate,** 1905, p. 49.

rower minds" and "less polished disputants," obviously referred to Lipscomb. But Lipscomb, believing Srygley was ignorant of his subject, read no more of his articles. Finally, at the urging of many brethren he was forced to give some attention to them.

Lipscomb, feeling that Srygley's reasoning was bad, his statements inaccurate, his treatment of the Scriptures poor, still did not want to review the articles. "I did not wish to review these articles," he explained, "they are of such a character that the simplest notice of them must seem severe, and I was satisfied would be regarded as harsh by Bro. Srygley." However, he realized that to fail to review them would be interpreted by Srygley as an admission of defeat. With this feeling Lipscomb sailed into Srygley without mercy. Just as he expected, Srygley's feelings were wounded. Lipscomb compared Srygley's position to sprinkling for baptism, and Srygley replied sarcastically, "If anything he opposes is not like sprinkling for baptism, I am curious to know what it is." Pained at Lipscomb's insinuation that he was ignorant, Srygley explained, "I have no desire to provoke a discussion with one who takes particular pains to say I am too ignorant of the subject in hand to write to profit."[11] The following February Srygley announced his withdrawal from the **Advocate.** Immediately, he began editorial work with the **Old Path Guide** of which F. G. Allen was editor. Srygley, pouting from his skirmish with the Advocate's editor, went away hurt, but Lipscomb gave him his assurance of good feeling and best wishes.

Lipscomb hoped by his overtures of good will to keep the way open for Srygley to return. Eventually Srygley did, thanks to Lipscomb's infinite patience, tolerance and charitableness. But he was slow doing it. Two years later Srygley went through Tennessee soliciting support for the **Guide** insisting that Allen's paper occupied a medium ground on societies in contrast to the Advocate's radical position. Srygley in the meantime had gone to Cincinnati to a society convention and had become intoxicated with the society spirit. His criticisms did not harm the **Advocate** as much as he had hoped.

[11]**Gospel Advocate, 1882, p. 100.**

Lipscomb's attitude toward the **Old Path Guide** was extremely fraternal despite the **Guide's** "medium ground" on the society question. Aside from the **Advocate,** he believed the **Guide** to be the safest paper in the brotherhood. Several incidents contributed to his confidence. In the late summer of 1882 the Missouri Christian Convention adopted a constitution at its annual meeting giving the oversight of the schools of the brotherhood in that state to the convention. The advocates of the measure referred to the recent unfortunate experiences at Kentucky University to show how a school might go wrong. F. G. Allen's mordacious answer revealed his skepticism of the society. "Our observation is," he wrote, "that our schools are equally as liable to continue faithful to their original purposes as our missionary conventions are. The conventions **need** a good deal more watching just now than the schools."[12]

This observation sounded good to Lipscomb who commented,

> We have believed for some time that if the **Guide** had not been born in the atmosphere of the Societies, it would stand fully and squarely with the **Advocate** on the question of societies. It seems to me that all hope that a society whose existence is itself an unauthorized usurpation, should refrain from unauthorized usurpation Of power, is wholly against Scripture and common sense."[13]

The **Guide,** while tolerating the Society, was far from being its ardent supporter.

For the most part Lipscomb stayed close to home much of the time in 1882. On Sunday, February 19, he met with a few brethren in North Nashville with a view to establishing a new congregation. He spoke both morning and evening. On the fourth Sunday of May he spoke at South Harpeth. About the same time he and L. H. Stine of Franklin, Tennessee, waged a bitter discussion over church cooperation and standing in prayer. Stine dropped in at the **Advocate** office one day in August. After he and Lipscomb talked for over an hour, they departed on good terms.

[12]**Gospel Advocate,** 1882, p. 621.
[13]David Lipscomb, "Societies," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXIV - No. 40, (Oct. 5, 1882) p. 621.

The year 1883 came and went in a hurry. Most of the spring he was confined to his home with rheumatism.[14] The last six months of the year he was gone a considerable portion of the time. His correspondence piled up, and the Bible questions he was expected to answer went unanswered. He spent the Christmas holidays at home. He welcomed the opportunity of hearing C. L. Loos, president of the Foreign Christian Missionary Society who came to Nashville to visit his son, W. J. Loos. For twelve years E. G. Sewell had worked with some degree of regularity with the church in Edgefield. Toward the end of his stay he noticed changes occurring. People moved in from the North with strong sympathies for the society. It was evident they wanted another preacher, one in sympathy with the society, and young Loos was employed. Sewell lingered on with the congregation, mostly at their mid-week services, trying to use his influence against the society, but finally he surrendered when he saw the congregation was completely gone.

W. J. Loos had been at Edgefield only a short time when his father came for a visit over the holidays. On Sunday, December 23, the elder Loos spoke at Edgefield in the morning and at Church Street in Nashville that night. Lipscomb had never met Loos, so availed himself of the opportunity of hearing him by attending services at Edgefield that morning. His impression was that Loos was not "so commanding and dignified" as he had expected, but thought he made up for it in a simplicity of manner and in a directness and earnestness in what he did.[15]

January, 1884, was the coldest month Nashville had seen in forty years. On the twenty-first day Lipscomb celebrated his fifty-third birthday at home with Aunt Mag. He had received an invitation from N. W. Smith and wife to be with them on this day in Acworth, Georgia, as they celebrated their golden wedding anniversary.[16] But it was impossible for the Lipscombs to attend. A week later he received a letter from F. G. Allen, then seriously sick at Milton, Kentucky. Allen wrote, "I have not

[14]**Gospel Advocate,** 1884, p. 86.
[15]**Gospel Advocate,** 1883, p. 3.
[16]**Gospel Advocate,** 1884, p. 69.

seen the Advocate this year. What is the matter? I am worse again this week. I try to wait patiently for the Lord to decide the case."

Looking To The Future

The **Advocate** was still very much alive although it had arrived at the point when something had to be done. Lipscomb's uncertain health made it entirely possible that he would not be around long to look after it. If the paper lived beyond Lipscomb's day, some organization would need to be formed. While the paper was not suffering financially, it paid its staff such small amounts that it embarrassed Lipscomb. For ten years or more there had been talk of enlarging and reorganizing the company so it could publish books in addition to printing the paper. Naturally Lipscomb wanted his teachings to live on beyond his day and for that reason wanted the **Advocate** continued. The need for putting the **Advocate** on a more permanent basis and in sounder financial condition loomed large in Lipscomb's mind.

Complaints were coming in that the subscription price of the paper was too high, but Lipscomb felt the complainers were basically too stingy. He recalled when the subscription price was three dollars, some complained, saying he would get a larger circulation if he charged two dollars. He dropped the price and the complainers dropped the paper. If he ever got one new subscriber, he never knew it.[17] He realized that publishing books would help any paper financially, but he frankly felt that Southern people would not read enough and Northern people would not buy books published in the South. He had once published Brents' tract, "Gospel Plan of Salvation" and was two years getting his money back. He had been asked to print his own articles on' the Christian's relation to Civil Government, but was fearful of not getting his money. Jesse L. Sewell had recently approached him about printing a volume of sermons. Lipscomb discouraged him, saying they would lose money if they did. When the **Advocate** sold books printed by other publishers, it helped the others

[17]**Gospel Advocate, 1884, p. 65.**

more than it did the **Advocate.** The **Advocate** needed more circulation so advertisers would come to it.

By March, 1884, James F. and Harry Lipscomb assumed control of the Gospel Advocate Printing and Publishing Co. The office, located at 98 Union St., solicited all kinds of printing. Lipscomb turned over to them all book business connected with the office.[18] This was only a temporary expedient. Any possibility of doing better was not to be overlooked.

The most sensible way to insure the future of the **Advocate** Lipscomb thought would be to unite it with the **Old Path Guide.** F. G. Allen had appeared, from private correspondence to be receptive to the merger. So certain was Lipscomb that F. G. Allen was coming his way with respect to their views on the Society question that Lipscomb did not consider this difference a major barrier. But Allen's health was bordering on the desperate. If he would negotiate the merger of the **Gospel Advocate** with the **Old Path Guide,** he must do so soon.

On Friday evening, August 22, Lipscomb left home to conduct a meeting at Forest Grove, in Clark County, Kentucky. When he arrived at Winchester about midnight, he was met by J. W. Harding, father of James A. Harding, who gave him a room for the remainder of the night. The next morning he went five miles out in the country to preach. That night he suffered another "bilious attack," and was pained with it for several days. He left for Lexington on Monday morning, September 1, and upon arrival, called at the office of the **Apostolic Times.** He spent considerable time talking with Brother Cozine, the office manager, about the business of publishing papers. While in Lexington, he visited with both I. B. Grubbs and J. W. McGarvey, both of whom were busily preparing for the fall opening of the College of The Bible. He also met J. B. Morton, a druggist in Lexington, a fellow student in college several years before. He travelled next to Louisville in the hope of seeing F. G. Allen at the office of the **Old Path Guide.** He failed to make any contact with Allen, so

[18]**Gospel Advocate,** 1884, p. 155.

looked over the city. He went to the Exposition then in town and saw buildings all lighted up with those new-fangled things called "electric lights." It was, as he put it, "a fine display."[19]

Lipscomb returned to his home and spent the next week in bed with a severe attack of the flux.[20] He regretted missing Allen in Louisville. Temporarily his hopes of uniting the **Gospel Advocate** with the **Old Path Guide** looked dim. A week later they were entirely shattered when the announcement came that the **Guide** had been sold to Russell Errett, and was now the property of the **Christian Standard.**

Fanning Orphan School

Added to David Lipscomb's other responsibilities came also the work of helping to establish the Fanning Orphan School near Nashville. Tolbert Fanning, always interested in the education of unfortunate children, had had a cherished desire to establish a school in which "destitute orphan children could be trained to the practice of those manual labor callings which minister good to men."[21] He wanted to combine this feature with a training that would embrace morality, religion, and "such intellectual culture as would make them successfully to pursue those callings for which their natural capacities and tastes fit them." Fanning died without being able to carry out his purpose. His property was left to his wife, Charlotte Fanning. It was her desire to see her husband's wishes carried out.

She selected thirteen members of the church, who evaluated her property as worth ten thousand dollars. She agreed, then, to turn over one hundred and sixty acres of land, plus Hope Institute, to these thirteen trustees as soon as they would raise ten thousand dollars in cash, an amount equal to the value of her property. In turn she was guaranteed an annuity during her life. The property was located five and one half miles from Nashville near the Murfreesboro Pike. There were a number of springs of good water and a large, three story brick building on

[19]Gospel **Advocate,** 1884, p. 583.
[20]Gospel **Advocate,** 1884, p. 651.
[21]**Gospel Advocate,** 1881, p. 469.

the property, with a two story frame building adjoining it. The lower part could be used for a large room and laboratory. The upper part could be used for sleeping rooms. It was estimated the buildings could accommodate from fifty to seventy-five girls. The trustees estimated that repair on the buildings would cost from five hundred to one thousand dollars. The goa.1 of the trustees was to raise ten thousand dollars plus an additional twenty-five thousand for a permanent endowment fund.

On the board were John G. Houston, C. W. McLester, C. Wharton, S. S. Wharton, A. J. Fanning, John Handley, P. S. Fall, O. T. Craig, Thomas Herrin, J. P. McFarland, E. Charlton, John H. Ewing, and David Lipscomb. Houston was the chairman of the board; J. C. Wharton, the secretary; and McLester, the treasurer.[22] Lipscomb was appointed the agent to raise the money.

Lipscomb used the **Advocate** to make appeals for money for the project besides making several trips in the interest of the work. An old man, John M. Fraim of Flippin, Kentucky, wrote Lipscomb that he had twenty-five thousand dollars to give to the school. He had wanted especially to build a school near home to benefit his neighbors, but they had not appreciated it. Lipscomb spent two days in Fraim's home. He finally succeeded in securing one thousand dollars from him, but "various hindrances" prevented his receiving the remainder. [23]

By the close of 1883 the ten thousand dollars was raised and Sister Fanning deeded her property over to the trustees. During Christmas week, the trustees held a meeting on the grounds. Noting the buildings to be in a bad state of repair, they determined to let the contract the following month for this work.

By the next fall, Fanning Orphan School was ready to open its doors. Much feverish work had been done in the spring and summer preceding. In proposing the work, the **Advocate** reported that "the trustees propose to furnish a school at which individuals, churches, and associations charitably inclined, may be able to educate destitute orphans in most favorable surroundings

[22]**Gospel Advocate,** 1881, p. 469.
[23]**Gospel Advocate,** 1883, p. 283.

at a minimum of cost." Lipscomb commended the work of the Fanning Orphan School saying, "This is a good work. It does not assume the work of the church. It affords means for the church doing its work—the work of educating and training orphan children under favorable circumstances and at small expense."[24] School was expected to open Monday, September 1, but was delayed until September 15. Miss Emma Page, formerly of Burritt College, was hired as a teacher. Miss Page was later the second wife of T. B. Larimore. Miss Bettie Holiman of Winona, Mississippi, was the matron.

The emphasis was upon the practical. Girls were taught to cut and make their own clothes, cook, attend to milk and butter, washing and ironing, sweeping and keeping house. They did their own laundry work with the use of the "Missouri Steam Washer and Wringer," the latest thing in modern conveniences. The girls slept four in a room. Charlotte Fanning herself occupied two rooms on the lower floor of the main building, and ate regularly with the girls.

David Lipscomb was thoroughly in sympathy with this routine. Girls that were helpless around the house were not fit to marry, he reasoned. Aunt Mag even at the advanced age of seventy was able to get in the coal and kindling, build a fire in the stove, and clean house. In his frequent visits to the Orphan School Lipscomb emphasized repeatedly that the girls should be "neat and tidy." When it was known in advance that David Lipscomb was coming out to speak to them, the girls giggled among themselves, "Old Brother Neat and Tidy will speak today." He seldom failed to meet their expectations.

For Lipscomb the establishment of Fanning Orphan School was a labor of love. Like his teacher, his sympathies lay with the poor. To assist unfortunate girls and at the same time fulfill an ambition cherished by Tolbert Fanning was a great work. Lipscomb cheerfully crowded it into his already busy schedule of life, and many were influenced for good.

[24]**Gospel Advocate, Vol. XXVI - No. 3, Jan. 16, 1884, p. 43.**

CHAPTER XII

A MAN TO BE ADMIRED

On December 23, 1884, David Lipscomb left home "for a few days' rest and a visit to Texas." He was delayed at Memphis because of an unusual amount of ice on the river, and arrived in Little Rock at three o'clock one morning only to be delayed for twelve hours awaiting a train connection. He meanwhile hunted up a Brother Kellog, one of the elders in the church at Little Rock, and a Brother Shinn, who had been very active in getting state missionary work going in Arkansas. The day was spent in visiting with these men. At Texarkana he waited another twelve hours, suffering with a bad case of asthma occasioned by poor ventilation on the train. Arriving at Bonham, Texas, he put up two days with a Sister Carlton, whose husband was at the Exposition at New Orleans. Lipscomb spoke twice to the church there to a fair crowd that gathered in spite of the bitter cold and ice.

His visit here with T. R. Burnett, editor of the **Christian Messenger** was particularly enjoyable, and no doubt paved the way for "Burnett's Budget," a spicy column carried some ten years or more later in the **Gospel Advocate.** J. B. Clark, an old school mate at Franklin College, was also at Bonham. A. S. Johnson, C. M. Wilmeth and Brother Rawlings, editor of the **Texas Christian** met him at Fort Worth and listened to both sermons he delivered there on the Lord's Day. A cousin, Dr. Van Zandt, came over from Grapevine and took Lipscomb to Thorp Spring to attend the Preacher's Institute. The visit with twenty preachers there was pleasant but the visit with T. W. Caskey, then living at Greenville, was more melancholy. The day before Christmas Caskey's house had burned, destroying all his books and his home.

The Texas trip provided opportunity for visits with "Aunt Fanny," then living in Fort Worth, and Uncle Dabney, who lived at Grapevine. He returned from Thorp Spring to Fort Worth on Saturday, in spite of the hard rains and muddy roads. The next

week was spent in an enjoyable visit with his relatives in Fort Worth and Grapevine. He spoke at Grapevine on the following Lord's Day. W. H. Wright came here to visit him, and at his insistence Lipscomb spoke at Bedford. On Thursday he left Fort Worth for Dallas, but the weather was so cold and the snow so heavy, he decided it would be best to head straight home. The train stopped a short while at Longview, allowing time for a visit with John T. Poe. After that, nothing of note occurred until he reached home at Nashville.[1]

The Texas trip came at a particularly important time. Lipscomb needed a rest. The worry and anxiety over the future of the Gospel Advocate was far from over despite some definite decisions that had already been reached. The journey gave ample time to ponder the events of the past three months. The failure to unite the **Gospel Advocate** and the **Old Path Guide** had been a disappointment; yet, as he mused over the circumstances which led to the failure he could see that there had been hardly a way to prevent it.

During Lipscomb's meeting at Winchester, Kentucky, he had received a letter from Charles Francis, a trustee for the **Old Path Guide** saying the paper would be for sale on September 30, and asking Lipscomb for a bid. All bids had to be in by September 1st, Francis wrote, Lipscomb knew, this being August 25 that he had little time to make such a bid. Lipscomb's brief note to Francis informed him that he would drop by the **Guide** office in Louisville in a few days and discuss the matter. When he arrived and discovered that Francis was in Cincinnati, he had strong suspicions that the **Guide** would be bought by the Christian Standard. Before his return to Nashville, Lipscomb left word in the **Guide** office that if it had been determined the Standard should purchase the **Guide**, he himself should not be bothered about it. But if not, he would discuss the matter with Brother Francis provided a statement of the status quo of the business affairs were provided him.

[1]**Gospel Advocate,** 1885, pp. 49, 50.

The first of September, then Francis wrote Lipscomb that no sale had been made, and he was on his way to Nashville to talk over the sale. Francis brought the papers, and together they went over them. Francis frankly told Lipscomb that he doubted if F. G. Allen would sell him the paper. Lipscomb then suggested that Francis himself purchase both papers, the Guide and the **Advocate,** and form a company to print the paper formed from the merger of the two. Francis was agreeable, and named what he considered a fair evaluation of both papers. But upon returning to Louisville and talking it over with Allen, he found Allen skeptical of the move. To encourage it, Lipscomb wrote Allen of his suggestion to Francis, and of the wisdom of merging both papers into one strong one "that would destroy the antagonisms and hurtful competition growing out of the existence of the two." Lipscomb proceeded to suggest that the editorial management be united into one. Of course there would be differences over the "Society question" but this, Lipscomb proposed, could be handled by each editor's being allowed perfect freedom to speak his convictions.

Perhaps, after all, F. G. Allen was much more practical-minded on this merger than Lipscomb himself. Allen, pondering the matter thoughtfully, was unable to see how the merger could prove successful in view of the difference between himself and Lipscomb on the "Society question." On September 24th, 1884, he wrote Lipscomb from Milton, Kentucky.

> Dear Bro. Lipscomb: Yours of the 22nd to hand. I see but one real difficulty in the way of the combination of which you speak. As you say, we seem to agree in principle, in the main, but we differ as to the application of the principle, in regard to our missionary enterprises. While I expected in the future as I have in the past, to criticise every feature of these societies which I believe to be wrong, either inexpedient or contrary to the teaching of the New Testament, I regard them, when properly conducted, as permitted by the principle of co-operation enjoined in the New Testament. For us, as the principle editors, to disagree in so important a matter, and utter a conflicting voice, would neutralize the paper's influence, and be embarrassing to all concerned. I feel it my duty to God whom I try to serve, to support our colleges, Bible Colleges, Orphan Schools, missionary enterprises, and every other good work among us, to the extent that I be-

> lieve them to be in harmony with New Testament Christianity. To this you will agree; but then we differ as to the extent that these things are in harmony with the New Testament. And how can two work together unless they are agreed? I could hardly expect you to join me in support of these things, or cease to oppose them, without which our work would lack a unity essential to power and success. You see, then, the difficulty in the way, as it appears to me.
>
> Fraternally and truly,
>
> F. G. Allen[2]

It is hardly deniable that Allen was using better judgment in the matter than Lipscomb himself. It was a part of Lipscomb's make-up to state his own convictions positively at all times and yet allow the widest margin of freedom to those who disagreed with him. It was difficult for him to understand why others could not do the same. It never occurred to Lipscomb to be offended at someone's disagreeing with him or to limit the other's freedom of expression. But unfortunately Lipscomb's world was too idealistic; he was too far in advance of his own brethren. What appeared to him to be no obstacle at all loomed large in Allen's mind. Lipscomb could work with Allen, even edit the same paper with him, though they differed radically on missionary enterprises. But Allen was not so certain that he could work with Lipscomb. This would make the merger impractical, Allen thought, and no doubt, rightly so.

Meanwhile, thanks to Russell Errett, Allen was being assured that if the **Christian Standard** purchased the **Guide,** there would be no change in its editorial policy. Allen was assured that at his death a successor in sympathy with his views would be chosen. Errett meanwhile criticised Lipscomb for wanting to purchase the **Guide** at nearly nothing. Lipscomb was angry. Russell Errett had married a Roman Catholic, thus choosing a Romanist to be the teacher for his own children. What assurance did the brethren have that Errett would be any more careful of the kind of teachers he would choose for God's children? It

[2]David Lipscomb, "Sour Grapes," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXVI - No. 45,
(Nov. 5, 1884) p. 710.

was an angry blow, but was struck for naught. On September 30, the **Old Path Guide** was sold to the **Christian Standard.**

In the back of Lipscomb's mind was the driving ambition to keep the **Guide** out of the hands of the **Standard.** His concern was scorned. In the three years that followed, Lipscomb saw sufficient evidence to prove to him that his prophecy had been correct. Allen died in 1887. The **Apostolic Times** which had begun so ostentatiously twenty years earlier, was purchased and united with **the Guide** to form the **Apostolic Guide.** M. C. Kurfees, then rising to prominence in the brotherhood, and J. W. McGarvey ran **the paper. When** Kurfrees resigned in the fall of 1888, Lipscomb, **recalling his** prophecy, quipped, "No one familiar with the **Guide dare to say It is not now run** in a channel directly opposite to **that in which its founder** intended it to be **run."**[3]

But with the question of uniting the Advocate to the Guide out of the way, nothing remained but to press on with the Advocate, grasping each opportunity to strengthen its business management In the fall of 1884 Lipscomb and Sewell discussed the matter at length and decided upon taking in J. C. McQuiddy as managing editor.

McQuiddy was a young man, blessed with unusually good business judgment. He had been conducting a "Tennessee Department" in the **Old Path Guide,** and had looked after the interests of the **Guide** in Tennessee. While a student of **T. B.** Larimore's at Mars Hill, he had become a close chum of F. D. Srygley. Srygley, still smarting from his encounter with the sardonic Lipscomb, had paved the way for his friend to be on the staff of the **Guide.** McQuiddy, possessing less of the vindictive spirit than Srygley, welcomed the privilege of being manager editor. Little did he know that he was to serve in this position until 1908, or what great control he was to exercise over the paper in the years ahead.

McQuiddy's industrious, business-like ways came to him by second nature. His grandmother, Achsah McQuiddy, was a Ken-

[3]**Gospel Advocate, 1889, p. 179.**

tucky lass from Woodford County where she was born on February 20, 1793. Her husband, John McQuiddy, whom she married on March 29, 1814, died in 1863. At the age of sixteen she joined the Baptist Church, but upon hearing the gospel preached for the first time in 1828, obeyed it. She was well acquainted with the Campbells, the Creaths, and old "Raccoon" John Smith. A woman of wealth, she frequently gave to the poor, or some equally good cause.

Newton, one of her three children, born on September 26, 1819, near Versailles, Kentucky, was quiet, industrious and economical. He and his wife, Nancy Shoffner, had seven boys and two girls born to them. One boy and one girl died in childhood. Two of the boys, J. C. McQuiddy and W. B. McQuiddy grew up to be preachers. The McQuiddys on down the line, had been faithful members of the church, unusually successful in business.

J. C. McQuiddy obeyed the gospel at the old Antioch congregation in Maury County during a meeting held by James H. Morton and a Brother Smithson. He was baptized in Duck River, "just below Leftwick bridge." He had come with his father from Marshall County, where they lived, to attend the meeting.

During 1878 and the year following, he attended school under T. B. Larimore at Mars Hill, near Florence, Alabama. The summers he spent in preaching. The summer of 1879 was spent in meetings in northern Alabama with seventy-five baptisms. Most of the year 1880 was spent preaching at Mountain Mills, Alabama. He graduated from a school at Winchester, Tennessee, in June, 1881, gaining a wide reputation as "a young man of modest and courteous demeanor and good deportment."

On December 24, 1883, he married Miss Emma Bell of Bedford County. It was her twenty-fourth birthday. R. Lin Cave performed the ceremony. During this time, McQuiddy was preaching much of the time in Columbia. From this point he could observe the work in Tennessee for reports in his Tennessee Department of the Guide.

McQuiddy's work as managing editor of the **Gospel Advocate** began with the first issue of 1885. Lipscomb was in Texas, and E. G. Sewell "broke him in." Sewell methodically pointed out the work to be done, taking special care to impress McQuiddy that this job was to be permanent—not an experiment.

McQuiddy's influence on the **Advocate** definitely improved the paper. The growing periodical needed somebody to give it more attention. There was more to running the paper than writing editorials. Lipscomb, who seldom found himself too far removed from a scrap, could write his editorials, travel over the country and preach, tend his farm, buy and sell a little real estate, and look after Fanning Orphan School. These things did not burden him unduly, but to take care of the business operation of the **Advocate** on top of this was too much. J. C. McQuiddy filled the vacuum admirably. In one year the paper's subscription list grew to over seven thousand.

At the beginning of 1886, Lipscomb completed twenty years of work on the paper. This gave him the occasion to reflect,

> This number begins the twenty-eighth volume of the Advocate, and the twenty-first year of our connection with it. Over one thousand weekly visits have been made by the **Advocate** to its readers during the last twenty years, very few of which failed to have something from our pen. During this time we have doubtless said many things in a style that was not the best and some things that had better never been said. But we have a clear conscience that what we have said has been at all times said with a view to honor God and promote His cause on earth. We began our course with a firm conviction that the path of safety to man and honor to God can be found in a faithful adherence to His revealed will and to the examples approved by God in faith, in worship and in work. We believed then that efforts to substitute human inventions for the ways approved by inspired men, would be a cause of division and strife among the disciples, and would, also, by accustoming men to look to their own wisdom for help, lead to a reliance upon human wisdom, human inventions, human strength. It breaks down faith and trust in God; it leads to rationalism, to the exaltation of human wisdom, and human expedients, and to infidelity.
>
> A number of persons prominent among those pleading for the return to the primitive order, has gone out from among us. They all traveled the same road. Beginning with the adoption of human expediences, they all have

followed the pathway until they set aside all divine appointments that fail to accord with their judgment.

As a man has faith in God, he will implicitly follow God in His approved worship and manner of work. As he lacks faith in God, and trusts human wisdom, he will forsake, set aside God's approved acts of worship and modes of work, and follow the suggestions of human wisdom instead. 'Blessed are the poor in spirit'—those without spiritual wisdom or resource, without confidence in their own spiritual strength or wisdom, is the first condition of possessing the Kingdom of God; because in the consciousness of their own lack of wisdom they are willing to rely upon God, trust His wisdom, and be led by Him in and through His own appointments, and leave the results in His hands. To return to the primitive heaven-approved ways of the Church of God requires a stronger faith in God-less faith in man. Whomsoever we trust, we will follow. If we trust human wisdom, our own or another's, that we will follow. These things, then, are tests of our faith in God.

Twenty years' experience and observation in the workings of the Church, have confirmed me more strongly in the conviction that the stronger our faith in God, the more closely we will seek to follow His approved order in faith, in work, in worship. And the more closely we follow God's approved examples, the stronger our faith in Him will grow. 'A closer walk with God' we will seek. On the other hand, observation teaches clearly that the adoption of human inventions and devices in faith, in work, in worship, gradually, led further and further from God; and one innovation but prepares for a dozen others to follow. This has been the pathway in which every denomination in Christendom has travelled away from God. We are not better than others; if we travel the same pathway, we will like them wander from God. The besetting sin of the Jews, of all nations of every tribe and kindred of earth, is to forget that God will be worshipped only in His own ways, and that the wisdom of man is foolishness with God.

We trust and pray as we grow older that we may more and more learn to trust God, and strive to walk continually more and more closely in His approved ways that we may more and more distrust human wisdom and human inventions in religion. Our future course in the **Advocate** will be in accord with this prayer. Will all who believe that man's good will be promoted by an unshaken trust in God, and a faithful walk in His ways, work with us in promoting this end? As we have labored the past twenty years of our life to this end, with increased confidence in the wisdom of the course, we consecrate the remainder of it, be it long or short, with the help of our Father, to a more complete devotion of all our powers to this work.[4]

[4]David Lipscomb, "Our Work," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXVIII - No. 1, (Jan. 6, 1886) p. 6.

With this goal in mind the **Advocate** pressed on. That fall, John F. Rowe, taking one of his few notices of David Lipscomb, commented: "Brother David Lipscomb, with his efficient aids, is doing a large and good work, for which the Master alone can bestow a corresponding reward. I know Brother David well, and have always had the most undoubted assurance that the welfare of society and the purity of the church were the interests that fill his great heart."[5]

Texas Problems

It was impossible for the **Gospel Advocate** to be far removed from the war raging among Texas brethren over congregational cooperation. Some of the greatest editorials David Lipscomb ever wrote centered around this problem. The status of the church in Texas had reached a crisis. Before the Civil War, Carroll Kendrick inaugurated "State Meetings," patterned generally after those conducted by his brethren in the East. For all practical intents these were missionary societies on a state-wide basis, but Kendrick's had a more conservative flavoring to them. State Meetings were held annually at which every phase of the work in Texas was discussed. Whatever missionary work was agreed upon, was then put under the eldership of a local church, usually the church at Sherman. The more conservative element among the brethren eased their consciences by imagining that since the work was under the elders at Sherman, it was not a missionary society of the human variety. By 1886, the more "progressive" element in Texas succeeding in ditching the old State Meeting idea, and establishing the Texas Christian Missionary Society. For two years in advance of this every informed brother in Texas knew the attempt would be made to establish the Society. Many were certain that if the effort succeeded, it would mean an open division in Texas. So, during these anxious months preceding 1886, the question of church cooperation with particular emphasis upon the affairs in Texas, gained wide publicity in every periodical in the brotherhood.

[5]John F. Rowe, "Items," **Christian Leader,** Vol. I - No. 2, (Oct. 14, 1886) p. 4.

John T. Poe of Longview, Texas, had been won over to Lipscomb's views on church cooperation. His column in the **Gospel Advocate** on the "Texas Department" was a vociferous battleground in these crucial months. David Lipscomb came to his rescue with a long series of editorials entitled, "The Church—How It Works," which appeared in the spring of 1885. The principle Lipscomb laid down not only denounced the missionary society but also the State Meeting, which conservative brethren had generally accepted.

David Lipscomb, followed the opposite track in logic to that once pursued by Alexander Campbell, maintained that the church universal had no organic existence. All thinking about the work of the church must begin and end with the local congregation. The local congregation was the largest unit of God's people known to the Bible. Violations of this principle of operation arose within two areas . The missionary society was a violation of this principle because it was a human device proposing to improve upon a divine plan. But what about the work in Texas under the elders of the church at Sherman? Was this not the church in action? Lipscomb's logic was couched in strong language:

> Paul was the evangelist at work. He needed help. He sent messengers, not delegates, to Philippi and other churches to make known his wants, and to bring their offerings. When the churches acted in concert, they sent messengers to lay the matter before other churches and let each church determine for itself what it will do. Each church sent a messenger or messengers of its own membership or of others well known to them, to convey their offerings to those in need . . .
>
> We developed from Scripture that each church kept the direction of its own contribution under its own control through its messengers. So keeping the church and Christians close to their work. They could fully realize that it is their own work. Is this the case with the Sherman arrangement? We may think these are small and indifferent matters. But if a great amount of money is placed under the control of one church, it gives it undue power. It takes the work from the control of, and removes it from contact with those who raise the means to sustain it ...[6]

[6]David Lipscomb, "Not Quite," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXVII - No. 7, (Feb. 18, 1885) p. 97.

The emphasis was placed upon the work done by the local church. Lipscomb further wrote:

> We have shown that the church sent messengers to help the laborers in their field. Paul says of Epaphroditus 'he is your messenger and he that ministered to my wants—your messenger ministers to my wants.' It is frequently asked how churches can cooperate? In the first place the great trouble is, in getting them to operate. The societies are founded more with a view to raise money than to distribute it. But churches cooperated in helping the poor in Judea by each church collecting means; by each member laying by itself and casting into the treasury, on the first day of the week as he prospered. Then each church sent the means by the hands of a messenger chosen by itself to carry it to the destitute. They were induced to engage in this work by Paul in person and by letter, and by messengers sent by him, stirring them up to engage in the work . . .[7]

As to the church universal, it can operate only through the local congregations, Lipscomb pointed out.

> This work is as clearly and fully committed to the church as the worship, the discipline, or the care of the poor. It is said sometimes that this is the work of the church universal; but the church universal has no existence on earth, save through the local churches. They are its only manifestations, its only organs. It cannot manifest itself save through these. It can do no work save through these its organs. It is just as much the church universal that maintains the worship or feeds the poor as it is the church universal that does the evangelizing. It does all these works through the churches—its only manifestations on earth. The church, or its members are loyal to their head only as they work through these divinely appointed organs of the church; not to work in and through these, is not work in the name of Christ; for on these alone, the name of Jesus is recorded on earth.[8]

It is impossible to estimate with accuracy how successful the **Advocate's** battle was. Momentarily at least it would appear that no good was accomplished, for the society was inaugurated in Texas despite the protests of many worried brethren. On the other hand, that Lipscomb helped to clarify the thinking on this subject is evident. Perhaps many were more cautious on church cooperation than ever.

[7]David Lipscomb, "Churches At Work," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXVII - No. 18 (May 5, 1885) p. 278.
[8]David Lipscomb, "The Church—How It Works," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXVII - No. 16 (April 22, 1885) p. 241.

Returning from Texas the third week of January, 1885, Lipscomb picked up where he had left off. McQuiddy, he found, had already begun working on the paper, and this left Lipscomb more time than ever to look after his other affairs. For the next month he stayed near home, writing considerably and looking after business. On the fourteenth of February, he preached in the new church house in North Nashville. The first of March Aunt Mag became suddenly ill, but she was well enough by the middle of the month for him to fill an appointment at Leiper's Fork in Williamson County. He returned home to find a pair of silver spectacles sent to him as a gift from John T. Poe out at Longview, Texas. His aging eyes would now possess some excellent assistance.

On April 5, J. W. Mountjoy began an evangelistic meeting with the Church Street congregation that lasted four weeks and resulted in 67 additions. Fortunately, since Lipscomb was close to home, he was able to attend often. During this spring, he was staying closer to home. Maybe he was concerned about Aunt Mag's health, or maybe there was too much to do to get released. When McQuiddy took a week off the middle of May to visit in Warren County, Lipscomb looked after the office for him. The following August, McQuiddy was gone again in a meeting, and Lipscomb looked after business for him. The **Advocate** received some boost in subscribers in the fall when Lipscomb purchased the **Texas Christian** from C. M. Wilmeth.

The following winter Lipscomb conducted his second debate. This time it was with Elder Moody at Watertown, Wilson County. There were two propositions discussed. First: "The Scriptures teach that man, by nature, is so depraved in mind and heart, that he is unable without a direct enabling power of the Holy Spirit to obey the gospel of the Son of God." Second: "The Scriptures teach that baptism to a penitent believer, is in order to the remission of sins." The debate began on December 14 and lasted five days, going from nine o'clock to three o'clock each day. Lipscomb denied the first proposition and affirmed the second. The house was crowded at each session. J. M. Kidwell

moderated for Lipscomb. About a dozen gospel preachers attended.[9]

Nashville Growth

Perhaps the most enduring work of David Lipscomb was the establishment of the work in South Nashville in 1887. From this time until his death Lipscomb worked with the College Street congregation, serving many years as one of its elders. During this year of 1887, J. C. Martin moved from McMinnville to East Nashville. Lipscomb inquired of Martin one day what the outlook for his religious work was in his part of town. Martin replied that it was not very good. Lipscomb then encouraged him to come over to the South Nashville church and assist in that work. Martin came. Shortly afterwards, Martin, W. H. Timmons and David Lipscomb were chosen as elders of the church. For several years these men did all of the public teaching done except when a protracted meeting was in progress. Martin, taking a particular interest in Sunday School work, by much visiting built up the Sunday School until it was the largest among the brethren in the South.

Radiating out from the South Nashville church, other work was begun. Some brother in the church would arrange **a** Bible class to be held in his neighborhood. From this a congregation would emerge, and soon **a** new preacher was employed. In this way the churches at Green Street, Flat Rock, West Nashville, Waverly Place, Jo Johnson Avenue, Reid Avenue, Carroll Street and Belmont Avenue began. Unostentatious beginnings, indeed, **but** the work invaluable. After twenty-one years twelve preachers had gone out from the South Nashville Church.[10]

The first sermon in the South Nashville church was preached by T. B. Larimore on Sunday, November 13, 1887. Before Larimore's sermon, W. H. Timmons gave a report that the church building cost about $3,000 which amount, less $800, had been "subscribed, paid, and expended" by the committee. Timmons

[9]**Gospel Advocate,** 1885, p. 747.
[10]**Gospel Advocate,** 1885, p. 747.

urged the raising of $800. J. C. Martin also called upon the congregation for the necessary amount. When the contribution was taken $488.56 was raised. David and Horace G. Lipscomb agreed to pay $11.44 to raise the total to an even five hundred dollars.

The first day of January the following year, Aunt Mag and David Lipscomb placed membership with the South Nashville congregation.

Meanwhile, David Lipscomb's name was becoming known far and wide. This meant that calls came in from many places for him to assist in the Lord's work. The first two weeks of February, 1889, he spoke sixteen times at Pulaski, Tennessee. The middle of the following month he traveled to Chattanooga to work with a little band meeting in the southern part of the city. The Walnut Street congregation, with about three hundred members, was using the organ in its worship, *so* others, in the effort to maintain a pure form of worship, started meeting in other places.[11] During the following summer, he was invited to attend a "mass meeting" (then become very popular in the North) at Meigs County, Ohio. But, at the time, E. G. Sewell was very sick, and most of the work of editing the **Advocate** fell upon Lipscomb, so it was impossible to get away from home. Moreover, the offices at 98 Union Street were undergoing remodeling. The **Advocate** had to move out until they were finished but the inconvenience made it more necessary than ever to stay close to home. However, by the last of September, Lipscomb was able to begin a two weeks' meeting at Lewisburg in which he spoke fifteen times.

This year, Lipscomb conducted a meeting in Winchester, Tennessee, staying at the home of Dr. Gattis. John E. Dunn, then *a* young preacher-student at Winchester Normal College, asked Lipscomb some advice to qualify young preachers to preach. Lipscomb's sardonic reply was, "Young preachers need to learn how to go into the homes of the poor, eat corn bread and fat meat, sleep on straw beds in houses with dirt floors, and be tormented at night with bedbugs."[12]

[11]**Gospel Advocate,** 1889, p. 214.
[12]**Gospel Advocate,** 1917, p. 1178.

By 1889 the long, laborious days of planting the seed in Nashville was beginning to bear fruit. The Church Street congregation had completed the basement of its new building on Vine Street and moved in in May. At the same time, the disciples in the northeastern part of the city were building a meeting house on Foster Street. The congregation by the spring had approximately one hundred members. In West Nashville Granville Lipscomb and F. B. Srygley were working together in a tent meeting, trying to establish a congregation. The South Nashville church was keeping a tent busy in the city, hoping to establish churches. Brethren in North Nashville were meeting regularly and small congregations were starting.[13]

The work in Nashville was bolstered considerably by the Harding-Moody Debate held in May, 1889. Harding, then in the prime of manhood, was enjoying a period of unparalleled popularity in the brotherhood. As a debater, he had a few peers. His debate was widely attended by brethren. Present were David Lipscomb, F. D. Srygley, J. C. McQuiddy, H. F. Williams, T. E. Tatum, F. W. Smith, J. W. Grant, E. B. Cayce, R. S. Robertson, J. L. Bryant, and E. A. Elam. Harding stirred the sectarian camps as no one else had. When the debate ended, it was decided to pitch a tent on Foster Street and have Harding preach. Harding's meeting began on Sunday, June 19, and closed on August 16 with 114 additions. Harding preached all the time except on Thursday and Friday nights, August 1 and 2 when he was sick, and R. Lin Cave preached in his place.

The churches in Nashville likewise lifted up their eyes to foreign fields of labor. J. W. McGarvey wrote to Lipscomb at the close of 1888 that there was a young Armenian in school at the College of The Bible who wanted to return home. McGarvey wrote that he would be glad if some of the churches in Nashville could send the Armenian lad, Azariah Paul, to his home as a gospel preacher. Lipscomb laid McGarvey's recommendations before the elders of three Nashville churches. Each congregation agreed to help Paul as much as it could, stipulating they would

[13]**Gospel Advocate,** 1889, p. 846.

send their money directly to him in the field. The last of June, 1889, Paul came to Nashville to make final arrangements to go to Harpoot, Turkey.[14] For the next two or three years Nashville churches watched Paul's work anxiously.

Meanwhile, Lipscomb in no sense let up on his conviction that Christians should remain aloof from entanglements with civil government as far as possible. He had often been encouraged to print his articles from the **Advocate** in book form, but never felt it would be a safe financial venture. The **Christian Quarterly Review,** edited by his old friend, E. W. Herndon, carried an article from him on "Civil Government As Presented In The New Testament" in the January, 1889 issue. Later that summer, Lipscomb announced to readers of the **Advocate** that his book, **Civil Government Its Origin, Mission And Destiny And The Christian's Relation To It** would soon be out. But it was the November 27 issue before the announcement came that the book was off the press and would sell for seventy-five cents.[15]

David Lipscomb was now face to face with the most glorious period of his life. On January 21, 1890, he passed his fifty-ninth birthday, old enough to be looked up to by a rising corps of young preachers who would in another score of years make their mark felt in the church. There were many struggles and triumphs ahead for Lipscomb. But to meet these problems, acting day by day in the fear of God, was his ambition. Come what may, he was determined to do this.

[14]**Gospel Advocate,** 1889, p. 471.
[15]**Gospel Advocate,** 1889, p. 763.

CHAPTER XIII

THE BIBLE SCHOOL

The following announcement from the pen of David Lipscomb appeared in the Gospel Advocate, June 17, 1891:

> It is proposed to open a school in Nashville, in September next, under safe and competent teachers, in which the Bible, excluding all human opinions and philosophy, as the only rule of faith and practice; and the appointments of God, as ordained in the Scriptures, excluding all innovations and organizations of man, as the fulness of divine wisdom, for converting sinners and perfecting saints, will be earnestly taught. The aim is to teach the Christian religion as presented in the Bible in its purity and fulness; and in teaching this to prepare Christians for usefulness, in whatever sphere they are called upon to labor. Such additional branches of learning will be taught as are needful and helpful in understanding and obeying the Bible and in teaching it to others.
>
> We desire at once to hear from all who feel an interest in establishing such a school, and especially from such persons as are desirous of attending. Tuition will be free, and arrangements be made for boarding, at the lowest price possible. Further announcements will be made so soon as fully perfected.
>
> **Address,**
>
> David Lipscomb[1]

This announcement came as a climax of two years of planning preceded by many years of dreaming.

The first definite plans took shape in the spring of 1889. In March James A. Harding conducted a meeting with the South Nashville Church on College Avenue. By Monday, April 8, after 74 had been added to the church, Harding raised the Baptist ire and was challenged for a repeat-debate with J. B. Moody. Moody and Harding had formerly debated in Pikeville. G. A. Lofton, pastor for the Central Baptist Church in Nashville, offered their meetinghouse for the discussion. Meanwhile, Harding continued his meeting at South Nashville until Wednesday night, April 24, with 112 additions. The following month the Moody-

[1]David Lipscomb, "Bible School," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXXIII - No. 24, (June 17, 1891) p. 377.

Harding debate was held, following which Harding conducted his lengthy and successful meeting on Foster Street in a tent.

During the meeting at South Nashville and the debate which followed, Harding was a guest in the home of David Lipscomb. Lipscomb presented to Harding his dream of a Bible School in Nashville. The heart of the great man was heavy as they talked "of the many fields that were white for the harvest for which laborers could not be found." Every day calls were coming in for evangelistic work, and these could not be met. There were not sufficient schools, they concluded, to educate their children, so they were being sent to denominational institutions. "And so we talked about starting a school," Harding later recalled, "in which we should teach the Bible daily to every student."[2] For sixteen years previously, Harding had been thinking of such a work himself, hoping and praying that the opportunity would present itself to start it. Now that Lipscomb was interested, Harding agreed to combine his efforts as soon as his evangelistic meetings were over. He had two years of evangelistic meetings already scheduled, so it was agreed, that then, Lord willing, the work would begin.

W. H. Timmons, one of Lipscomb's fellow-elders at the South Nashville Church, "hailed with joy" the proposition to have such a Bible School.

> I hail with such joy the proposition to have in Nashville a Bible School for the purpose of teaching Christians and preparing them for greater efficiency and usefulness in the cause of our Master.
>
> In this latitudinarian age, it is eminently proper that all true and devoted followers of Christ should put forth every effort to draw the minds and hearts of the denizens of earth closer to God and to the **word** of his grace which is able to build them up.
>
> I am willing with my prayers—which include my ability to become one of a number to press to a successful termination a Bible School especially devoted to the education of consecrated young men for the **ministry of the word** and for usefulness in the church.

[2]James A. Harding, "Bible Schools And Colleges," **Christian Leader & The Way,** (Vol. XXIX - No. 15) (April 11, 1905) p. 8.

> I am decidedly opposed to any system of training and education which will develop or encourage clerical professors or priestly pastors to places and positions to build themselves up in worldly pomp, glory and splendour which as a rule results in the abasement and prostitution of the cause of the Redeemer.
>
> To preach the gospel and encourage others to do so, is commendable work in which all lovers of unadulterated and pure Christianity can agree. You can put me down as one of a half dozen willing to make the effort a success.[3]

Thus, W. H. Timmons became the first enthusiastic backer of the project.

J. C. McQuiddy, however, had been preparing the public for the announcement. Upon learning, in the summer of 1889, of the talks between Lipscomb and Harding, he mildly proposed to the readers of the **Advocate** that a school be started. The **Baptist Reflector** stated the intention of the Baptists to begin a Female College in South Edgefield. "The thought occurs to us," McQuiddy wrote, "why have not the disciples a good institution of learning in this city? . . . We have known of the subject being discussed and agitated by some and all concurred in the opinion that by all means we should have a first class school here."[4] The next spring McQuiddy announced that one brother had proposed to give ten "acres of beautiful ground out about three miles from the city." The anonymous benefactor also agreed to give thirty-five acres at his death to a board of trustees for the school. McQuiddy had even found out that the street railway company would extend an electric car that far, so everything looked promising.[5]

Two weeks after Lipscomb's initial announcement of the opening of the Bible School in the fall, inquiries poured in. Lipscomb complained, however, that the responses of those wishing to enter were very encouraging, while the responses from those wishing to aid in the work were not so encouraging. This con-

[3]W. H. Timmons, "The Bible School," Gospel Advocate, Vol. XXXIII - No. 25, (June 24, 1891) p. 397.
[4]J. C. McQuiddy, "Miscellaneous," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXXI - No. **33,** (Aug. 14, 1889) p. 522.
[5]J. C. McQuiddy, "Miscellaneous," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXXII - No. 22, (May 28, 1890) p. 346.

dition prevailed through the summer of 1891, so the week before school was to open Lipscomb made another appeal for assistance.

> The number of inquiries concerning the Bible School by young men wishing to attend is gratifying. The number writing is larger than we expected. We were not anticipating a large number to begin with. The greater number of those applying are not able to pay their way. The churches ought to aid them. The individuals who have undertaken to sustain the work are not able to help others further than to furnish the house room and support the teachers. They ought to be helped in this. Each congregation should encourage a young man to devote himself to the service of God and aid him in the work. It is a ridiculous idea that a church of Christ should exist five or ten years and not develop a single soul in the church disposed or able to teach God's will to the world. There is something radically wrong in the church. It has no life in it or it would raise up men and women too, consecrated to the service of God. A dead profession of religion is the trouble with our churches.
>
> A religion that does not make us active, earnest, fruit-bearing will not save us. Then we ask our brethren to bestir themselves, be earnest and active and help in this work and every work to advance the cause of God on earth. We must 'work out our salvation with fear and trembling,' before 'God works in us to will and do his own good pleasure.' Then brethren let us all be earnest, active, vigilant, redeeming the time, that we may save both ourselves and others.
>
> We again ask all who intend coming to the school to notify us at once that we may know how to provide.[6]

The Nashville Bible School opened on Monday, October 5, 1891, "in the second story of an old frame building" at 108 Fillmore Street. The beginning was far from being ostentatious. On the first day Harding walked into a barren room to meet with seven boys. There were no chairs, no tables, no desk, "and no fitted-up schoolroom." "Harding remembered that Jesus was born in a stable, that God had never despised the day of small things, and worked and prayed and waited on the Lord to see if this work was from God or man. . . ."[7] The old brick building had once

[6]David Lipscomb, "The Bible School," **Gospel Advocate, Vol. XXXII** - No. 35 (Sept. 5, 1891) p. 557.

[7]J. D. Tant, "The Henderson College and Nashville Bible School," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. L, No. 37, (Sept. 10, 1908) p. 687.

been one of the fine homes in Nashville. In two weeks the school had nineteen students enrolled with prospects of more. Young men from Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Arkansas, California, and Texas had come, most expecting to "devote their lives to the ministry of the word."

The faculty consisted of Harding, and David and William Lipscomb. Classes were taught in English, Latin, Greek, mathematics, logic, metaphysics, natural science, "and, in general, whatever may be necessary to fit one for usefulness in living an earnest, faithful life." Above everything else, the Bible, "free of any theological system" was taught. There were three daily classes in the Bible. One studied the Old Testament; one, the New; and one proceeded along the line of topical investigation.

The three brethren rented the old house on Fillmore Street and furnished it to the school free of charge. Their intention was to rent the house with the young men furnishing and keeping it. However, upon finding a boarding-house keeper selling out, and ready to dispose of his furniture at exceptionally low rates, they bought him out and furnished the school with this. Expenses of the students consisted in paying the actual cost of living including food, the wages of those serving them, and fuel—in all, two dollars per week. For those able to pay three dollars a month tuition was charged.

By the Christmas holidays the Nashville Bible School had enrolled eighteen young men. "Considering that none of them had been in school of late, their application and advancement were very good." School was scheduled to open again on the first Monday of January with eight to twelve other students expected. Harding's family would be with him and would eat with the young men in the dining room.

The Bible above everything else played a prominent role in the course of studies. It was the ambition of the teachers to make every student name the books of the Bible, give a brief outline of the contents of each book, and then taking each book, chapter by chapter, give a comprehensive synopsis of each. Every grad-

uate was expected to repeat from memory every prayer, every speech, and every parable of the New Testament in both the English and Greek tongues. Each student was expected to give a detailed sketch of every Bible character, major and minor. Besides this, training in delivering orations and in conducting debates was also given.

With this rigid routine it was not unnatural that Harding and Lipscomb should hear frequent criticisms that their standards were too high. It was too much, critics said, to expect the students to know this mammoth amount of information. While each recognized the validity of the criticism, it was conceded to be better to aim high and fall short than to aim too low.

The establishment of the Nashville Bible School also drew a barrage of criticism against it. At first, most of the criticism centered upon the advisability of the school. The brethren already had schools at Lexington, Kentucky, Indianapolis, Indiana, Bethany, West Virginia and other places. What was the matter with these? The **Apostolic Guide** asked, "Are not Graham, Grubbs and McGarvey sound enough to teach the Tennessee boys?" **The Christian-Evangelist** raised an eyebrow and inquired succinctly, "Would it be impertinent to inquire what will be taught in Nashville which is not taught as well at Lexington, or Hiram, or Butler, or Bethany, or Drake, and what will not be taught there that the others teach?" McGarvey, viewing the large number of Tennessee students enrolled at the College of the Bible, pawed the ground, and complained gruffly that the Nashville Bible School was a work of spite to injure the College of The Bible. But on the whole, this criticism excited little attention.

The question with many critics was, When had David Lipscomb changed his mind on Bible Schools? Was it not true, they asked, that he once vehemently opposed them? But now he favors them! Whence and why the change? Lipscomb upon hearing the criticism, denied it emphatically. "If this were true," he wrote, "we do not see the crime in it, and certainly we would not be ashamed to own it. But there is not a shadow of

a truth in the statement." He had, as he admitted, once criticized schools, but only because they existed to make preachers exclusively.

> We criticized schools to make preachers specially excluding all others, and certain methods of conducting them, but we have always insisted on Bible schools to teach the Bible to all who will attend—men and women, old or young, saint or sinner. They ought to be taught the Bible, and all should be prepared and encouraged to devote themselves to the service of God according to their abilities and surroundings.[8]

The disruption at Kentucky University after 1871 involving J. W. McGarvey and Moses E. Lard set many brethren for the first time to questioning Bible Schools. Articles appeared in many leading brotherhood periodicals critical of the schools. But the criticisms by and large boiled down to one charge: the Bible Schools were producing a "hireling clergy." It was a common objection that no Bible School had a right to exist if its purpose was to educate and train preachers. Behind this was the belief that the duty of educating preachers belonged to the church; that when schools did this, they were taking over the work of the church. In accordance with this view, Lipscomb had written,

> We have always doubted whether a Bible college, as we use the term—that is, a school to especially train young men for preachers, is the best way to develop true, earnest preachers faithful to God. We believe in the Bible being taught in all schools and in all colleges, to all who attend regardless of whether they are Christians or not. It seems every Christian who teaches ought to be careful to do this. Then in after life, those who in the services of the church, find an inclination and taste for teaching our holy religion, and who by piety and zeal for the truth of God, show a fitness for the work, should be encouraged by the churches to devote their time and talent to the work of teaching the world the way of righteousness. With this order, it seems to me these would never find themselves in the position or calling of a preacher, without a real taste for the work. The number at least would be comparatively small. Young men having spent means and time in preparing for it. and having been put into the calling without growing through labor and real love for the work, into it, are liable to find themselves in the calling without real taste for the work. Then there is a temptation to use it merely as a means of livelihood. Any man

[8]David Lipscomb, "Bible Schools," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXXIV - No. 26, June 30, 1892) p. 404.

> preaching simply as a means of making a living, will injure and demoralize the church of God, and will corrupt the truth of God, because his leading purpose is not to maintain the truth in purity as the only good of human souls, but to make a living. There will be a constant temptation to such, to adopt the methods and preach the things, and in the matter that will gain the greatest amount of money. Where there is a constant temptation many will yield. Recognizing the advantages that come to a young man from study with those who have made the teaching of the Scripture his life-work, it seems *to* me that all the advantages might be gained, without the evils incurred by a different course. I am not meaning to intimate that the great majority of those who attend the Bible colleges are not true to the truth. Many of the best and truest, and most independent thinkers, and men most faithful to God we have, are those who have attended Bible colleges. Some who never attended are as mercenary in their course as any we know. We apprehend that there is more in the true faith in God and in the moral stamina of the man himself than in the school he attends as to his being firm in fidelity to the principles of the Bible.[9]

In the five years before his death in 1878 "old reliable" Ben Franklin wrote considerably against the Bible Schools. But, like David Lipscomb, his objections centered on what he considered the one major vice: Bible Schools to educate preachers.

> The question, then, is really not about education; but about raising up a special class and bestowing great labor on them, while the great body is neglected. This special class, thus trained, soon and very naturally get the idea that they are *to* teach the people and rule them. Here is where the dissatisfaction comes in ...[10]

Likewise, Daniel Sommer's early criticisms of the Bible Colleges drove hard at this one major "vice." In the fall of 1878 he wrote a series on "Educating Preachers" in the American Christian Review. Ten years later he wrote again on colleges in the same paper which he had renamed, Octographic Review. A careful reading of his early writings reveals that Sommer was wrestling some with himself on the subject. He was wrestling with the problem of how to criticize' the popular abuses of the Bible School without condemning in toto schools for teaching the Bible. So

[9]David Lipscomb, "How Shall Preachers Be Made?" **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXVI - No. 32, (Aug. 6, 1884) p. 503.
[10]Ben Franklin, "Educating Preachers," **American Christian Review,** Vol. XXI - No. 44 (October 29, 1878) p. 348.

strongly did he oppose the abuses that sometimes his language was construed to be a condemnation of Bible Schools in a blanket way. C. E. Wilmeth so understood Sommer in 1888, and wrote Sommer saying that he agreed in a large measure with what Sommer said, but cautioned him that he was going too far.

> With many of the sentiments expressed therein I am in hearty accord, especially in regard to secular, liberal, and professional education, and also touching the dangers coming of existing Bible Colleges. Yet I think it is a mistake to condemn in toto Bible colleges or schools. It is the kind rather than the thing itself, that needs condemnation. All the teachers being tinctured, at least, with unscriptural sentiments give a coloring to the ideas of their students.[11]

Sommer watched the establishment of the Nashville Bible School with interest, and wrote,

> There is a Bible School in Nashville, Tenn., which we presume is doing a good work, but if the brethren who have it in charge ever call it a college, and give the pupils a regular collegiate course, and a diploma with titles, then we predict that it will be an institution of mischief. Collegism among disciples led to preacherism, and preacherism led to organism and societyism, and these led to worldlyism in the church.[12]

Sommer approved of a school that was simple in its organization and that would not give degrees. Near the close of his life he recalled that some had pressed him at Odessa, Missouri, in 1907 to state what kind of a school he would endorse. Sommer recalled his answer as being,

> My prompt reply was—'An untitled school such as Buffaloe Seminary, which Alexander Campbell conducted for years before he seemed to have thought of Bethany College.' Such a school did not graduate pupils, and thus did not confer on them any empty, pompous titles. To such a school pupils went to learn without any idea of degrees or titles of any kind. And such schools could never have impoverished the brotherhood by using millions of money to pile brick and mortar and secure furnishings.[13]

[11]C. E. Wilmeth, "A Letter From Texas," **Octographic Review,** Vol. XXXII - No. 1, (Jan. 3, 1889) p. 2.

[12]Daniel Sommer, "Notes And Annotations," **Octographic Review, Vol.** XXXVI - No. 47 (Nov. 21, 1893) p. 1.

[13]Daniel Sommer, "Disciples of Christ Challenged!", **Apostolic Review,** Vol. LXXXI - No. 9-10, (March 2, 1937) p. 8.

James A. Harding, at least, was sympathetic with the idea of degrees being "empty titles." It was very early announced that the Nashville Bible School would offer no degrees. "It is vain," he wrote, "to use empty titles; and the degrees D.D., A.B., A.M., B.S., Ph.D., etc., in this country are just that; they are so common and so easily obtained." A student finishing four years of work at the Bible School with an average of seventy or above, was given as a diploma a beautiful book. "The presentation," Harding promised, "will be publicly made, and will be, we think, more valuable than any degree we could confer."[14]

David Lipscomb read the criticisms against the school with mild disgust. Brethren wanted to know where there was scriptural authority for the Bible School, but Lipscomb insisted it could be found in the same scripture that authorized a man to run a bank, farm, or do any other worldly work. Each could be wrong, but when operated by Christian ethics, was not. W. H. Dodd operated a suspender factory in Nashville and at specified times had his employees study the Bible. Was it necessary for one to find a scripture authorizing one to operate a suspender factory? At the last consultation meeting in middle Tennessee, held at the Church Street congregation the end of 1877, the question of schools was raised. Lipscomb had then reflected,

> On the subject of schools we have yet to learn that the Scriptures ever required a church to build up or manage schools any more than to cultivate farms. School teaching is not a whit more of a Christian duty than farming. Religion sanctifies both. But neither constitute any part of religion as revealed in the Bible. To put churches to doing either is to transcend divine authority and to pervert the churches from their legitimate work. Being no part of religion, how to conduct schools is as much a matter for human judgment as farming.[15]

Later critics of the school wanted to know the difference between the missionary society, the Bible School, and the Gospel Advocate Publishing Co. These parallels Lipscomb could not overlook, but the force of them never loomed too large to him.

[14] James A. Harding, "The Nashville Bible School," Gospel Advocate, Vol. XXXVI - No. 26, (June 28, 1894) p. 405.

[15] David Lipscomb, "The Consultation Meeting," Gospel Advocate, Vol. XX - No. 3 (Jan. 17, 1878) p. 38.

P. W. Harsh of Castalian Springs, Tennessee, asked Lipscomb petulantly:

> Is not feeding, clothing, and educating orphans, God's work? Is not the Fanning Orphan School with its president, board of trustees and corps of teachers a 'man-made institution?' Does it not do the aforesaid work? Are you not one of the trustees? Did not some brethren refuse to contribute anything to said institution on the ground that all such work, as it proposed to do, should be done through the churches. . . .
>
> Now, if you withdraw from brethren who organized to preach the gospel, (which is one work the Lord has committed to his disciples), why should not other brethren withdraw from those of you who organize to care for orphans, (which is another work the Lord has committed to his disciples?)
>
> Do not you, Brother Sewell, Bro. McQuiddy, Bro. Srygley, Bro. Williams and others, constitute a society to publish the gospel? Is such a combination or whatever you may style it, known to the Scriptures?[16]

Lipscomb's attitude may be seen in a later reply to Brother Harsh:

> I have no objection to any criticism of the Bible School or any other work I do, but one-sided and incorrect statements do no good. Brother Harsh, while he aims at good, looks at things so much from their bearing on himself that he magnifies points that are no points; so he is first on one side, then on the other, of many questions that come up. When he sees a neglected truth, it seems impossible for him to maintain it without depreciating some other. His motives are always for good, I feel sure.
>
> 1. Brother Harsh gives some points of likeness between the Bible School and the society, and concludes if these exist, if one is wrong, the other is, too; but there are many points of similarity between a man and a mule, yet that does not prove they belong to the same class of animals. He correctly says the Bible School is not mentioned in the Bible, but is this a reason for saying it is wrong? I believe Brother Harsh is a bank director; I farm a little. Neither of them is mentioned in the Bible. Does that prove they are wrong? Is everything not mentioned in the Bible wrong? Some things not mentioned in the Bible are wrong, and the fact they are not mentioned proves they are wrong. All admit this. Some things not mentioned in the Bible are right, and their not being mentioned is no proof they are not right. How, then, can we determine what is right, and what is wrong? Beefsteak or milk in the Lord's Supper would be wrong. We know

[16] **Gospel Advocate,** 1891, p. 70.

that, because they are not mentioned as part of the Supper. Teaching a child to read and write is not mentioned. Is it wrong? What clothes we should wear are not mentioned. Is wearing clothes, therefore wrong? How can we determine whether a thing is right or wrong? The rule is a simple one. God has ordained the appointments and services in which we should worship and serve him. Anything entering into the worship or service not required in the Bible is wrong and sinful. All the acts of worship and religious service must be sealed with the blood of Christ. To use in his service an ordinance or institution not sealed by his blood is to reject his blood. Now the society and the organ come under the head of the institutions for worship and service to God.

Anything in the service not required in the Scriptures is wrong and sinful. The Scriptures do not provide means for teaching persons to read and write or clothes to wear; yet they show that both reading and writing are helpful to the work and worship of God, and wearing clothes is right. They constitute no part of the worship or work of God, are not essential to it, but may be helpful in learning and doing the will of God. It is the duty of Christians, then, to teach children literature. How they shall do it God has left to man's own wisdom. He requires children must be trained 'in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.' If they teach them at home, they must teach them the Bible; if they send them to school, they must send them where they will be taught the will of God. There is just the same obligation to teach the Bible to them at school that there is to teach it at home. Schools are not mentioned in the Bible, but teaching the Bible in school is required in the Bible. 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.' There is a requirement to teach the gospel to every creature in the whole world. There is not a place or person in the world but what Christians are required to go and teach the word of God; there is not a saloon, a brothel, a prison, a school, or a family in which Christians are not required to teach the word of God if those in control will permit it. Christians are required to teach at all times and places and in every way that is possible for them to teach persons. All times, all places, all methods of teaching the word of God are sealed by the blood of Christ; and he who would oppose or restrict the teaching at any place or time, or by any method possible, sins against God and man and God's blood-sealed appointments. A Christian does not restrict teaching God's word in time, place, or method. That things may be done in connection with the teaching that violate the order of God is true, but the teaching is right.

Farming and banking are not mentioned in the Bible. Do Brother Harsh and I sin in our bank and farm because they are not mentioned in the Bible? I think we can run banks, farms, teach school, and not sin. We may sin in either or all of these. Christians must do business in the name of the Lord, must use it for the glory of God and salvation of man. If a man runs a farm, he ought to use

all influences connected with it to promote the good of man. Suppose he were to spend an hour each day in teaching his employees the word of God, would he sin in this? The farm is not in the Bible, but the teaching is there: 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature'; 'Go . . . teach all nations.' This command cannot be obeyed without teaching the Bible in the school. Brother Harsh says the school without the Bible is no sin. If it is a sin with the Bible taught, then teaching the Bible is the sin.

2. Brother Harsh says both societies and the school are run by members of the church of Christ. So is Brother Harsh's family and every Christian family and church in the land. He had as well say both eat bread and wear clothes to prove that if one is wrong the other is.

3. Brother Harsh says they are both denominational institutions, as only those who are members of the church of Christ are eligible to official position in either. The same is true of every church of Christ in the world, and must be so in every business in which a Christian engages if he obeys the command: 'Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers.' The managers of the Bible School have never disavowed authority to choose those who shall work with them in the school, any more than Brother Harsh and I disavow the right to choose who will work with us in our bank and farm or in our families. No one has ever objected to the society because it is run by Christians. It has been objected they let men not Christians be directors if they give money, and only such Christians as do give money have any voice in it.

4. "They are both intended to propagate Christianity." So is every church of Christ, so is every disciple of Christ begotten of God to propagate Christianity; and while the school is intended to teach literature the brethren use the occasion to teach the pupils the Bible.

5. 'They are both engaged in teaching the Bible to the people,' and invite people to come to them. So are every church and every Christian. Our complaint of the society is: By precept and example it teaches in religion more than the Bible teaches. Brother Harsh, with his tent, invites the people to the teachers, and allows them to Day their board and their way to his place of meeting. So do every church and every Christian. Somebody pays the board and way of everybody that lives. Brother Harsh pays the board of his children in buying them food, fuel, clothes, and furnishing them a home.

6. 'Both assume superiority to the people at large' in asking their money to control it for them. Brother Harsh asks money for specific objects. He has now a dozen or more brethren making monthly contributions to pay the board of a couple of young persons at this sinful Bible School, too. I did not know in doing this he assumed superiority in financial management to those he asked to

give the money. They exercise their own judgment when they give it for a specific end. He, or we, only present what we regard as a good opening for using means. We do not keep the money to manage it; we place it where the owners desire it.

7. 'Both supplant the churches—the one in developing Christians, the other in supporting evangelists."

When Brother Harsh trains his children for the Lord, is he supplanting the work of the church? When he takes boarders and teaches them the way of the Lord, is he supplanting the work of the church? When he teaches the Bible as opportunity offers, does he supplant the church? Does not the Bible commit the work of teaching to individuals as well as to the church as a whole? Those teaching in the school, as Christians in the church, use that opportunity to teach the gospel.

8. We do not justify ourselves in the school on the ground that the churches fail to do their duty. We do it as our part of the work as members of the church of developing Christians, just as Brother Harsh does his part of the work in his family and elsewhere in teaching the word of God. We do our work as members of the church, under the church, as Brother Harsh does in his family and elsewhere.

9. It is right in a proper way, like Paul, to boast in the Lord. As individuals, we, like others, may sin in our boasting.

10. 'Each is willing to recommend preachers to churches.' This is wrong. Brother Harsh never heard of the Bible School recommending a preacher. I have, when asked, recommended preachers. He has asked me to recommend to him what to do. I did it before and since my connection with the school. As a teacher in the school, I know no difference between a preacher and an infidel. We have had both in the school; both attend the same classes, and they are both taught the Bible and treated exactly alike. I have recommended preachers who never attended the school more frequently than those who have attended. I presume the same is true of Brother Harding. I think Brother Harsh recommends his brother preachers, too, sometime.

11. The school never accused any one of anything. I, or Brother Harding, may have done wrong in such things; but what we do as individuals the school does not do. I eat at home every day, but the school does not eat at my house. Opposing what opposes us is not peculiar to those connected with the school. It is Brother Harsh's peculiar weakness to oppose those who are in his way. We all have weaknesses, and should guard against them; but points of likeness a hundredfold might be given, none of them involving the points that are wrong."

[17]**Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XL, 1898, pp. 332, 333.

The first year of classes at the Nashville Bible School closed on May 26, 1892. Of the total of thirty-two students who had enrolled twenty-four intended to spend their lives preaching the gospel. The two nights, May 24 and 26, were devoted to closing exercises, highlighted by addresses from the young men in school. The services were held at the South College Street Church Building.

It was David Lipscomb's plan to teach a class each year in both the Old Testament and the New. The Old Testament class could begin with Genesis and proceed to the end. The New Testament class would start with Matthew, skip to John, and then proceed to the end. Each class met for forty-five minutes, the New Testament class following immediately upon the Old. Lipscomb also conducted a class in "Topics," selecting a subject, and proceeding to investigate all the Bible said on the subject.

David Lipscomb's teaching techniques were patterned after his manner of life—humble and thorough. Whereas Harding demanded endless memorizing of his students, Lipscomb rather emphasized the command of the material. Lipscomb did not believe that the man who could quote the most Scripture necessarily knew the most about it. Lipscomb, in his halting, stammering way, selected his words carefully lest he convey a wrong idea. He was filled with the solemn sense that he was teaching God's word, not man's. He was never embarrassed to admit that there were things in the Bible that he did not know, and when students asked him questions that he was unable to answer, he frankly said so. His methods inspired students to study, so that few ever came to class unprepared.

Lipscomb disciplined himself to be both punctual and regular in attendance. He was almost never late for class. Once, when he 'was leaving the **Advocate** office to attend his class, a man came in to pay a debt and get a receipt. Lipscomb, knowing this would make him late, kindly told the man he did not have the time to take the money and requested that he pay the debt some other time. At the beginning of each school year, Lipscomb explained to his classes that he would miss only twice and that would be when the Board of Trustees of Fanning Orphan School

would be meeting. He would seldom miss class even to attend or preach a funeral. Once, upon being strongly urged to preach a funeral, he consented. But when he reached the Union Station and found two other preachers going to the same funeral, he said to them succinctly, "It is not necessary for me to go since you are going, and I am needed at the school." So, he returned to his classes.

James A. Harding, himself a master-teacher, said of David Lipscomb with solemn emphasis: "Brother Lipscomb is the greatest man on the continent."

In the fall of 1892 thirty-four students "all save two or three, preparing to spend their lives in teaching the lost the way of life," enrolled in the Bible School. The second session closed on Thursday evening, May 31, 1893, with recitations in the house of worship of the College Street Church. J. W. Grant, added to the faculty this fall, gave his entire time to teaching. Harding also devoted his full time, but Lipscomb limited his work this year to one class daily in the New Testament. Lipscomb, greatly concerned over the need of more space, determined to do something about it before the third session would open the fall of 1893.

By the late summer a number of brethren had purchased a tract of two acres on which was a large brick building. Immediately they went to work to add other buildings, and turned these over to the Bible School to be used free of charge.

> It is ours to use, (wrote Harding) for a school as long as we are true to the Bible in our religious teaching, believing it to be a sufficient guide in all our work and worship in the service of Christ; but if any teacher in the school is allowed by the faculty to advocate or use any of the innovations that cause divisions among the people of God, the trustees will sell the property and divide the proceeds among the donors, giving to each in proportion to his donation."[18]

The old brick building was cleaned up and made into a boarding house, Brother and Sister W. H. Dodd volunteering to manage it. The third session Harding taught Latin and Greek; Grant, mathe-

[18]James A. Harding, "The Nashville Bible School," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXXIX - No. 9, (March 4, 1897) p. 144.

matics and English; and David Lipscomb, a course in New Testament. Dr. J. S. Ward, assistant professor of chemistry at the Vanderbilt Medical University, was engaged to teach chemistry. Two courses were now given—a long and a short one, the latter taking four years to complete. The rule held that no degrees would be given. Each student, upon completion of his work, was given a book as a present in which his name and the courses he took were written.

The fourth session opened on October 2, 1894, and closed on May 30 the following year. Enrollment had jumped to 80 students, 18 of whom were girls. 48 of the students were preachers. The school was growing, but this growth was the fruit of much sacrifice and prayer. Walking across the campus one day during this session, T. W. Brents said solemnly to David Lipscomb, "This is a big thing, a much bigger thing than I expected to find here; there is no telling whereunto this will grow."[19]

[19]David Lipscomb, "Bible School Notes," **Gospel** Advocate, Vol. XXXVII - No. 26, (June 27, 1896) p. 407.

CHAPTER XIV

THE GOLDEN ERA

FLETCHER DOUGLAS SRYGLEY, fretting under the chastisement David Lipscomb had given him, went off in a pique resolved to wash his hands of the **Gospel Advocate.** To Srygley Lipscomb loomed as a gruff, sour old man, bent on having his own way at all costs. Dazzled by the suave ways of his mild-spoken teacher, T. B. Larimore, Srygley conceded that as an editor Lipscomb was behind the times. A towering host of pioneer preachers had advocated the societies; Larimore himself was silent on them. Lipscomb's opposition, then, could be laid to nothing else than conceit and a certain biliousness in temper. David Lipscomb was holding back the restoration movement in the South, and so far as Srygley was concerned, the best use to which he could put his life would be to checkmate the influence of David Lipscomb.

That was in 1883. By 1890 F. D. Srygley was an older and wiser man. Strange how things had changed! David Lipscomb was not nearly as bad as he had once seemed to be! As a matter of fact, Srygley was ready to concede that maybe James A. Harding was right—maybe Lipscomb was "the greatest man on the continent."

This change in Syrgley's thinking was due in a large measure to Lipscomb's absolute faith in the guiding principle of his life. He expressed this principle once by saying,

> We have noticed those most extreme on one side are liable to run to the other extreme. Let your moderation be known to all men. Be firm for the truth, steadfast in the maintaining of right, yet forbearing to the weaknesses of our fellowmen, knowing we also are liable to be drawn aside, and as we judge others, God will judge us. We have often borne with men that were wrong, tried to get them right, often failed, but have never regretted the forbearance. Be true to the truth, oppose the error, but forbear with humanity.[1]

[1]David Lipscomb, "Thirty Years' Work," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXXVIII - (Jan. 9, 1896) p. 20.

By being "true to the truth," opposing the error, and forbearing with humanity Lipscomb learned to deal kindly with his enemies, and to view with gentleness the personal weaknesses of others. Both J. C. McQuiddy and F. D. Srygley were added to the **Advocate** staff at a time when neither admitted that he was solidly against the missionary society. Lipscomb conceded that while they had not come as far as he had in their thinking, they were traveling in the right direction. He would forbear with their lack of understanding, believing both men would later be a great asset to the truth. As events proved, he was right. Both men would have been lost to the truth without the gentleness with which they were treated. Less than ten years later, Lipscomb yielded his judgment to his faculty's on the question of adding Hall Calhoun to the faculty of the Nashville Bible School. Calhoun admitted that he was not thoroughly convinced that the missionary society was unscriptural. Lipscomb believed Calhoun was coming the right way, that forbearance should be used. His faculty, no doubt led by the intrepid James A. Harding, stood against him, and Lipscomb yielded to their judgment. Calhoun in later years saw the principle and renounced digression. Who knows how much earlier he might have done it if Lipscomb had his way?

But Srygley's change was not due entirely to Lipscomb's attitude. Life's cryptic ways, her fierce vicissitudes and poignant sorrows had mellowed the maturing Srygley. In December, 1880, only a few months out of college, Srygley moved to Paris, Texas. He was far from his home in Alabama, lonely and worried. His young bride, not yet twenty, was in broken health. She, too, was lonely and wanted to go home. Confiding to John T. Poe one day, Srygley poured out his problems, and asked his advice. Poe, kindly and sympathetic, told him to go back to Tennessee. In October, 1882, Srygley moved to Savannah.

In a few weeks T. B. Larimore received a call to come to Rock Creek. Srygley's infant daughter, Mamie, was dead. Larimore preached the funeral. Srygley's wife was grief stricken, and never recovered. At eight o'clock on the night of January 7, Miss Ella

also passed away, and was buried in the quiet cemetery beside her baby.

Srygley tried to forget by working hard. Two months later he joined his friend, J. C. McQuiddy, in a meeting at Columbia, Tennessee. On Friday, March 15, during the meeting, he paid his first visit to the **Advocate** office. Lipscomb was impressed that Srygley had a "fine, striking face, and very expressive eye." What they talked about is not recorded.

As far as Srygley could tell, the one paper that seemed to be the hope of the South, was the **Old Path Guide.** Allen, like Srygley was not opposed to the societies yet he kept a wary eye on them, being freely critical of their policies. Here was a paper sufficiently conservative and yet progressive enough to suit Srygley. In July, 1883, he "went to the office" of the **Guide** at the same time Chalmers McPherson took over the "Texas Department" of the same paper. Before long Srygley owned half interest in it. Within another five years he had branched out to purchase stock in the Courier Publishing Co. at Dallas, publishers of the **Christian Courier.** The **Courier** was owned for the most part by Russell Errett and the Standard Publishing Co. of Cincinnati.

The sorrow accompanying the loss of a child and a young bride was hardly over until the discovery was made that Srygley had Bright's Disease. He was in a sullen mood when he walked into the **Advocate** office one day the first week of February, 1885, on his way to Louisville, unable to resist the urge to drop by Nashville and see how his friend, McQuiddy, enjoyed his new job with the **Advocate.** He explained to McQuiddy that the doctors had told him he was no better. Nothing would help him but a long rest. He had his eyes on Arkansas. Here he could rest and perhaps preach a little in a mission field at the same time.

Coal Hill, Arkansas was a little mining town 115 miles west of Little Rock. Srygley stepped into the town on October 8, 1885, and was almost immediately followed by a colony of three hundred people, mostly relatives moving from Rock Creek, Alabama. Srygley made his home with his brother, F. G. and wife, Susan. During the time, Srygley was an invalid, suffering constantly,

and "none too amiable in disposition." Susan was kind and understanding, and with such treatment he gradually improved.

Since nearly all of Srygley's relatives were members of the church, a congregation was soon planted at Coal Hill. When Srygley was able, he preached for them. To make a living he sold real estate. By the summer of 1888, he was definitely better, although he was conscious that in the long run he was fighting a losing battle. It was inevitable that he would die relatively young. His problem was to crowd as much work for the Lord into his few remaining years as he could.

During his illness, rapid changes were made. F. G. Allen died, and the **Old Path Guide** was purchased by the **Christian Standard.** The **Apostolic Times,** started with such ostentatious splendor, yielded to the inexorable demands brought on by a decreasing subscription list, and united with the **Guide** to form the **Apostolic Guide.** The **Christian Standard** was so wedded to the societies that criticism of them was out of the question. This fact was made dramatically evident in the spring of 1888 by the sudden resignation of M. C. Kurfees.

So, for all practical intents and purposes the **Old Path Guide** that Srygley knew was dead. The **Christian Standard** was not conservative enough to suit his tastes. While he could not yet convince himself that the principle of societies was unscriptural, it was plain that the bellicose **Gospel Advocate** leaned toward the safe side. Maybe "Uncle David" Lipscomb had more sense than Srygley gave him credit for! Somehow he was not nearly as bad now as he once had seemed!

A chain of circumstances drove Srygley right toward the **Advocate.** It is not unlikely that his marriage on December 26, 1888, to Miss Jennie Scobey, daughter of James E. Scobey, helped. The **Gospel Advocate** had no better friends than the Scobey family. How far a man may be influenced by his wife is hard to say!

Again, there was the matter of Srygley's admiration for T. B. Larimore, his teacher at Mars Hill. He loved Larimore beyond measure. He felt toward him a childlike possessiveness that made

him often say, "I'll criticize him when he needs it if I want to; but no other man shall do it." And other men did surprisingly little of it! He had an insatiate desire to write about Larimore, to let the whole world know what a great man he was. The memory of his days at Mars Hill was delightful beyond measure. So he wrote a book, and called it "Larimore And His Boys." The job of finding a publisher drew him toward the Gospel Advocate Publishing Co.

Then J. C. McQuiddy's connection with the **Gospel Advocate** pulled him toward the paper. Since their school days, McQuiddy and Srygley had been the closest friends. McQuiddy saw eye to eye with Srygley on the societies, and yet, surprisingly enough, still managed to work with Lipscomb. McQuiddy knew that Srygley could work with Lipscomb, too, if he would. And so, McQuiddy lent his influence to bridge the gap between the two men.

In the spring of 1889 the opportunity presented itself. Srygley finished his manuscript on **Larimore and His Boys,** and so with Miss Jennie, came to Nashville for a visit with the McQuiddys and to talk over getting the manuscript published. There was time now for plenty of talk. As for publishing the manuscript the Gospel Advocate Publishing Company was in better condition than ever and would be glad to do it. But what McQuiddy wanted was to get Srygley in with the paper. Srygley was far too valuable a man not to have.

The talk with David Lipscomb was refreshing. Srygley frankly admitted that he did not see altogether eye to eye with the **Advocate's** senior editor. He agreed the societies needed frequent criticism in that they were to be kept in line. Lipscomb on the other hand with equal frankness admitted that Srygley was not as far along in his thinking as he would like. He felt that Srygley was coming along in the right direction, that by the practice of forbearance on his part, Srygley would some day see for himself the principle involved. Lipscomb, knowing that no man would or should sacrifice a single conviction, wanted only to know if Srygley could work to build up the **Gospel Advocate** without sacrificing his convictions. Srygley replied that he could and would.

These talks paved the way for Srygley to purchase a financial interest in the Gospel Advocate Publishing Company in the fall of 1889. Accordingly, the November 6th issue announced that F. D. Srygley would become connected with the Advocate as an editor, and besides would help in the business end of the paper.

From 1890 until his death in the summer of 1900, F. D. Srygley edited the front page of the **Advocate.** With little doubt he was one of the best writers the **Advocate** has ever had in its long history. His sentences were radiantly alive, sparkling with wit and repartee. It is not difficult to see that he enjoyed his work. During this decade, the **Advocate** went through its golden era. Srygley's wit gave the paper life; Lipscomb's "heavy artillery," as T. R. Burnett called it, gave the paper depth; Sewell's grace gave the paper elegance; and McQuiddy's "Office Notes" made it informative. Though many an editor envied the puissance of the **Advocate** during this period, few could duplicate it.

Under the new arrangement, the Gospel Advocate Publishing Company went actively to work. At long last Lipscomb was able to print his articles on civil government and the Christian's relation to it in book form. This was in 1889. A year later a new edition of **Christian Hymns** was published. Lipscomb and Sewell (with their wives' assistance) went over the songs carefully to be sure they were scriptural. When Jesse L. Sewell died at his home at Viola, Tennessee, on June 29, 1890, Lipscomb began preparation on the book, "Life And Times of Jesse L. Sewell" which came from the press a year later. In 1890 F. D. Srygley brought out his **Seventy Years in Dixie,** based largely upon the experiences of T. W. Caskey.

In 1890 the Gospel Advocate Publishing Company began publication of a periodical called **Youth's Advocate,** jointly-edited by F. D. Srygley and David Lipscomb. Upon getting his copy, A. C. Henry of Greenville, Texas, wrote Lipscomb: "With those who have not progressed beyond the New Testament the name of David Lipscomb is the synonym of soundness and thoroughness. He then sits upon the bed rock of our religion and holds the anchor

stay of the little barque, while Srygley unfurls her sail."[2] The Youth's Advocate aroused the ire of Austin McGary, intrepid editor of the Firm Foundation, who charged that Lipscomb had once opposed Sunday-school or children's papers, and that Lipscomb was still really opposed to publishing them now but that he did so because somebody else would. Lipscomb spent several hours, gleaning through the old Advocates, finding quotations to show McGary his error. Lipscomb roared, "I never saw the hour in my life that I was fool enough (bear a plain expression) to say it was right to publish a paper to interest and instruct grown people in the scriptures of truth, and a sin to publish one to do the same thing for children."[3]

Despite the success of the publishing business, Lipscomb was not altogether at ease. It was inbred in him that it was wrong to go in debt. In twenty-five years of editing the Gospel **Advocate,** he had run the paper on a pay-as-you-go basis. It is not unlikely that he could have started his publishing business sooner if he had been willing to go in debt. But in dealing with his young financial manager, J. C. McQuiddy, he found he was not doing business with one so averse to debt. McQuiddy, if he saw the opportunity of expanding his business by this means, would not refuse to do so. In the spring of 1891 he went to Chicago, and plunged the Gospel Advocate Publishing Company in debt $3000 for some new printing presses. Lipscomb, outwardly perturbed, fidgeted and fretted. Going over his records, he found that if all his subscribers would pay up, he could get out of debt. So he urged them to send him their payments.

But if McQuiddy embarrassed Lipscomb by going in debt, his business acumen created a more serious tension a year later. Early in June, 1892, Lipscomb took a two weeks' vacation by visiting some of the churches in West Tennessee. While he was out of town, Russell Errett sent McQuiddy word to meet him in Louisville. At the meeting they talked of consolidating the **Apostolic Guide** and the **Gospel Advocate.** This was not the first

[2]**Gospel Advocate,** 1890, p. 182.
[3]**Gospel Advocate,** 1890, p. 295.

time they had talked. When David Lipscomb was considering merging the **Old Path Guide** with the Advocate in 1885, Errett had paid McQuiddy's expenses to Cincinnati and back. During the conversation, Errett expressed his doubt that the Society was doing any good, and stated emphatically that the Society and W. T. Moore in particular had made some grave blunders. During the 1885 negotiations, Errett talked also with Srygley, asking him to use his influence to "harmonize David Lipscomb." Srygley tried, but when he found Lipscomb adamant, he dropped the whole idea.

Now by the summer of 1892, Errett was willing to try again. The **Apostolic Guide** was not paying off, and furthermore, both Srygley and McQuiddy were more deeply involved with the **Advocate.** The question, of course, was what to do about David Lipscomb if the two papers combined. Errett confessed that he believed there was better editorial talent on the **Advocate** but he was in favor of retaining "the pestiferous whim-whams of David Lipscomb" on the paper to hold the support of those who like that sort of thing. Later Errett publicly complained that Lipscomb was his "pet abomination" *us* a journalist, and should never be named the same day with F. G. Allen.[4]

Upon returning from his westward trek the middle of June, Lipscomb learned that McQuiddy had been to Louisville to negotiate with Errett. When the affair came into the open, Errett exploded that Srygley and McQuiddy had lied, that he never had the slightest intention of uniting the **Apostolic Guide** with the **Gospel Advocate** and retaining Lipscomb as editor. The squalid history of the case was fully repeated in the **Christian Standard** to the complete embarrassment of McQuiddy and Srygley. The naive Lipscomb supinely drawled that any harm the boys had done was simply because Errett had taken advantage of them. At any rate, the episode wrote "finis" to any further merger with the **Standard** or any **Standard-backed** publications.

Meanwhile, Lipscomb's pen was seldom still. The spring of 1890 he published a sixty-four page tract on "Christian Unity, How Promoted and How Destroyed, Faith And Opinion." The

[4]**Gospel Advocate,** 1892, pp. 389, 409.

tract was an answer to a series of articles in the **Christian-Evangelist** defending instrumental music and missionary societies. Only a few weeks before, Lipscomb ran a series of articles on "First Principles," dealing with the conditions of salvation. A few years later, J. W. Shephard gathered this material together and printed it in book form, calling the book, **Salvation From Sin.** Three years later Lipscomb printed the "Truth Seeker," a tract written in courteous style, asking and answering questions on the Bible. Lipscomb also found himself saddled with the job of writing the commentary on the International Sunday School lesson, "a first class commentary by a first class man." These were chaotic years. So much was happening! The whole brotherhood was faced with a crisis, brought on by the missionary society and the growing popularity of the instrument in worship. Added to this was the visible threat of what was then called Rationalism, but now more popularly called Modernism. David Lipscomb towered as a giant among men in the thick of the crisis. But not once did he lose sight of his fundamental work of preaching the gospel of peace to the world.

Once a month he preached at the Nashville Bible School congregation. It was known in advance he would preach and a crowd always gathered. It was a familiar sight to see his heavy, stooped frame mount the platform and sit on a chair, his hickory walking stick placed idly by. His iron-gray hair was seldom combed. More often than not he wore no tie. His pants slipped up over his shoe tops. With his Bible in his hand, he would read a chapter, commenting as he went. He had no outline, and made no gestures. He drove hard to his point. He was no Demosthenes, but everybody sensed his power.

During 1890, Lipscomb was so busy with the Advocate that he was out of town less than usual. The fourth Sunday of April, he preached at Smyrna, baptising Eq. James Gooch. He preached a few nights the week of September 7-14 in White's Bend, near home, baptizing three. The following week was spent in West Tennessee, preaching eight days at Henning, in Lauderdale County at the request of Brother J. A. Carter. He met E. H. Smith here,

son of old Peyton Smith, who had preached in middle Tennessee when Lipscomb was a boy. He also met F. W. Smith, a rising young preacher, at Martin. In ten days he spoke nineteen times and had seldom enjoyed better health. The next month Lipscomb visited in Chattanooga where plans were being laid to establish a state missionary society in Tennessee. The week of December 7th he attended the Fleming-Hall Debate at Camden, Tennessee, and later reviewed the debate in the **Advocate.**

The year 1890 was also marked by a discussion with Austin McGary on the rebaptism question. McGary's point was, "I do believe with my whole heart, that immersion without a previous preparation of the heart, though it be done to 'obey God' is no more the one baptism spoken of by Paul than any made of affusion 'to obey God' would be, e**xc**ept that the action is externally the same."[5] Lipscomb agreed with McGary to write four articles, stating his position, and McGary was to write the same number in reply. Lipscomb wrote four, but McGary insisted that he had written five, so wrote another himself. Then he claimed Lipscomb wrote six, so wrote still another in reply. Lipscomb decided that it was only fair that he should have another say, but McGary refused to print his article in the **Finn Foundation.** Frequently through the next decade Lipscomb discussed the question with McGary until he finally wearied of it and dropped the whole matter.

The first week of April, 1891, McQuiddy received his new printing presses from Chicago, so the **Advocate** shut down while moving its office to 232 North Market Street and installing the presses. It was six months later that the Nashville Bible School opened "in a rented house, with two teachers, no money and a very small attendance." In the intervening time Lipscomb was invited to deliver a lecture on the duty of Christians to civil government at the Missouri Christian Lectureship, to be held at Huntsville, July 14-16. The plan of the program called for lectures, followed by ten minute speeches of criticism.

[5]A. McGary, "Re-Baptism," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXVI - No. 1, (Jan. 2, 1884) p. 6.

Lipscomb felt embarrassed, like a country boy way up north among all those Yankees, but he was determined that his modesty would not keep him home. So he went. He heard a lecture from G. W. Longan on Galatians 3:16 in which Longan accused Paul of some fallacious reasoning. Alexander Proctor, speaking on "Rationalism," admitted, like Longan, that the Bible was full of errors and made an attack on the inspiration of the Old and New Testaments. On the trip something stirred up his bile, so Lipscomb found himself a room and went to bed. He was too sick to hear the other lectures, but was well enough to get up on Wednesday night and deliver his speech. He missed a lecture by J. W. McGarvey on "Church Government," delivered during the day, which he very much wanted to hear.

Lipscomb spoke that night for an hour and thirty minutes, completely disregarding any time limitations. J. W. Randall was the only man present who agreed with him. McGarvey sat attentively, listening in respectful silence. Many in the audience squirmed restlessly; some were more openly discourteous. Alexander Proctor spoke the next day, going out of his way to crack some witticism at Lipscomb's expense. Lipscomb started for home telling his brethren that he had enjoyed the meeting and that he "hoped they would not dislike me more for the acquaintance." McGarvey later commented on Lipscomb's speech in the **Christian Standard** saying, "He led us along a line of scripture evidence that was new to many, and that few were able to grapple with on the spur of the moment, and although every one felt that he was certainly wrong, very few were prepared to show it in a speech of ten minutes, the limit of each man's criticisms."[6]

Meanwhile, David Lipscomb's advice was sought on an impending mission to Japan. W. K. Azbill was determined to make the trip, being supported by the congregations and not by the missionary society. He requested Lipscomb to write to J. M. McCaleb, a young lad from Hickman County, who had graduated from the College of The Bible only that June, and persuade him to go. Lipscomb refused saying it was such an important step

[6]Gospel Advocate, 1891, p. 485.

that outside influences should not be brought to bear. A short time later McCaleb wrote Lipscomb, asking advice. Lipscomb replied by pointing out what the privations and problems were, leaving the decision up to McCaleb entirely.

Lipscomb's daily classes at the Nashville Bible School in 1891-2 proved confining so far as his journeys to preach were concerned. On Sunday, April 3, 1892, he preached at Murfreesboro, and after the close of school the next month, preached at Fowlkes. T. A. Smith and Elihu Scott had established this congregation, which now met in a small house despite the fact it was only two weeks old. Between six and eight hundred people came to hear Lipscomb preach, on, "What Has The Christian Religion Done For The World?" Sunday afternoon there was a dinner on the ground, and Lipscomb spoke again that night. The next two nights he spoke at Newbern on "The Word of God The Seed of The Kingdom" and "How Faith May Become Fruit-Bearing." The church at Newbern had introduced a small organ, so a threat of division filled the air.

Wednesday and Thursday nights Lipscomb spoke at Union City. It had rained constantly so few people came to hear him speak on, "The Blood of Christ—What It Does For Us And How We May Reach It." Thursday night the house was full as Lipscomb spoke on "the works of man and the works of God; the works that save and the works that allow boasting." Friday night he spoke at the Antioch congregation in Dyer County, and on Saturday morning and night, and Sunday morning at Crockett Mills. Sunday night he spoke at Alamo as he did on Monday night. Heavy rains interfered with services Tuesday and Wednesday, but on Thursday and Friday nights he spoke at Bells, arriving back home on June 15.

At this time Lipscomb and his family frequently worshipped at Compton's Chapel near Nashville. The last of August and the first of September Lipscomb heard Phillip Harsh some during a meeting Harsh conducted. It was necessary to miss the meeting on the night of August 31 to go to a home in North Nashville and perform the wedding ceremony for William T. Selley to Miss Callie Potter.

The year 1893 began with Lipscomb resolved to let the question of the society rest. For the past three years the issue had been almost constantly before the readers of the **Advocate.** All had been convinced who would be. "Then, let these questions rest," he wrote, "and let us give our whole energies to the spread of the truth, the conversion of sinners, the perfection of souls and the upbuilding of the churches of Christ."[7] So Lipscomb set to work at this task.

On Sunday, April 11, while he was crossing a railroad track in a horse and buggy on his way to a preaching appointment, the horse became frightened and threw him out of the buggy. His face, side, and nose were severely bruised despite the fact that no bones were broken. His recovery was very slow, and many of his closest friends were more than anxious over him.[8] V. M. Metcalfe paid him a visit. Sedately reflecting over Lipscomb's life's work, Metcalfe wrote:

> He is getting old, and in the course of nature will not be here many more years to earnestly contend for the purity of the church and simplicity of the gospel. I don't know of a brother who is more frequently misquoted and misunderstood than Bro. Lipscomb. While everybody concedes that he is a man of ability, yet few know his real worth. I have known him intimately for over twenty-five years, and I have never known a more godly or self-sacrificing man. Many suppose from his writings that he is a cross, ill-natured, sour old man, yet just the reverse is true. He is tender-hearted and loving as a child—can be led to do almost anything unless he thinks it wrong; then all the earth can't move him. He is loyal to the teachings of the Bible. I have never known a man just like him in all of his make-up. I believe that God in His providence has used him in the last twenty-five years as he has no other man to elevate the standard of the church of Christ and keep it pure from innovations. God has given him wisdom and power for accomplishing good. He has not been unfaithful.[9]

David Lipscomb at 62 was not an old man, but old enough for his counsel and wisdom to be in demand. Through the years ahead friends and relatives would come to him, asking advice on

[7]**Gospel Advocate,** 1893, p. 13.
[8]**Gospel Advocate,** 1893, p. 245.
[9]V. M. Metcalfe, "Our Bible School," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXXV - No. 22, (June 1, 1893) p. 341.

every conceivable subject. His being laid up with bruises gave them time to come to his home and talk. Srygley himself was faced with a problem. A year before he had published **Seventy Years in Dixie,** treating of the experiences of the enigmatic T. W. Caskey. Caskey had at first sent a manuscript to Srygley which Srygley rejected. He sent another. Srygley worked it over, changing it radically, and leaving out about fifty pages that Caskey sent. Much new material was also added. Caskey's friends were disappointed and persuaded the old man to bring out another book. It was charged that Srygley had cheated Caskey in the deal. Srygley came to Lipscomb in deep melancholy, wanting to know what to do, and giving Lipscomb all the facts. Lipscomb listened patiently. He felt sure that Caskey's friends wanted to injure the **Advocate,** but advised Srygley to print the contract and state all the facts. An ugly situation was smoothed over by a sagacious counselor.

The **Gospel Advocate** surged boldly ahead in 1894. The **Gospel Echo,** edited by R. H. Howard at Corley, Arkansas, merged with the **Advocate** in August. Two months earlier the **Christian Messenger** had been taken over, and while neither of these papers in a major way increased the Advocate's circulation, both helped. The year started off in a big way. E. G. Sewell, fighting against failing health, had decided to combine business with pleasure and do some mission work in Bartow, Florida. He left home the last of January. At the same time James A. Harding began a meeting at the Nashville Bible School. David Lipscomb complained that he was doing the work of three men, so some things went undone.

At the same time the sad news came of the sudden death of Azariah Paul in Turkey. Paul had died in December, 1893, a month earlier. After spending four years in the College of the Bible, Paul had been sent to Turkey, each of the congregations in Nashville supporting him. In the four years he had worked in Turkey, he had baptized over a hundred people and established two congregations which were meeting regularly.

John S. Sweeney's great meeting with the South Nashville Church began March 11, 1894, and ended on Monday, March 26.

Lipscomb attended regularly, commenting enthusiastically, "I never heard the subjects of faith, repentance, and baptism for the remission of sins presented, illustrated, and enforced from so many standpoints, or with more clearness or force."[10] Once during a sermon, Sweeney spoke tearfully of children. Lipscomb, listening attentively, drifted back through the years and saw in his mind the coarse bier of his infant son. Without being conscious of what he was doing, Lipscomb bowed his head and wept audibly.

Lipscomb was criticized severely for using Sweeney in the meeting, for Sweeney was sympathetic with both the organ and the society. But in private Lipscomb spoke to him at great length. He was convinced that Sweeney was headed the right direction. Perhaps patience and proper teaching would do the rest.

"Let your moderation be known to all men" was no idle motto with David Lipscomb.

[10]**Gospel Advocate,** 1894, p. 206.

CHAPTER XV

THE CRISIS

The Woodland Street Church in Edgefield, across the river from Nashville proper, had its beginning in 1871 with the work of E. G. Sewell. The year before, Sewell moved to Nashville to rear his large family, and assist David Lipscomb as editor of the **Gospel Advocate.** His work with a small band of disciples near his home lasted somewhat irregularly for twelve years or more. He averaged preaching for them once a month and usually at their mid-week service. He received no pay for his services, except now and then a gift from some grateful Christian. In 1878 the congregation arranged to pay him a little for his preaching besides giving him a small extra support for preaching in the country. In 1880 a new house of worship was completed, so Sewell was asked to preach here longer. For the next two years he gave three-fourths of his time to this congregation. But omens of coming strife filled the air. E. G. Sewell watched the coming storm with considerable anxiety.

From the North, where the Society system was deeply imbedded in the churches, people moved into Nashville. Gradually a substantial number filled the Edgefield congregation. By the end of 1882, a sister from Kentucky asked Sewell about forming an auxiliary society to the Christian Woman's Board of Missions. Sewell objected, and gave his reasons. But as always, when a group in a congregation wants something, and the preacher stands in their way, there is only one thing to do: dismiss the preacher. Sewell was ousted, and at the beginning of 1883, W. J. Loos, son of C. L. Loos, president of the Foreign Society, was hired. In the fall of that year young Loos attended the annual convention at Cincinnati, telling them with some embarrassment that he was ashamed to admit he was from Tennessee for the churches of his state were doing nothing. He returned to Woodland Street, fired with Zeal for the society.[1] On the next Wednesday night, Sewell vigorously refuted the charges that Tennessee churches

[1] **Gospel Advocate,** 1890, p. 123.

were idle. While he managed to check-mate young Loos' influence temporarily, in 1887 things took a change for the worse.

R. M. Giddens took Loos' place, and readily fanned the flame of "Societyism." The women were soon busily at work to form an auxiliary society. Sewell's pleas to Giddens went unheeded. During the following summer, the women wrote letters to the churches of the state, asking funds be sent to them so they could hire a State Evangelist. Before long, plans were laid to secure the services of A. I. Myhr.

One Saturday night in the fall of 1889, R. M. Giddens came to the home of David Lipscomb to talk over the future work in Tennessee. He informed Lipscomb that Woodland Street had raised enough money to hire a preacher, and expressed a desire to work with the churches in Tennessee. Admitting the money had mostly been raised by the sisters in the church by fairs, parties, and societies, Giddens insisted it was their desire that the evangelist be employed to work under the elders of the Woodland Street church. Lipscomb was informed that A. I. Myhr had already been employed, and was in sympathy with working under these elders.

Lipscomb's immediate reaction was that the money had been raised incorrectly. He expressed his doubts if Myhr could work except through a society. But, Lipscomb made it clear that he desired harmony among all the churches, and he would mention the matter in the **Advocate** if the work would be done the way Giddens suggested. Giddens departed, giving Lipscomb the assurance that it would be done that way.

Within the next few days Lipscomb prepared an article for publication. Just before he turned it over to the printer, a letter came from a brother in Louisville, saying he had just talked with Myhr who informed him that he was coming to Tennessee to form a state society. Lipscomb waited for Giddens to return from the Louisville Convention, expecting him to come by and see him. Giddens never came. Lipscomb held up his article, waiting for developments.[2]

[2]**Gospel Advocate,** 1890, p. 108.

Meanwhile, Giddens failed to get the work under the Woodland Street elders as he promised. J. C. McQuiddy, who upon coming to Nashville became identified with Woodland Street, helped raise the money for the evangelist. But when it came to arranging for Myhr neither Sewell nor McQuiddy was consulted, although Sewell was an elder in the church. Neither man knew that Myhr had been hired until Sunday morning, February 9, 1890. It had been announced that Myhr was to speak at Vine Street in Nashville that morning, so McQuiddy and Sewell went to hear him, and heard the news for the first time.

David Lipscomb watched these transactions with a heavy heart. It was evident that a major move was on to force the society upon the churches in Tennessee. This would divide the churches in Tennessee if the effort persisted. A great battle loomed ominously on the horizon.

Lipscomb plunged heart and soul into the battle. Myhr, Norwegian, had come to the United States at the age of sixteen, worked his way through college, and started preaching in 1880. Lipscomb said if Myhr had the spirit of an Andrew or a Paul, he would have gone to Norway to preach rather than to Tennessee. Myhr he believed, was then strongly in favor of the "Rationalism," then rife in Missouri. The whole move, Lipscomb anticipated, would "ostracize, boycott, and starve every preacher that does not approve the societies."

Myhr was received only by a relatively few churches in Tennessee. The **Christian Evangelist** blamed the lack of cooperation with Myhr upon David Lipscomb, claiming he was the pope of Tennessee. "If they do not work in harmony. . . . they believe in a one man power when the editor of a paper appoints himself president, secretary and treasurer and says, brethren send me your money. I am a whole board myself. He can then give the money to his favorites who go out and hold meetings in some of the country churches and send in a good list of subscribers." Accusing Lipscomb of "selfishness" and "greed," J. H. Garrison cried, "When the desire for one man power in our mission work

grows so strong and the greed to build up certain papers so determined that its editors will resort to such methods it is time to call a halt."[3]

In the fall of 1890 a convention was called at Chattanooga ostensibly to organize the state society. Churches backing the organization movement were Woodland Street in Nashville, and individual congregations at Knoxville, Chattanooga, Clarksville, Henderson and Memphis. The only congregations in Tennessee wanting the Society were those which had already adopted the use of the instrument in their worship. Prof. A. D. Wharton, a member of the Vine Street church in Nashville, and a strong advocate of both the organ and the societies, pushed the organizing efforts at Chattanooga.

Lipscomb attended the Chattanooga convention, watching the deliberations with great interest. The defense of the society was the same as that echoed by Alexander Campbell much earlier, viz.: the church universal was responsible to preach the gospel, and since the church universal was not told how to preach, it was left to devise its own ways and means. Brother Rhoulhac preached a sermon on the history of preaching the gospel, by a review of the book of Acts. Rhoulac concluded there was only one case on record of a church sending out a preacher and that was in Acts 13. From that he reasoned that the Bible gave no way of doing mission work, so it was left up to man to devise his own ways.

> Brother Rhoulhac took the position, (wrote Lipscomb), that the whole body that was to be joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth Eph. iv was the church universal. Then the churches at Nashville, Chattanooga, and Knoxville are just joints of that body. One is the foot, another the eye, another the ears, etc. The attempt to carry this out is the entire destruction of the churches and the logical and necessary outgrowth is a hierarchy that necessarily runs into Episcopalism or Romanism."[4]

Lipscomb was treated with courtesy and even allowed to express his views, but he was unable to check the move to organize the society.

[3]Gospel **Advocate,** 1890, p. 166.
[4]Gospel Advocate, 1890, p. 678.

The crisis was by no means ended. The **Christian Standard** carried the report in October, 1891 that "it is reported that the brethren in Nashville, Tennessee are desirous of entertaining our National Convention next year."[5] The "brethren in Nashville" referred, of course, to some members of Woodland Street and Vine Street. The other congregations were far from desirous that the National Convention come to Nashville. Obviously, the society hoped by a pompous display of its size to sweep the churches in middle Tennessee behind it. Lipscomb, it was hoped, would be bowled over and the **Gospel Advocate** nullified.

Lipscomb saw all of these implications readily. Out of 2500 white Christians in Nashville, less than one hundred wanted the society. So Lipscomb informed the society backers that their convention was not wanted.[6] The churches in Nashville, rather than being idle were supporting J. M. McCaleb in Japan, Azariah Paul in Turkey, and helping with the mission to the Indians in Oklahoma Territory. The most the convention could do would be to stir up strife and discord.

These overtures were ignored and the society met as planned. At the convention C. M. Wilmeth, editor of the Christian Preacher, stood up and read a paper signed by himself, David Lipscomb, E. G. Sewell, M. C. Kurfees and others to ask the brethren to abandon the society in the interest of peace and unity. J. W. McGarvey, presiding chairman, assigned the document to a committee for a consideration where it appropriately died. J. H. Garrison smiled as the paper was read.

Lipscomb attended and watched with keen interest the proceedings. The Bible, he observed, was as popular as last year's almanac. He came away much relieved, afterwards saying,

> We did not see or hear of a single preacher or brother among our Tennessee preachers that was not strengthened in his conviction that these things are all wrong and lead to division and strife, and gradually school men to neglect the Bible. Quite a number even of those who had looked favorably on the societies went away disgusted. . . . I

[5]**Gospel Advocate,** 1892, p. 680.
[6]**Gospel Advocate,** 1892, pp. 628, 9.

> believe the effect of the Convention here has been good, that the atmosphere will be purer, that the brethren and sisters who are in earnest will be more united, more content to stand upon the Bible, and be satisfied with its provisions; because they have seen in this convention to what extent good, God-fearing, strong-minded men like McGarvey, Loos, and others can be carried by those organizations, unknown to the apostles, not mentioned in the New Testament.[7]

Back as early as 1883 Lipscomb started having some strange misgivings as to some of the brethren's views on the Bible. Most of his questions arose directly from lectures delivered at the annual Missouri Christian Lectureship. A. B. Jones said there were two revelations—one in the Bible and the other in the intuition of man. Loyalty to God was essentially loyalty to self. Errett's lectures on inspiration tended to put doubt on the Bible as the inspired word of God. At the time Lipscomb observed,

> There are many ways of rendering the commandments of God of none effect by our traditions. To teach that our intuitions are revelations of coordinate authority with, and more permanent than the revelations of the Bible, certainly makes us feel less dependent upon the Bible than we otherwise would. When we are immediately told that the Bible is not an infallible revelation of His will to man, that feeling of reverential dependence, that makes us tremble at his word, is greatly weakened. When we are told that when God speaks to man he speaks to himself, that man's nature and God's nature are the same. Hence man is a law to himself. When we are told that we may look to our own feelings, desires, or within our own hearts and minds, or to man's own judgment for new revelations, for new guidance of the Holy Spirit, equal in authority to the word of God, our sense of dependence upon Scriptures given by inspiration of God are destroyed.[8]

Later E. B. Cake delivered an address on "The Son of God" that Lipscomb regarded as destructive of the Bible's teaching on this subject.

In 1887 James A. Harding said to David Lipscomb that he would give those who advocate the societies and the use of the organ two years to accept the unbaptized into their churches. Lipscomb said nothing at the moment, discounting the statement

[7]David Lipscomb, "Convention Items," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXXIV - No. 43, (Oct. 27, 1892), p. 676.
[8]David Lipscomb, "Strange Developments," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXVI - No. 11, (March 12, 1884) p. 167.

as coining only from prejudice.[9] Yet by 1889 J. S. Lamar openly declared that he was in favor of accepting the unimmersed. The Foreign Society was by then looking with displeasure upon its missionaries who taught the unimmersed who professed to be Christians that they had to be immersed.

A tidal wave of what was then called Rationalism was sweeping the brotherhood by 1890. David Lipscomb regarded it as truly significant that this Rationalism was almost exclusively centered among those who advocated the Missionary Society. Nor was he surprised. "If we were to depart from the order of God in one point," he wrote, "we could with no consistency maintain it on the others"; an institution whose very existence was itself a usurpation of the Bible could never be expected to lead men closer to the Bible. Men who could use the society or the organ must begin with a very loose concept of the Bible. Beginning there, their institutions would hardly lead them back.

The **Nashville American** requested R. Lin Cave, preacher for the Vine Street Church, in the fall of 1891, to write two articles on the distinctive features of the disciples. Cave passed the responsibility on to Lipscomb, asking Lipscomb to write on the introduction of the cause in Tennessee in addition to some sketches of pioneer preachers. Lipscomb did. Later when Lipscomb inquired why Cave had not written, Cave replied that it was because he was not in agreement with his brethren in Tennessee. Lipscomb thought Cave's trouble was on baptism. But Cave shocked him by saying that his trouble was on the relation of Jesus Christ to God. This began a series of differences with Cave that finally exploded in 1896. Thereafter, Lipscomb would no longer recommend him as a preacher.[10]

Liberalism—or as Lipscomb preferred to call it, Rationalism—jumped boldly into the public eye when R. C. Cave delivered a sermon in St. Louis early in December, 1889. Cave, following his belief that man's intuition is in itself a revelation of God, de-

[9] **Gospel Advocate,** 1889, pp. 422, 3.
[10] **Gospel Advocate,** 1896, p. 484.

clared that any man who brings himself, according to his own measure of knowledge, into obedience to the will of Christ, was a Christian and entitled to membership in the church. Attacking the Bible as a revelation of God to man, Cave denied the virgin birth of Christ and the fact that either Moses or Abraham understood or knew God.

The Christian Evangelist sailed into R. C. Cave, declaring that "the church of God is today in the presence of a common foe, Unbelief, either in the subtle form of rationalism, or in the more pronounced type of defiant infidelity." Lipscomb liked the ring of this remark, but still wondered why **The Christian-Evangelist** had for so long thrown all of its influence behind the rationalistic tendencies. G. W. Longan's articles were full of liberalism, but when Lipscomb pointed this out, Garrison rejoined that Lipscomb "showed a strange incapacity to deal with questions of Biblical criticisms." But Longan did agree with the German Rationalists, and so declared his belief.[11] "It is folly," wrote Lipscomb, "to speak of opposing rationalism as a common foe, to God and man, while cherishing its most insidious and hurtful teachings and teachers."

Reactions to this wave of liberalism were pronounced. Garrison himself edited a book entitled, **The Old Faith Restated,** in which he attempted to return to more solid ground. J. W. McGarvey, himself aroused, began a serious study of "Biblical Criticism" which was printed over a period of years in the **Christian Standard,** and later assembled for his book. Lipscomb wrote a series of editorials entitled, "Is Rationalism Rife In Missouri?", sounding a warning against a current danger.*

[11]**Gospel Advocate,** 1890, p. 119.

*For a fuller discussion of the Society crisis in Tennessee, and the threat of Liberalism see the author's **Search For The Ancient Order, Vol. 2.**

CHAPTER XVI

"BROTHER DAVE WITH HIS HEAVY ARTILLERY"

On July 23, 1895, David Lipscomb and "Aunt Mag" celebrated their thirty-third wedding anniversary. Strange how two people become so much alike in thirty-three years! Without entirely knowing it, David Lipscomb found himself leaning heavily upon Aunt Mag. It would be strange if Aunt Mag did not meet him at the rail when he came from the office, unhitch the horse and take it to the stall. It would have been stranger still if he wore clothing not made by the impeccable hands of his good wife. Indeed, Aunt Mag was a preacher's wife in every sense of the term.

There was her household. Everyone had the feeling that she reigned as a queen should. She was immaculately clean, not only with her own person, but with the house. She was far from lazy. She ground the flour in her own mill, and made whole wheat bread. She churned the butter, and fed her husband lavishly on preserves, corn bread, butter, eggs, and buttermilk. Even when she was seventy years old, she would compel whoever brought in the coal to set it on the porch, so she could bring it in and put it on the fire. In a sense, Aunt Mag "spoiled" Uncle Dave. Lipscomb thought girls ought to do manual labor, and Fanning Orphan School made this a fundamental part of its curriculum. "Girls that are not able to do the work required in the school are too delicate to be educated and, without radical improvement, too frail to marry," was the way Lipscomb succinctly put it.[1]

But Aunt Mag never forgot that her husband was a busy man. She brought him his shoes, and even tied them for him when he was going out. She bore the brunt of sharp criticism rather than allow her husband's time to be wasted. People dropping by to see him would spend three hours in idle chatter. Lipscomb was too busy a man to have his time thrown away like this, so Aunt Mag took over. Callers were promptly but kindly asked their business, and if it were nothing important, they were kindly

[1] **Gospel Advocate,** 1912, p. 833.

turned away. Students at the Nashville Bible School learned to converse freely with Aunt Mag. Looking into her piquant face and smiling eyes, students soon learned they could find out what Lipscomb thought on any subject by merely talking to his wife.

In every sense Aunt Mag was a Christian. She patiently kept the home affairs going while her husband was off in meetings, sometimes several weeks at a time. Although denied a child of her own, she took in Maggie Callender, daughter of her youngest sister, who was in frail health. When William Lipscomb's first wife died, William's boy, David Lipscomb, Jr. went to live with Uncle Dave and Aunt Mag. David, Jr. and Maggie Callender grew up in the Lipscomb home, helping with the chores. David, Jr. was then only twelve years old.

Aunt Mag's Christian life was marked by tireless service. At Compton's Chapel where she often attended services, she taught a class of boys and girls. Granville Lipscomb, Uncle Dave's half-brother, purchased the adjoining farm from David Lipscomb, and on it raised eight children. Aunt Mag was the doctor for all these children. But they came in handy; often when David was going to be gone over night, one of the children came over to spend the night with Aunt Mag if none else was there.

Homelife was marked by family devotions. Promptly at nine o'clock each night, the old Bible was lifted from the stand, and David Lipscomb would read a passage of Scripture. The procedure was to read a chapter each night. Lipscomb would read a verse, pass the Bible to Aunt Mag who would read another. If company was present, they shared in reading the Scriptures. When the chapter was finished, as if a signal were given, all bowed while Lipscomb himself worded the prayer.

It is unbelievable that David Lipscomb could have done the volume of work that he did without the help of his wife. With advancing age his work only increased. It was as though he realized that there were only a few more years to work for the Lord and he was determined to crowd all that he could into them. At the close of 1895 he wrote in the Gospel Advocate:

> Thirty years is an average lifetime. A comparatively small proportion of the human family devote thirty years after they are grown to the affairs of life. The last number of the Advocate closed thirty years of work for me in editing and publishing the Gospel Advocate. I began with the first week of January, 1866. The last number closed the year 1895. I lacked a few days of being thirty-five years old when I published the first number. I now lack a few days of being 65 years old.
>
> During this time, I believe, there has not been a number issued that did not have some words from my pen for the readers. But few of the readers who began with us then remain with us now. A few of the veterans still abide in the flesh. Largely a new generation has come upon the stage.[2]

A new generation had come, indeed, and the **Gospel Advocate** itself reflected the fact. With the issue of January 17, 1895 J. D. Tant began work as Field Editor. Tant, Texas-bred in spirit at least, agreed with Austin McGary that Baptist baptism was worthless. He found in David Lipscomb a cordiality and generosity that were praiseworthy. As Tant joined the **Advocate** staff, Lipscomb quickly explained, "It is not understood by his taking position with us that he agrees with all the positions of the **Advocate.** Neither do we ask this. It is not to be expected that men who think for themselves will agree about all matters of opinion."[3] Besides Tant, Lipscomb also added T. R. Burnett to the staff to conduct a column known as "Burnett's Budget," a spicy column in which nearly anything might be found.

The **Advocate** was now at the height of its power. In its long history the paper had never had a group of writers superior to F. D. Srygley, T. R. Burnett, J. D. Tant, E. G. Sewell and J. C. McQuiddy, not to mention Lipscomb himself. But clearly visible behind the movements of the paper was the guiding hand of David Lipscomb. He would never hesitate to cut off any of his writers if he felt he needed it. At the close of 1898 Burnett got engulfed in a vitriolic argument with both the Christian Courier and the **Firm Foundation.** The differences became personal and bitter, so Lipscomb promptly refused to publish a reply from Burnett in

[2]David Lipscomb, "Thirty Years' Work," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXXVIII - No. 1 (Jan. 2, 1896) p. 4.
[3]**Gospel Advocate,** 1895, p. 37.

the **Advocate.** Burnett, unable to appreciate Lipscomb's point of view was offended, and embarrassed to tell his friends that the **Advocate** would not print his articles. Lipscomb himself was far from being embarrassed:

> We are not ashamed to take the full blame of it. All know Brother Burnett is more than a match for all the writers put together at repartee and sharp retort; but the controversy became so personal that it is anything else than helpful to writers or readers. Such controversy degenerates into coarseness and bitterness. We have determined to stop it in the Advocate. In order to do this, Brother Burnett will no longer write editorially, but as a contributor to the Advocate; and his contributions will be treated like those of others; accepted when we think they will profit the readers, rejected when we think otherwise.[4]

Meanwhile, Lipscomb's ceaseless pen moved on. At the beginning of 1895 he added to his burdens, writing the commentary on the International Sunday School Lesson. Looking ahead to 1897, Lipscomb made plans to write a commentary on **Acts** since the year's lessons would all be found in here. For several years he had been planning to write a commentary on the New Testament Epistles. McGarvey's Commentary on Acts made another one unnecessary on that book. Still McGarvey's commentary had its imperfections. On a few minor points Lipscomb disagreed with McGarvey. However, he warmly commended it to his students at the Nashville Bible School, objecting mainly to the order of arrangement of the material, saying it was not suited for class room work. Lipscomb's new commentary intended to "improve" this.

Written in a hurry to meet a deadline, Lipscomb's comments were too superficial, lacking the depth which Lipscomb was capable of giving. When the book hit the market, it was freely criticized for being too elementary. Lipscomb was unmoved by the criticism saying,

> Our 'Commentary on Acts' has been well received. It has been criticized by a few in an adverse spirit, but we regard their objection as the highest compliment that

[4]David Lipscomb, "A Word of Explanation," Gospel Advocate, Vol. XLI - No. 4, (Jan. 26, 1899) p. 56.

> could be paid it. It is criticised as making no show of learning, as good for beginnings, and simple and easy to be understood in its statements. It was our study and effort to make it worthy of just such criticism. How much learning was brought to bear in studying it and in reaching our conclusions it does not become us to say, nor does the judgment of others on this point trouble us. We have never believed that it required learning and scholarship to understand the teachings of the Bible. These teachings are addressed to the unlearned and the sincere-hearted. It is adapted to their understanding. The province of learning is to determine definitely and accurately what the text says, and then understand the people to whom and the conditions and circumstances under which the things were spoken, and, when this is done, determine what impression it would make on the honest-hearted common sense, uneducated people. The scriptures were addressed to this class. The translations, commentaries, and criticisms of the learned have made the true translations of the text depend more upon a discriminating judgment than on scholarly attainments.
>
> In writing this commentary, we sought first to determine the things said; then, conditions of persons to whom spoken; and we studied to know how the things told would impress the common sense of those who heard them. Gaining this, we sought to give these in as direct and plain language, with as little show of learning, as possible. The highest triumph of true learning is to state the results and fruits of that learning in language so plain and simple that the humblest can understand it. without any display of learning. The conclusions, if correct, will commend themselves to the common sense of the masses, and stand the criticism of the learned, without any display of learning in the work.[5]

Still, Lipscomb's main line of writing was devoted to **a** variety of subjects in the **Gospel Advocate.** During 1895 he wrote largely on the question of instrumental music, giving special emphasis to the point of David's introduction of the instrument in the temple. After publishing a long series of articles on the use of the instrument, he asked for criticisms, and received two "objections" but no "criticisms."

The discussions over instrumental music had by now passed on to the second stage—the question of fellowship. By 1895, it was evident that many of the churches adopting its use would not be persuaded to exclude it. In view of this fact what should be the attitude of those who believed its use wrong? This was a

[5]David Lipscomb, **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXXIX, 1897, p. 116.

major question before the brethren in the years 1895-99. In 1897 J. B. Briney agreed to deny the following proposition in the **Christian Courier** with the intrepid James A. Harding: "The use of a musical instrument in the church in connection with the song services is a sin of such character and gravity that it justified the withdrawal of Christian fellowship by those who oppose from those who use it."« Young Jesse P. Sewell, only recently out of the Nashville Bible School, confronted W. K. Homan in Texas on the question of the use of the instrument. Homan maintained to young Sewell that his brethren ought to affirm that a Christian should withdraw from those who used the instrument. When Sewell wrote to Lipscomb, the latter responded, "I will affirm that a church in introducing an organ or any instrument of Music into the service of God, rejects God that he should not reign over them, and that a Christian cannot fellowship or build up such a church without disloyalty to God." Lipscomb thought this covered the case when he sent the statement to Sewell, but Homan was dissatisfied. Jesse wrote back asking if Lipscomb would discuss the question, "Is it sinful to use the organ to assist in the song service?" Lipscomb refused "for instruments of music are not used in religious service for that purpose. ..."

> If that was the object, one small instrument to carry the tune and be heard as little as possible and not interfere with the volume of song would be used;' but they use the deep toned, high-sounding instruments, and several at once sometimes, that drown the voices and destroy instead of assist in song. To debate this question is to raise a false issue. ... I am not willing to sanction the false pretense by discussing the false issue.[7]

Lipscomb's refusal offended Sewell for the moment and this led to the proposed discussion between Harding and Briney in the **Christian Courier,** which however, never materialized.

The whole question of fellowship was charged with electrifying results. O. P. Spiegel, a former student at Mars Hill under T. B. Larimore, asked his teacher to speak out on the things troubling the church. Larimore's long article, printed in the **Gospel Advocate,** was in a general way good, but truly evasive of the

[6]**Gospel Advocate,** 1897, p. 292.
[7]**Gospel Advocate,** 1897, p. 292.

real problems. The **Christian Standard** picked up the article and commented that Larimore "indicated a poor opinion of those who make missionary societies, stipulated support of ministers, organs, etc., tests of fellowship." When Lipscomb's attention was called to what the **Standard** said, Lipscomb replied:

> It seems to me that Brother Larimore's language will bear the construction they place upon it. I publish it as he sent it to me without comment, because I found the same difficulty in understanding it that I have always found in understanding Brother Larimore himself. Brother Larimore has in preaching, so far as I have learned, always insisted on following 'what is written'; has told in preaching: 'I favor whatever is written in the Bible; I oppose what is not written in the Scriptures.' While this is all that any one could ask of him as a general statement, when he comes in contact with the things in the church that are not written in the Scriptures, that he acknowledges are not ordained of God, he has been noncommittal, or has worked with them without condemning them. His article seems to me to correspond to this course.[8]

The suave Larimore, Lipscomb conceded, was not of the temperament to aggressively oppose anything. "He is not built that way." But Lipscomb felt that nevertheless Larimore should make a choice for either the right or the wrong side and not be neutral. Larimore responded with a much more vigorous letter, which apparently satisfied Lipscomb as to his convictions.

A similar problem presented itself with reference to Hall Calhoun, then preaching for a congregation in Paducah, Kentucky. Calhoun visited the Nashville Bible School the week of April 11, 1897, and the following Lord's Day began a meeting at Fayetteville. J. C. McQuiddy, riding with Calhoun on a train as far as Dickson, talked to Calhoun about the missionary society and the organ. Calhoun agreed that both were sinful but maintained that brethren should patiently labor with the advocates of these innovations as long as there was any hope of leading them to the right way. Two years later, Lipscomb had a conversation with Calhoun on the same subject. He asked Calhoun to write or preach a sermon on "Worship." Calhoun wrote one, and Lipscomb printed it in the **Advocate.** The sermon, Lipscomb thought,

[8] **Gospel Advocate,** 1897, p. 500.

was too general. He believed that Calhoun thought the society and instrument were sinful, but Lipscomb also thought that Calhoun was wrong in allowing his actions to encourage their use.[9]

The discussion between W. L. Butler and J. W. McGarvey in 1897 on whether the "pious unimmersed" would be saved, reflected even in Tennessee. Lipscomb, in a minor way, got into it. McGarvey asked petulantly, "Does the Bible teach that all believers under the Christian dispensation who have not been baptized, will be lost." McGarvey demanded a "yes" or "no" answer from Lipscomb. The Advocate's senior editor replied succinctly that McGarvey was on the affirmative in this, and it was up to him to show that any believer not baptized could be saved. McGarvey's attitude, Lipscomb believed, would encourage men to regard lightly obedience to the Bible.

The problem of distinguishing between the missionary society, the Gospel Advocate Publishing Company and the Nashville Bible School continued to be raised. Lipscomb was forced to give frequent attention to this angle of the problem. In answer, he wrote at great length,

> The brethren who support societies of man's make for doing the work God committed to his churches and to individual Christians because they can find no scriptural authority for their organizations try to justify them by saying that others are doing things as bad. This is always a sign of a bad cause. When a man has no better defense or support for his cause than that some other man does the same thing or something like it, he had better abandon it. It will be no justification before God for substituting human societies to do the work of his churches that some of the rest of us formed publication societies for some other purpose. But do publication societies stand related to the church as missionary societies? God has committed the work of preaching and teaching the word to churches and individuals. The elders are the divinely appointed leaders and directors of the churches. The missionary society is an association of members or churches that collect the money to support preachers, employ and direct the preachers, and so take the work out of the hands of the churches. They all come to oppose all preachers and preaching that is not "done in harmony with their organizations. Today the South Kentucky Society opposes any preaching in Kentucky that is not willing to work with them.

[9]**Gospel Advocate,** 1899, pp. 680, 1.

Does a publication society undertake to support or control preachers or do any work God has committed to the church? If so, what and how? A publication society is not a religious organization, nor for religious purposes. To show this, a few years ago the largest stockholder and business manager of the Christian Publishing Company, of St. Louis, was not a member of the church at all. He has become such of late years, I believe. The same is true of the Standard and Guide Publishing companies. I believe members of these companies a few years ago—active business members, at that—were not members of the church. I do not know how it is now. Then those who talk of the Gospel Advocate Publishing Company could not tell what it is or who compose it. It has no corporate existence. Brother Srygley is not a member of it, Brother Sewell is not; and the Company does not own the Gospel Advocate. The company prints the Advocate; it prints the Pilot; it prints the Tennessee Methodists; it did print for two or three years the Tennessee Farmer; and it prints books and pamphlets, religious and not religious. The publication company does not dictate what is written in the Advocate, and exercises not the shadow of control over it. The publication company is a business partnership to do printing and "binding. It was formed because they thought they could do the work and make something. If the publication company were to dissolve and cease to be tomorrow, it would not affect the Advocate. For twenty years of existence of the Advocate there was no publishing company. The owners of the Advocate got the Methodist Publishing House to do what they get the Gospel Advocate Publishing Company now to do for them. Brothers Sewell, McQuiddy and myself own the Advocate, and we get the Gospel Advocate Publishing Company to do the printing, binding and mailing for us. The Advocate controls no preachers or preaching. It is an instrument through which brethren and those not brethren make known what they think. The Advocate only multiplies and sends out copies of what brethren write. It only multiplies copies of what individuals write, and distributes them. It has no more power than a written letter, save it multiplies the copies, and so extends the influence; it controls no man; it seeks to control none; it has no organic connection with any church; it interferes with the work or course of no man and no church further than those who write for it tell what they think the Bible teaches on various subjects, and leave all men to accept or reject what they write, exactly as the individual preacher or writer does. Publishing a paper is no more a religious institution than running a farm, a factory, or a store.

Christian men ought to so direct any business as to build up and help forward pure and undefiled religion. I have always tried to do this both on the farm and in the publishing or printing business. There is no more likeness between a society to have preaching done and a publica-

tion company than there is between a society and a partnership to sell goods.[10]

As to the Bible School, Lipscomb insisted,

> There has never been a question with me as to whether a Bible School is right or not. The question that has troubled me is, Can a Christian teach or support a school that is not a Bible School? 'Whatever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus.' (Col. 3:17) To do it in his name is to do as he would do were he in our places. Does any one believe, if Jesus were here as we are, he would teach a school in which he was not permitted to teach the Bible as the most important consideration of life? If he would not, his servants should not. Does any one believe he would send his children to a school in which the Bible was not the chiefest text-book?[11]

Brother James A. Harding's "Defense of The Bible School" was printed in the **Gospel Advocate** in early June, 1897. Srygley, agreeing with Harding's sentiments, wrote:

> Few people will object to 'an educational institution, located in Nashville' or anywhere else, 'in which the usual college curriculum is taught, and in which the Bible also is taught daily by Christians.' Any school is to be commended which has no other motive than 'to fit one to live a wise, useful, and happy life here' and prepare 'to live happily thereafter.' The school which seeks to accomplish this by teaching the Bible daily along with 'the usual college curriculum,' and by having no teachers but Christians, is especially to be commended. It is certainly n»t wrong for Christians to teach school, and still more obviously is it not wrong to teach the Bible. Brother Harding also puts his defense on a basis that will be generally accepted when he claims for his work and his school nothing but 'the authority that every Christian has to work for a living, and to teach the Bible as he does it.' At this point he might have cited as authority Paul's teaching, as translated by the American Committee in the Revised Version of the New Testament (Titus 3:9), 'that they which have believed God may be careful to profess honest occupations,' as well as 'the authority that Paul had for making tents while he was planting the church at Corinth. Instead of opposing or discouraging Brother Harding and the school on this basis, the right thing to do is to encourage the starting of just such schools in every neighborhood in the country. So far as the Nashville Bible School is concerned, the important thing with those who have the management of it is to keep it strictly within the limits of Brother Harding's defense in the matter of practical operations.[12]

[10]David Lipscomb, Gospel Advocate, Vol. XXXVIII, 1896, p. 276.
[11]David Lipscomb, "Teaching The Bible," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XLVI No. 32, (Aug. 11, 1904) p. 505.
[12]F. D. Srygley, "From The Papers," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXXIX - No. 23, (June 10, 1897) p. 353.

Harding, however, was keenly conscious of the force of the objection: "When you who have started the work pass away, and it falls into other hands, they will pervert it and make it a curse to the cause of Christ." The memory of Bethany College was too recent to be forgotten. So, Harding replied, "We do not deny the possibility of this. True, we are doing all we can to prevent it. We are accumulating no endowment fund. We are trying to arrange so that if the school should be perverted, the property would be sold by the trustees and the money given back to the original givers, but we may not succeed in what we are laboring for. Greater men than we have tried it and failed."[13]

It was still necessary for Lipscomb's pen to give some attention to the problem of Rationalism, but now the problem had struck closer to home. Since P. S. Fall left the Church Street congregation, this local church has been drifting rapidly into the ways of the Christian Churches over the country. It was no surprise to Lipscomb in December, 1897, when Vine Street brought in the organ. Fall and the elders, J. H. Ewing, J. G. Houston, S. S. Wharton, and George Shields, had opposed it. All of these by 1897 were dead except Shields, and he refused any longer to serve as an elder. Church Street (now Vine Street) was a new congregation.

R. Lin Cave's preaching career at Vine Street was everything but pleasant to Lipscomb. R. Lin, like his brother in the flesh, R. C. Cave, had often expressed his conviction that one would be saved even though he did not believe that Jesus was the Son of God. Cave agreed that the church ought to accept all persons who thought they had been baptized, so recognizing sprinkling. These thoughts Cave had frequently expressed to Lipscomb, Harding, F. W. Smith, F. B. Srygley, F. D. Srygley and T. W. Brents. By the fall of 1895 Lipscomb felt he was compelled to state these matters in the **Advocate.** When George Shields heard of Lipscomb's intention, he asked Lipscomb to have a conference with Cave first. Lipscomb, although sick and busy, agreed to meet. They talked privately several times. Nothing resulted to prevent Lipscomb's

[13]James A. Harding, "Questions About The Bible School Answered," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXXIX, - No. 14, (April 8, 1897) p. 213.

articles. Lipscomb was later severely criticized by Cave's partisan followers for persecuting Cave. It is not unlikely that this episode caused the Vine Street church to throw caution to the wind and introduce the organ when they did.

The Nashville Bible School continued to demand much of Lipscomb's attention. Although he lived several miles out in the country, he managed to teach for an hour and a half each day without pay. Occasional changes in the faculty strengthened the school but did not relieve Lipscomb's work. J. N. Armstrong was added as a teacher in the fall of 1897.

Still the Bible School was growing, both in the number of students and in influence. During the fourth session, 1894-5, 88 students were enrolled. School closed the following spring with the announcement that 48 preachers had been enrolled and eighteen young women. David Lipscomb and James A. Harding had taught every day, Harding still insisting that his students memorize a chapter a day from the Bible. T. W. Brents, during the previous session, had given a series of helpful lectures. The Bible School was badly in need of recitation rooms and a chapel, but money was coming in in sums from fifty cents to five thousand dollars. So the future looked bright.

The following year, the Bible school enrolled 110 pupils—the largest number yet. At the commencement exercises in May, 1896, diplomas were given to five men: J. N. Armstrong, R. C. White, J. E. Dunn, L. K. Harding, and G. W. McQuiddy. These diplomas were "handsomely bound books with parchment leaves, as fine as the bookmaker's art makes them." Lipscomb spoke solemnly to the graduating class, giving charges that were "full of rich, strong thought, which could only have been given by one who has been drinking deeply for many years from the fountain of all true wisdom and prudence."

It was expected, when the fall session opened in 1896, that there would be 150 boarding students. The **Nashville American** reported that "friends" of the school are moving into the vicinity

and building large, commodious houses around it." The goal was a little too ambitious, for by the fall of 1897, 130 students were enrolled.

An important phase of the Nashville Bible School's work was a series of lectures delivered each year. Some outstanding preacher was selected to deliver the lectures, which, as a rule were on some controversial subject. G. G. Taylor, who held the opposite view to David Lipscomb on the Christian's relation to civil government, was invited to speak on that subject beginning June 1, 1897, and continuing as long as he felt necessary. Afterwards, he was "deluged with questions." The following spring, E. G. Sewell lectured on "The Appointment of Elders and Deacons." He was the "recognized champion of those who oppose the laying on of hands." Earlier the same year Granville Lipscomb delivered four lectures on "Saul of Tarsus." The next fall J. D. Tant discussed the question of Baptist baptism before the Bible School. "For many years," Tant wrote, "I have held that those who have been baptized by Methodist, Baptist, and other sects have been unscripturally baptized, and that when said parties come to the church of Christ they should be baptized by the authority of God." James A. Harding argued the question with Tant before the Bible School. The following year both men discussed it in the **Gospel Advocate).** This controversy received more than its share of attention in the **Advocate** over a period of years. Lipscomb complained, "Brother McGary refuses to see or to correctly represent me on this subject. I am very sorry for him in this course."

Meanwhile, David Lipscomb's attention was never turned for long away from the Fanning Orphan School. Charlotte Fanning was stricken with paralysis in December, 1895, and was never able to speak again. She died at three o'clock on the afternoon of August 15, 1896, and was buried in the front yard of the Orphan School the following afternoon. The school missed her influence considerably for the next few years. Lipscomb continued to work as a member of the Board of Trustees, and visited the school as often as possible encouraging the girls to be "neat and tidy." At the commencement exercise held June 8, 1899, he

delivered a short talk, although Col. George N. Tillman was the featured speaker.

Aside from his work with the **Advocate,** the Nashville Bible School and the Fanning Orphan School, Lipscomb still had his preaching to consider. The spread of the kingdom of God was a thought close to his heart. He maintained a lively interest in the Japanese work where J. M. McCaleb was doing so much. It discouraged him to see the work of the Lord lag at any place. The first week of August, 1895, he spent with some old friends at Bean's Creek in Franklin County. The eleven congregations in the county were weak and inactive, but Lipscomb spent his time encouraging them to do more work for the Lord.

The Campbell Street Church in Louisville, Kentucky, known far and wide for its faithfulness to the word, had been urging David Lipscomb to come north and preach for them for some time. The time seemed never to be ripe. Finally, Lipscomb squeezed in four days from March 1 to 4, 1896, to be with M. C. Kurfees and the congregation. "He preached six discourses, which were filled with the word of God, and delivered with great tenderness, pathos, and power." Kurfees reflected, "It seems impossible to listen to him without being impressed that the controlling purpose and the only purpose of all his preaching is to please God, and thus bring the greatest good to man."

It was an enjoyable and profitable repast for David Lipscomb from the busy work connected with the **Advocate** and the Bible School. His stay in Kurfees' home was most enjoyable. The visit with friends was also pleasant. The widow of W. A. Broadhurst came several miles to see him. W. J. Loos, now connected with the **Apostolic Guide,** and a group of young preachers, came to hear him. Lipscomb hoped to see his friend, G. G. Taylor, but sickness prevented Taylor's coming to the meeting. J. M. Luck, E. L. Powell, Lon Jackson, and C. W. Dick were among those who did attend. This was Lipscomb's first time to worship in Louisville, since that Lord's Day thirty years before when he had come to the Floyd and Chestnut Streets congregation where

T. P. Haley preached, to ask money to aid the destitute people of the South. But it was a good meeting. Afterwards, Kurfees wrote.

> Among what are called well-balanced men, David Lipscomb is probably without a superior on the church of God. He can come as near seeing faults in his friends and virtues in his foes, where either exists, as any man I have ever seen. It is truly refreshing to hear him in the social circle, as well as in the pulpit, where these qualities shine out in a manifest desire to do justice to all. He made a fine impression for the Savior of men on this community. From the beginning good and increasing crowds greeted him; and, with the exception perhaps of Sunday, the largest crowd was present on Wednesday night.[14]

His duties at home prevented his leaving on many long or frequent trips, but it is nothing short of amazing that he could go as often as he did. He spent a week in the middle of 1895 with the church in Bardwell, Kentucky, where the congregation was having trouble over the organ and societies. E. G. Sewell was to have gone, but sickness prevented. Lipscomb baptized three, spoke sixteen times, and spent most of the meeting with a Brother Ratliffe, who lived nearby. "It was a pleasant week's change from our ordinary and pressing labors at home." Later that year, he preached at Hille's Chapel in Hopkinsville, Kentucky.

The following year his travels were somewhat limited, but at the close of the year he managed to leave school long enough for a meeting and a business trip. The third and fourth Lord's Days of November, he spent in Flat Creek, at the home of J. D. Floyd. He was surprised to meet here an old Sister Betsy Broadaway, a ninety-two year old lady who had come several miles to see him. She had gone to school with David Lipscomb's father's first wife back in Spottsylvania County, Virginia. She was present when Granville Lipscomb united with the church near Owl Hollow in Franklin County. So, there was plenty to talk about with her. During the meeting, Lipscomb spoke sixteen times. The weather was ideal, but school duties called him home. The next month he made a business trip to East Tennessee, visiting Charleston, Calhoun, and Cleveland. He preached in the middle of the

[14]M. C. Kurfees, **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XXXVIII, 1896, p. 263.

week at Calhoun. This was the home town of old Rees Jones, one of the early Tennessee preachers that Lipscomb knew about when he was a boy. Jones was not only a preacher but a blacksmith. Some of the brethren took Lipscomb around and showed him the blacksmith shop where Jones had worked many years before.

During the school term, Lipscomb planned to stay as close to home as possible. The middle of April, 1897, he could conduct a meeting at Green Street in Nashville and still not miss his classes at the Bible School. The fourth Sunday of the month he was expected to be at Mallards, in Maury County, when the church opened its new meeting house, but was unable to attend. As soon as school was over the last of May, he prepared to leave for Guthrie, Kentucky. He spoke twice a day here for ten days. He spoke on, "What is God?" suggesting that man's relation to Him was one of implicit obedience. He also discussed,

> Who was Jesus? What has he done for us, and our obligation to do the will of God as he did the will of His Father. What is the Holy Spirit and what has he done for the world? The New Testament is a book of spiritual direction. To do what the Spirit required, not adding to or taking from, is to be led by the Spirit of God. The word of God is the seed of the kingdom. All that is developed in the kingdom or church of God must be first enveloped in the seed. Whatever is not in the seed is a lichen or parasite on the tree that may for a time add to its verdure and beauty, but in the end saps its lifeblood and destroys it.[15]

Just before school opened, he conducted a short meeting at New Hermon in Bedford County. On Friday, September 17, he left Nashville for a quick trip to Virginia.

The next year, 1898, Lipscomb's meetings were limited. He conducted one in early September at Singleton in Bedford County, and immediately followed it with one at Epley, Kentucky. On Wednesday night, October 12, he performed the ceremony uniting his half-brother, Granville, to Miss Leela I. White at Smyrna, Tennessee.

[15]**Gospel Advocate,** 1897, p. 420.

The beginning of 1899 Lipscomb faced the fact that before long he would lose the strength of James A. Harding around Nashville. Harding began publication of a paper called **The Way,** a monthly periodical. Already, overtures were being made for Harding to go to Bowling Green, Kentucky, and start a new school, similar to the Nashville Bible School. Lipscomb and Harding made it clear that there were no differences between them. Lipscomb, with his usual charitableness, was glad to see Harding reach out and do more good, and made it clear that he would rejoice to see Bible schools all over the land, that he was not selfishly interested in building up just the Nashville Bible School.

Nevertheless, there is room for some question. The Nashville Bible School was changing some of its plans. A part of the change looked toward building up a permanent endowment, and eventually, the offering of degrees. Harding had spoken out often against both. He did not want a permanent endowment for the fear the school would one day get so large and powerful that it would tear down the very thing it was founded to build up. As for degrees, these were "vain" things, easily secured, and tended to puff man up in his pride. The school changed on these things. Harding left. Is it possible that Harding left out of a matter of disagreement on the change? In the absence of any documentary proof, the answer is one of mere conjecture.

Through the school year of 1899 Lipscomb preached often close to home. He spoke at Portland, in Sumner County, the third Lord's Day of April, and received an invitation to conduct a meeting there in August. After the Portland meeting the first of August, Lipscomb went to Philadelphia, in Warren County for a short meeting, and then on to Richmond in Bedford County. He held several meetings in a row, and failing to consider that he was not as young as he once was, injured his back. For the next six months all of his preaching was done sitting down.

David Lipscomb faced the dawn of the new century with confidence and determination. Although he was just shy of his

three score years and tern, his health was on the whole better than usual. The infirmities of age were slowly becoming more apparent. He tired more quickly than usual, and a nervous trembling put his hands in ceaseless motion. All of his life he had tried to do the will of God. How long he would live, he had no way of knowing, but he would follow the same principle of action in the future as in the past. He had made many mistakes in life, "but had never knowingly done what he believed wrong. Men were so often partial, looking at one side only. They saw only the bad points in their enemies, and only the good in their friends. Lipscomb was impressed with this thought as his tiring fingers ran through the pages of F. D. Srygley's new book, Biographies And Sermons. Lipscomb read Srygley's biography of David Lipscomb and thought to himself that Srygley had "picked up a few good things and partial successes" of his life and left out the evils and failures. This was the reason Lipscomb was not favorable to biographies: they were more often than not partial. So Lipscomb spoke to Srygley about it. He told him how he had been unfair in that he had mentioned only his good points, leaving out the bad. Srygley thought for a moment, smiled, and told Lipscomb that he need not worry for his enemies would take care of that.

Lipscomb mused meditatively, "Possibly things may be adjusted in that way."[16]

[16]David Lipscomb, "A New Book," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XLI - No. 3, (Jan. 19, 1899), p. 41.

CHAPTER XVII

A NEW CENTURY DAWNS

As the new century dawned, David Lipscomb wrote in the **Gospel Advocate:**

> This number of the Gospel Advocate is the last one for the century, and closes thirty-five years of work I have given to the Advocate. This is considered an average lifetime, and usually spans the period of one man's active labors. I had earnestly desired by this time to have closed up my business relations with the Advocate and the publishing company, that the business might rest on younger shoulders and that I might write only as I had something to say. I have not been able to do so. The difficulty has been to find a suitable person willing to do the work and bear the responsibilities for the pay there is in it; this, too, in the face of the impression made by many that it has been a source of profit to those who manage it
>
> There are not many names on our list now that were there thirty-five years ago. The generation then living has passed away, and a new one has arisen. A few that then were with us still linger on the shores of mortality, while the great number are gone. The rest must soon follow.
>
> While my general health is now much better than it was when I began this work, I feel very sensibly the infirmities of age creeping over me, and the incurable disease, old age, will soon finish its work. I do not now believe I will dread or shrink from the change when it comes. I have tried through three-score years and ten to keep a conscience void of offense toward God and man. I remember when yet a youth my desire was to go through the world without any one's being able to say he was the worse off by *my* having lived in it. I have tried to keep that before me through life. This falls far short of the ideal placed before man by God. This, if it were successfully lived up to, is only a negative life. The ideal God puts before man is, while injuring and harming none, to help all whom we can help. To do no evil is well; to do all the good in our power is the work to which God invites every human soul. I have tried to do that which would help my fellow-men. I have not always succeeded. I have not tried to do what would please them. I have tried to please them for their good to edification. I have tried to get them to be pleased with that which would build them up, do them good, and fit them for the service of God forever. Only in seeking the good of others can man find his own true good; only in seeking to live up and save others can he save himself. If all men could realize this, how it would change this world of woe into a heaven of bliss. . . .[1]

[1]David Lipscomb, "The Closing Year And Century," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XLII - No. 52 (Dec. 27, 1900) p. 824.

January 21, 1901, David Lipscomb celebrated his seventieth birthday. His desire to close up all his business affairs, recede from public life and allow others to take the lead was not granted. For thirty-five years he had fought the introduction of instrumental music and the missionary society. No matter how great his desire to allow someone else to take over the battle, Lipscomb must still be in the front line for a few years longer. This fact dramatically forced itself upon him in the fall of 1902 when the church at Newbern, in Dyer County, went to court over the possession of the meetinghouse when the organ was put in the worship.

The building at Newbern had been built long before either instrumental music or the Tennessee State Missionary Society was thought of in Tennessee. For the past decade the church had been moving rapidly toward trouble with a growing sentiment favoring the society and the organ. By 1902 the die was cast, and those favoring the "innovations" decided to delay no longer. Some of the old brethren approached Lipscomb to ask his advice. Lipscomb made it clear that they were in the right, and felt confident the law would back them. Nevertheless, he counseled strongly against going to law, encouraging them to suffer wrong rather than do wrong.

> "The strife and contention of a lawsuit, (he explained) will result in a spiritual declension and loss that cannot be compensated for by any pecuniary or property gains. It would be better and more in harmony with the spirit of the religion of Christ to quietly and earnestly protest against the wrong, but bear it for Christ's sake and seek another place of worship and diligently and meekly strive to build up a faithful church of Christ in Newbern."

Lipscomb's counsel went unheeded. In November, 1902, A. H. Nicks, S. W. Porter and some others filed in court a charge against J. S. McCorkle and the pro-organ party "alleging that they have corrupted the faith, principles and practices of said church, and diverted it from the purposes for which it was founded and dedicated, by the introduction of 'innovations' which are unscriptural, sacreligious, and objectionable to the members." The charge was that the true Christians had built the house, and a new element had come along, desiring the organ, having church festivals, ice cream suppers, etc. to raise money, and to align them-

selves with the Tennessee Christian Missionary Association. It was said that this organization would furnish the preacher instead of allowing the church to do so. W. W. Phares had already been hired as the new preacher, and was, of course, sympathetic with the new element in the church.[2]

The filing of the lawsuit came as a disappointment to Lipscomb. He decided that still he might avert the trial, so went to G. N. Tillman, one of the managers of the State Society in Tennessee, asking that they work up a plan agreeable to all, to avoid the trial. Lipscomb reasoned that there would be other similar circumstances coming up, and that it would be wise to set a precedent here that could be followed in other cases. Tillman was adamant. Meanwhile, R. P. Meeks joined Tillman and the two worked feverishly to raise money to conduct the trial. They publicized the coming trial widely, saying that the property of all the churches in the state was at stake. They served notice that they were going to introduce the testimony of J. B. Briney, C. L. Loos, J. W. McGarvey, Burris Jenkins, Hall Calhoun, and W. T. Moore to prove their contentions. [3]

Beginning in the spring of 1903, Lipscomb was on the witness stand more or less regularly for 18 months. The lawyers for the society presented writings from the pen of Lipscomb over twenty years old, alleging that Lipscomb had once favored the organ. Lipscomb positively denied this, but added, "If I had changed in twenty years, I do not see why it should disconcert me. I have changed on many questions within that period. Had I occupied the position assigned me, and changed, I would feel a godly pride in having changed from a position of error and dishonor to one of truth and honor to him and his word."[4] Lipscomb's testimony was chiefly that of reading the testimony of early men of the restoration movement on the subjects at issue. Two-thirds of his time was given to reviewing the writings introduced by G. N. Tillman and R. P. Meeks. C. L. Loos, J. W. McGarvey, and Hall Calhoun, by their writings, testified that the use of the instru-

[2]**Gospel Advocate,** 1902, p. 792.
[3]**Gospel Advocate,** 1904, p. 773.
[4]**Gospel Advocate,** 1905, p. 425.

ment had a tendency to change the true spiritual worship into artistic entertainment. As to what to do when the instrument was introduced, they differed. McGarvey advised the people to leave and start a new congregation; Loos said the instrument was sinful, but not so serious a one to create disruption; Calhoun thought it was a sin, but thought it might be used as a help to the song provided it was no part of the worship. Now that the trial was in progress, Lipscomb was determined that the truth should be given a fair representation. He decided then to spend all the time necessary to accomplish this end.

The decision was finally handed down by the circuit court in April, 1905, in favor of the organ and society party. "The judgment of the court was the things complained of were departures, but not of sufficient importance to justify the intervention of the court." The pro-organ party had said during the trial that when the organ was used as a part of the worship, it was sinful; but they defended it on the ground that it was an aid to worship. Lipscomb, on the other hand, had insisted that it was "a distinct service, and when persisted in, always supersedes and destroys congregational singing." The court, passing on this phase of the question, said that the claim that the organ was not a part of the worship was untenable and it could not be considered as merely an aid to worship.[5]

Aside from the strenuous days spent at the Newbern trial, Lipscomb obviously slowed down in his encounters with his foes. The battle was very largely turned over to other hands. Daniel Sommer, truculent editor of the **Octographic Review,** was thundering heavily against all Bible schools. But his attack was met by the equally vituperative James A. Harding. Lipscomb on the whole followed his policy of ignoring Sommer. When someone handed him a clipping of a barrage from Sommer, Lipscomb commented,

> So long as parents send their children to school, I do not believe there is any sin in providing schools in which the Scriptures are taught to these children. I do not believe any parent will be damned for sending his children

[5]**Gospel Advocate,** 1905, p. 313.

> to schools in which they will be taught the Bible, instead of those in which they will not be taught it. I do not believe any child will be damned for learning the Holy Scriptures at school, and I do not believe any teacher will be condemned for teaching the Bible to children in schools. I cannot believe the editors of the Review believe any of these things. I am sorry for them if they do.[6]

The question of the Nashville Bible School's being a parallel to the missionary society came up, but Lipscomb turned the struggle over to his new writer, E. A. Elam, who in 1901 carried on quite a discussion with W. L. Butler on the subject in the **Advocate.**

Meanwhile, the Gospel Advocate itself was undergoing a reorganization to improve its status. Beginning with the issue of July 3, 1902, the Gospel Advocate Publishing Company was succeeded by the McQuiddy Printing Co. When the Gospel Advocate Publishing Company was begun, the plan was that it should be purely a business concern. Since the paper had to hire somebody to do its printing, it would hire the publishing company to do it. It addition to printing the **Advocate,** it would do a regular line of printing on a strictly commercial basis. But, As McQuiddy complained, "Under the old name it was hard to get some people to understand that we were doing a general line of printing, the name indicating that we were doing only religious work." So, from their establishment on 232 North Market Street the McQuiddy Printing Co. was born.

Changes in the editorial staff of the paper necessarily had to be made frequently. T. R. Burnett, as already noted, faded out of the picture in 1899. On August 2, 1900, F. D. Srygley passed away, so the **Advocate** lost much of its power. At the beginning of the year, 1901, E. A. Elam stepped in as front page editor of the paper, in Srygley's former role. The next July, Alfred Ellmore merged his **Gospel Echo** with the **Advocate,** and then began editing a department known as "Gospel Echo Department." The following spring Jesse P. Sewell was added to the editorial staff. At the same time, while J. C. McQuiddy was on a visit to Dallas, he talked Joe S. Warlick into doing editorial work on the **Advocate.** So the **Advocate,** despite its losses, pressed on.

[6]**Gospel Advocate,** 1905, p. 425.

Meanwhile, important changes with respect to the Nashville Bible School were now in store. Lipscomb was in the middle of these. Beginning in September, 1901, William Anderson, a close friend to Lipscomb, was chosen to be Superintendent of the Bible School. A student at Franklin College in 1866, he had been baptized by Tolbert Fanning. Thereafter, he became widely known for his ability as a teacher. Anderson replaced Harding who that fall went to Bowling Green to begin the Potter Bible School at the invitation of C. C. Potter and wife. With Harding went his son-in-law, J. N. Armstrong. But Anderson was in frail health. A year later, upon the advice of his doctor, he was told to avoid confinement in a class loom. Paul Slayden was selected to take over Anderson's teaching chores. On Thursday, May 31, 1905, Anderson died suddenly.

In the November 27 issue, 1902, of the Advocate Lipscomb announced that 62 acres of land, in the suburbs of the city, near a car line, had been donated to the Bible School. He proceeded then to ask for funds to erect the necessary buildings, adding, "1 have found more satisfaction in teaching the Bible to the young men and women at school than in any work of my life."[7] The next February, Lipscomb announced that the foundations of two buildings had been laid. One building, 44 feet wide and 75 feet long was to be two stories high, and contain a chapel, eight recitation rooms and a library. The other building was made in the shape of a "T," and was 116 feet by 125 feet, and was to be three stories high when completed. This was to be the "lodging room" for boys, a kitchen and a dining room. A residence on the 62 acres was to be used as a dormitory for girls. The buildings were to cost between sixteen and seventeen thousand dollars. The present buildings of the Bible School, Lipscomb estimated, could be sold for twelve thousand dollars, making it necessary for friends to contribute another five thousand dollars. When school opened the next fall, the buildings were not yet fully completed despite the fact that many small donations had been received. Within the next few months the buildings were finished, but the

[7]**Gospel Advocate,** 1902, p. 761.

school had incurred an indebtedness of two thousand dollars. This debt bothered Lipscomb, so again he took to the **Advocate,** asking for funds.

Lipscomb's teaching continued as before. The school year, 1889-1900, he took his classes through the New Testament, except the epistles of John and Revelation. They examined every sentence and clause about which there could be the least difficulty. In the old Testament they went from Genesis through all the historical books, the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Hosea. Besides, they studied such questions as "Who is God?", and others associated with this.

In February, 1902, M. C. Kurfees delivered a series of lectures at the Nashville Bible School. There was a ripe friendship between Kurfees and Lipscomb. A year later, Kurfees spent a few days in Nashville on a return trip from meetings at Lavergne and Rock Spring. He ate dinner with Lipscomb and Aunt Mag. Lipscomb, Dr. J. S. Ward, and William Anderson then showed him over the grounds of Nashville Bible School. The Bible School was now at the home of Lipscomb, a few miles south of the city.

On May 28, 1903, William Anderson, David Lipscomb and T. B. Larimore spoke to the graduating class of the Bible School. Lipscomb, more and more impressed with the solemn thought that man's duty was to be submissive to the laws of God, went on to state that if everybody would do the will of God, there would be no failures in life. He proceeded from this to discuss the way to attain success. His address was one that proceeded spontaneously from the heart; it was not a prepared oration. Larimore, recognizing its greatness and simplicity, paid tribute to it, speaking only briefly himself.

As the years pressed upon him, Lipscomb preached less at great distances, staying close to home. He spoke at the Tennessee State Prison on Sunday, February 18, 1900, reading Deuteronomy 10:12, 13, and urged all the inmates to make an honest effort for a nobler and higher life. Lipscomb's half-brother, Granville, was chaplain of the prison. He spent June 15, 1902, with the church

at Rock Spring in Jackson County, Alabama, on the occasion of their fifty-fifth anniversary. There were four to five hundred people present. With Lipscomb was William Anderson. Lipscomb spoke on Saturday night and twice on Sunday. The Lord's Day was a beautiful day, cloudy but no rain in sight.

The first part of 1904, Lipscomb's eyes bothered him considerably. He could barely see either to read or to write, so his articles appeared less often in the **Advocate.** Word reached him in the spring to come to Coleman, Texas to look after probating the will of E. L. Lindsay, who had willed a great amount of goods to the Fanning Orphan School. His first reaction was that he was too old for the trip. On second thought, his eyes being bad made it impossible for him to do much at home. Besides this, his hearing had become worse, so he could barely manage to carry on a conversation. He decided that since he was almost worthless around home, maybe the best thing he could do was take the trip.

He departed from Nashville on Tuesday, July 5, and arrived in Coleman the following Saturday. He first made inquiry about services for the next Lord's Day. He wrote a note and sent it to Brother J. R. Lane. In a short while, Lane and a Brother White, the preacher, came to call on him. Lipscomb was informed that the church there had recently divided. "The 'digressives'—they call them in Texas (I have never named them; I have hoped against hope that they would see the sin of their course and turn to the first, fundamental principle of the Bible teaching and duty to God, and the only possible basis of union among the people of God—that is, follow the law of God, adding nothing thereto, taking nothing from it)—hold the meetinghouse." The loyal brethren were meeting in the Cumberland Presbyterian meetinghouse, Lipscomb learned, at three o'clock each Lord's Day. But the "digressives," having no preacher that day, offered Lipscomb the use of the meetinghouse, so Lipscomb spoke twice on Lord's Day.

As Lipscomb entered, the Sunday School was giving a closing performance on the organ. A few left as Lipscomb entered. They

did without the organ that day, and outwardly, at least, Lipscomb observed that unity and good feeling seemed to prevail.

The next day Lipscomb went to the court house. Lindsay had died leaving thirty thousand dollars worth of property. The will had been made out several years ago, dividing a large portion of this between the Fanning Orphan School, the Nashville Bible School, and "the work of gospel evangelizing." Lindsay's sisters and a brother wanted it carried out just as he left it, but some nephews were contesting the will. The case was postponed by the court, so Lipscomb packed up and returned to Nashville. On the return trip he stopped off at Dallas and visited with Jesse P. Sewell whose heart was full of Southwestern Christian College to be opened that fall at Denton, Texas.

Lipscomb was not alone growing old. His youthful friends were also yielding to time's inexorable demands. Lipscomb and E. G. Sewell and their "better halves" received invitations to attend the golden wedding anniversary of J. W. McGarvey on March 23, 1903. The gala affair was to be held at the gymnasium of the University of Kentucky. Lipscomb, while unable to attend, nevertheless reflected,

> We would be glad to be present to congratulate them on their long and happy married life and to extend wishes for long years of continued happiness to come. We have always esteemed President McGarvey, and have tried to show our esteem by approving him when right and criticizing him when he goes wrong. This is true friendship when rightly viewed. . . . I have heard that he says he prefers criticism to compliment. This is praiseworthy. I know then, he thinks well of me. I give both approval and criticism. They grow out of my esteem for the man. He is so often and so thoroughly right on so many points that I feel indignant when he tramples on his own principles to go wrong.[8]

Lipscomb could look back with the melancholy thought that many of his friends were departing this life. His father-in-law, Henry Zellner, died in November, 1899. Now, on June 27, 1904, a good friend, Dr. J. B. Neil, one of the deacons of the South Nashville

[8]David Lipscomb, "Golden Wedding," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. XLV - No.
11 (March 12, 1909) p. 169.

Church, died. Neil, a Civil War veteran, had at the outbreak of the war enlisted in the Seventeenth Tennessee Regiment, and was with Lee at the surrender at Appomattox. His home was at Lewisburg, Tennessee. The Frank Cheatham Bivouac attended the funeral in body, while Lipscomb, C. A. Moore, J. C. Martin, Granville Lipscomb and George Gowen each spoke briefly. Lipscomb lost another friend when T. W. Brents died on Wednesday, June 29, 1905, at the home of his son, A. C. Brents in Lewisburg.

The preachers that Lipscomb had known in early life were passing rapidly off the scene. The **Advocate** was filled with names of a new generation of men. Lipscomb felt the loneliness, but he still had Aunt Mag by his side. They faced the fact of the infirmities of old age with quiet Christian serenity, resolute but always submissive to the guidance of God.

CHAPTER XVIII

"VETERANS OF THE CROSS"

The closing exercises of the Nashville Bible School were held the last of May, 1908. David Lipscomb and E. G. Sewell sat together on the platform. F. W. Smith sat quietly in the audience in an unusually somber mood. "As I sat in the audience and looked upon these gray and aged veterans of the cross," he later reflected, "contemplating the great work of their lives and realizing that time will soon come when they will quit the walks of men, unrestrained tears dimmed my eyes. They both delivered short addresses that were full of soul food. . . . "[1]

Lipscomb's health was slowly declining. There were always ailments coming along to check his activity for a time. Just before school closed in the spring of 1905 a carbuncle came on the back of his neck that caused him severe pain. He missed the closing exercises at Fanning Orphan School. Especially did he regret this since his friend, Senator Edward Ward Carmack was the scheduled speaker. As things worked out, Carmack was unable to attend anyway. While laid up with the carbuncle, Lipscomb did not feel like writing. Rummaging through the old files of the **Advocate** for 1856, he came across the first article, and reprinted it in the paper for 1905.

No other illness occurred until early in January, 1909, just a few days before Lipscomb passed his seventy-eighth birthday. So ill did he become that many of his friends thought he would not recover. It was not until the middle of April that he showed any improvement for the better. By the middle of the next month he was able to drive out of the house in the buggy for a few times. By Sunday, May 16, he was well enough to attend worship services at the Reid Avenue Church. By June 10 the **Advocate** announced that he "made three visits to the office last week, but is still very weak." During the spring, P. Y. Pendleton

[1]F. W. Smith, "Gems of Thought," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. L - No. 22, (May 28, 1908) p. 345.

dropped by for a visit, and offered Lipscomb the use of his house in Florida if he would go there and rest. But Lipscomb kindly declined the offer.

It was necessary for Lipscomb to confine most of his activities close to home. He celebrated his seventy-fifth birthday on January 21, 1906, by preaching twice that day at the Nashville Bible School. The spring came and it was a time of happy reunions. A reunion was planned at the Fanning Orphan School for teachers, students, and friends of Franklin College, Hope Institute, Minerva College and Fanning Orphan School for June 12. The exercises were held at the Fanning Orphan School grounds. Lipscomb spoke on the character and work of Tolbert Fanning, while Sewell discoursed the influence of Fanning on his life while he was a student at Franklin College. It was a great occasion for the Orphan School. Just two weeks before, Lipscomb had attended the graduating exercises, and as chairman of the Board, gave one diploma to one girl. F. W. Smith had spoken on "Character Building" while both Lipscomb and Sewell gave talks on the work of the school.

Meanwhile, another reunion was held May 23 at the Nashville Bible School as a result of plans laid by C. E. W. Dorris, John E. Dunn and J. S. Ward. A thousand former students, and friends of the Bible School attended the joyous occasion.

During the year, Lipscomb spoke frequently at the Nashville Bible School. In July he managed to preach at Coopertown, and in December, at Owen's Chapel in Williamson County. The middle of November, his brother William's wife died, so William moved in at the Fanning Orphan School with his son. William's health was broken. On February 7,1908, at 10:30 P. M. he quietly passed away.

Lipscomb's preaching during 1907 was largely confined to Nashville. He spoke at Alberta Avenue, Third Avenue, South, Waverly Place, and the Nashville Bible School. On Sunday, April 20, he preached in Franklin. He, together with E. A. Elam and J. C. McQuiddy preached at the commencement services of the

Nashville Bible School on May 23. A week later, he spoke at the graduating exercises of the Fanning Orphan School.

The **Gospel Advocate,** meanwhile, was still a growing concern. The middle of November, 1906, it moved into its new quarters at 317-19 Fifth Avenue, North and Sewell realized that they were getting old. They suggested to J. C. McQuiddy that they reorganize the company again to leave them out of any of the responsibility. So, two years later J. C. McQuiddy resigned the position of managing editor which he had held since 1885, and turned it over to J. W. Shepherd. The business of the **Gospel Advocate** and the McQuiddy Printing Company was to be kept entirely separate, with McQuiddy now becoming the sole owner of the Printing Company. With this new arrangement, Lipscomb and Sewell felt that new managers could take over in the event of their deaths with the least amount of complications.

That reorganization out of the way, Lipscomb laid plans for a trip to Red Boiling Springs. He had been noticing that Aunt Mag looked tired and persuaded her to come along so she, too, could enjoy a rest.

Most of the year, 1908, Lipscomb wrote in the **Gospel Advocate** on "Oneness In Christ." These studies pointed out the basis of how Christians could be united. They were comparatively "tame" in comparison to the usual thunder that roared from his "heavy artillery." No doubt Lipscomb was mellowing some with old age.

When the national census of 1906 was to be prepared, J. W. Shepherd was asked to make a separate one for the "churches of Christ," in contrast to the one made by the "Disciples of Christ." When the report finally came out, both **The Christian-Evangelist** and the **Christian Standard** made quite an affair of it. The insinuation was that Lipscomb had been instrumental in dividing the church. Taking notice of this, Lipscomb wrote:

> The Christian-Evangelist and now the Christian Standard make quite a to do over the enumeration of the churches and disciples who stand by the old landmarks, made at the request and for the use of the government. They have not had the fairness to publish what we have said and done. They, of course, make a misrepresenta-

tion of what was said and done. We have said or done nothing to create or promote a division, further than to urge Christians to stand fast in the faith once for all delivered to the Christians. We have never doubted that standing fast by the truth of God would result in separation from those who reject his word and add the innovations of man to the requirements of God. I have seen this division coming on by steps. We have regretted it, protested, and entreated them to desist. Our requests have been ignored or disregarded. I had never done or thought of doing anything to make this manifest, nor had it ever occurred to me that the civil authorities were taking note of this growing division until I received a letter from the census bureau saying they had noted it in the papers and asking to know the facts in the matter. I gave, as impartially and as truthfully as I could, the real state of the case. They then asked for the statistics of the churches walking in the old paths. While I have never cared for statistics or numberings, I did not see how such a request could be well refused, and referred them to Brother J. W. Shepherd as a man having a talent for statistics, and the government employed him to gather them for its use. I stated in the paper that it seemed just that the government's request should be complied with. Further than this, I have never spoken or written a word to any one on the subject. It was thoughtless in me, probably; but I had no thought of its extending or emphasizing the division. But those who add to the word of God have done nothing to excite or foster it except to stand by the word of God, and, incidentally, on the ground that the fathers of the Reformation occupied. I regret division as much as anyone. There is only one thing I am not willing to do to avoid it; that is, I cannot give up the word of God and so separate from God. I have done nothing to bring about any separation from those who serve God. I intend to do nothing. And if it is any relief to you to abuse and misrepresent me for clinging to the word of God, I will bear it for the sake of the Master.[2]

[2]David Lipscomb, "Divisions," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. L - No. 17, (April 23, 1908) p. 265.

CHAPTER XIX

DECLINING YEARS

The question of how congregations of the Lord may cooperate to do the work of God is one of the oldest in the restoration movement. Lipscomb gave the question much attention in the years immediately following the Civil War, and again in the years, 1884-86, when the problem was so acute in Texas at the time the state missionary society was to be formed.

The practice in Texas was for the churches holding annual or state meetings, giving reports of the past year's work of the various congregations, and then, putting the work under one local church for the coming year. The plan was that all of the churches in the state would work under the eldership of one church to preach the gospel. Lipscomb frankly rejected this. The church universal, he argued, had no organic existence whatsoever, and could never work save through the local churches. The matter of the many churches working through the eldership of one church was wrong in Lipscomb's conception because it made out of the elders of a local church a missionary society in embryo. They were being granted a responsibility and work larger than that of one local congregation. When, therefore, Azariah Paul was sent to Turkey, Lipscomb presented the matter to three of the larger congregations in Nashville. Each congregation sent directly to the man in the field. The work was done, but not by one congregation assuming more than its scriptural amount of power.

Early in January, 1910, this problem forced itself anew on Lipscomb in the form of an overture from the church in Henderson, Tennessee, a call for a meeting of all elders and preachers to meet at Henderson, January 25-28. The call referred to those congregations in southwestern Kentucky, eastern Arkansas and northern Mississippi, and was signed by J. W. Dunn, G. A. Dunn, G. Dallas Smith, John R. Williams, N. B. Hardeman, L. D. Williams, W. Claude Hall, F. O. Howell, D. A. Parish and T. B. Thompson. The article said in part:

> Fully appreciating the condition of the cause of Christ in West Tennessee and adjacent territory, and knowing too, what great good can be accomplished by concerted action on the part of both preachers and churches, we desire to call a meeting of all loyal preachers and teachers of the gospel of Christ and all elders, with all who are interested in strengthening the walls of Zion and carrying the gospel to the lost, to meet at Henderson, Tennessee, on January 25-28, 1910.[1]

The purposes of the meeting were said to be "that the brethren might get better acquainted; learn from one another more of the conditions of this great field of labor; mutually encourage and inspire one another for the work of preaching the gospel, and gain a more intimate knowledge of the Henderson school."

Lipscomb responded to the invitation by saying:

> Some of the brethren last week called for a meeting of the preachers and elders in West Tennessee. We do not doubt that these brethren intend only the best for the churches, for themselves and others. But I have been through and under these meetings so much it surprises me to hear of such meetings. . . . I have seen much evil come out of them to the preachers and the people. I never saw any good come out of them to anyone. ... It is scriptural to call one man in to teach the members aright. But I never found an inspired man called in at a council of elders and preachers. Let us all individually and solidly try to stand on solid ground.[2]

The meeting, however, was held as planned. Each night sermons were delivered on such subjects as, "The Work of An Evangelist," "How may churches cooperate?", "How to interest the churches in Mission work?", "What is Liberality?"; "How To Lead Churches To Be More Liberal"; "The Kind of Houses and Lots To Buy"; "Shall We Advertise?"; "West Tennessee Evangelist," and "Our Schools."

Lipscomb received many letters complimenting his notice of the Henderson meeting, and responded to them saying,

> I have received quite a number of words of approval of my suggestions about unscriptural meetings. I only desired in their incipiency to call attention to the danger. I had no idea that a brother who joined in the call intended any evil or wrong. But when men get away

[1] **Gospel Advocate,** 1910, p. 59.
[2] **Gospel Advocate,** 1910, p. 81.

> from the scripture order to engage in unscriptural meetings, they have no rule to guide them save their own wisdom. (Jer. 10:23) We are no wiser than others if we cut loose from God's order. I find no meeting of elders and preachers in the Bible, and I do not see what scriptural work and unscriptural meeting can do. Let us study the questions and follow the divine order.[3]

Meanwhile, another situation made the issue involved somewhat complex. Some of the congregations in Nashville were holding monthly meetings on a Sunday afternoon for all of the Bible teachers in the city. F. B. Srygley, J. C. McQuiddy, and C. A. Moore, one or all, would speak in a way "calculated to arouse interest and enthusiasm in the work." A. G. Freed, president of Georgia Robertson Christian College at Henderson, took one look at the situation and concluded that it looked to him as though the churches in Nashville had certain liberties which those in other areas were denied. So far as he could see there were no essential points of difference between the Henderson meeting and the Nashville meeting, so he wrote to Lipscomb inquiring,

> How is it that only good can come from one, and only evil from the other? How is it that one is on 'solid ground' and the other on the 'sand'? How is it that the Nashville gatherings of preachers, elders, and teachers from the various churches was a 'scriptural meeting' doing a 'scriptural work,' and the one at Henderson an 'unscriptural meeting' doing an 'unscriptural work'? Why is it that some brethren who participated in the Nashville meeting stand ready to pass 'adverse criticism' on the meeting at Henderson? Why warn the brethren against the one and not against the other? Why do some brethren approve of the warning of one and wink at the other?

J. C. McQuiddy entered the discussions by revealing that there was more behind the objections than had appeared on the surface. From an article sent to the **Advocate** office by G. Dallas Smith

> the impression was received that West Tennessee was to call the evangelist and that the contributing churches throughout West Tennessee were to send their contributions to the elders of the Henderson Church to send to the Evangelist, and that the church at Henderson had been asked to take the direction of the work and had consented to do so. . . . As there is no scriptural authority for one church controlling and directing the funds of other church-

[3] **Gospel Advocate,** 1910, p. 271.

> es, it appeared to those who read the article that Brother Lipscomb was probably correct when he said: 'I find no meeting of elders and preachers in the Bible, and I do not see what scriptural work an unscriptural meeting can do.'

McQuiddy insisted that the only "adverse criticism" about the Henderson church was occasioned when the brother wrote "stating that the Henderson church was to direct the work and take charge of the funds raised by the cooperating churches." By way of conclusion McQuiddy wrote:

> The Scriptures establish clearly that in New Testament times the church communicated directly with the missionary in the field. '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 again unto my need. (Phil. 4:15-17) Paul knew what church sent to his necessities. This is not true when the missionary society supports the laborer. The missionary cannot see through the board and know what church is fellowshipping him. As in New Testament times churches commended, sent, communicated directly with, and received reports of the laborers in the field, if we now have proper respect for divine example, we will not turn away from the church of God to a human society to do mission work.[4]

The explanation for the moment was passed. What some at Henderson wanted to know was the difference between their meeting and the meetings held in Nashville. Why was one wrong and the other right? To be sure of getting the proper answer a letter of inquiry was sent to David Lipscomb signed by J. W. Dunn, W. S. Long, Jr., A. O. Colley, G. Dallas Smith, L. L. Brigance, A. G. Freed, G. C. Wharton, N. B. Hardeman, W. H. Owen. In response Lipscomb made it clear that he had never attended one of these meetings, but upon inquiring of the brethren involved in them how they worked, he found nothing wrong in them "save by a failure to express themselves well." "I feared," he wrote, "their example would lead others to engage in illegitimate work. In their work each congregation invites other persons interested to come and with them study the word of God and to encourage them

[4]J. C. McQuiddy, **Gospel Advocate,** March 17, 1910, pp. 328, 329.

to the more faithful discharge of the duties all Christians must perform in the worship of the church. This is not wrong."

As to the Henderson meeting, Lipscomb, backing McQuiddy, quoted from the article by G. Dallas Smith which, when not printed in the **Advocate,** was later printed in the **Gospel Guide.** The objectionable part of the article said:

> It was finally agreed that the Henderson church should select and put in the field an evangelist to work in the destitute places in West Tennessee. This work is to begin June 1. We practically agreed to do what we can to interest the churches in West Tennessee to cooperate with the Henderson church in supporting the evangelist.[5]

According to Smith's report, the Henderson church was to send out an evangelist into the destitute places of West Tennessee. Other congregations were to send their money to the Henderson elders who in turn were to oversee this work. This, then, was the crux of the problem. Lipscomb inquired,

> Now what was that but the organization of a society in the elders of this church? The church elders at Henderson constitute a board to collect and pay out the money and control the evangelist for the brethren of West Tennessee, and all the preachers are solicitors for this work. This very same course was pursued in Texas a number of years ago. The elders of the church at Dallas were made the supervisors of the work, received the money, employed the preacher, directed and counseled him. For a number of years they employed C. M. Wilmeth. He then dropped out of the work and the Texas Missionary Society took the place. Other experiments along the same course have been made. All of them went into society work.
>
> All meetings of churches or officers of churches to combine more power than a single church possesses is wrong. God's power is in God's churches. He is with them to bless and strengthen their work when they are faithful to him. A Christian, one or more, may visit a church with or without an invitation and seek to stir them up to a faithful discharge of other duties. But for one or more to direct what and how all the churches shall work, or to take charge of their men and money and use it, is to assume the authority God has given to each church. Each one needs the work of distributing and using its funds as well as in giving them.[6]

[5]**Gospel Advocate,** 1910, p. 364.

[6]**Gospel Advocate,** March 24, 1910, p. 364.

With the facts now all out in the open, it was clear where the issue lay. G. Dallas Smith wrote that he believed the church at Henderson was misunderstood and that possibly his article had lent to it. He was not meaning to leave the impression that other churches were to send funds to Henderson to be used by Henderson to sustain a preacher. A. G. Freed likewise explained that the Henderson elders had no intention of taking charge of funds from other congregations. When McQuiddy received the explanations, he admitted that it was impossible for him to harmonize the statement Smith wrote in his article with the explanations given later. "I disapproved the Henderson meeting," he wrote, "because it was represented by Brother Smith as proposing to do mission work by making the elders of one church the board to take the 'general oversight' of work in which other churches were equally interested." He then added, "The work proposed is nothing less than a missionary society in embryo. The' board of elders in Henderson is the board to control the funds contributed by not only the Henderson church, but by all the churches of West Tennessee. This is a combination larger than the organized church of the New Testament which is the only organized body ordained by Jehovah for doing mission work." The matter was finally settled by McQuiddy's charitable statement, "As the brethren at Henderson reject our understanding of Brother Smith's language, we cheerfully accept their assurances that the' church at Henderson Is not to take 'the general oversight' and hope this will end the matter."[7]

Despite his 79 years of age, Lipscomb's mind was still clear. But even so, he recognized that the end of his connection with the **Gospel Advocate** was clearly in sight. In January, 1910, he wrote,

> This is the forty-fifth year of my connection with the Gospel Advocate. It is a good long stretch of time for one man to give to one paper. Not many numbers of the paper have been issued during this time without an article from me. During that time, I have never been stout, but not often sick enough to hinder the preparation of an article until within the last few months. I failed and will

[7]**Gospel Advocate,** 1910, p. 392, 393.

> not be able again to do much work on the paper. What I have written has been more as a reminder to our readers than with the hope of teaching them anew. It was a reminder to our readers of what I had done; it was a monition to me of how little a man is in the world. I could easily drop out of the work and never be missed after a number or two. The paper is well edited or better than when I gave my full time and labor to it.[8]

Although the Gospel Advocate Publishing Company had been reorganized in 1903 by forming the McQuiddy Printing Company, both Lipscomb and Sewell had retained a financial interest in the paper. Their advancing years made it appear more imperative that they should be relieved of any interest whatsoever in the **Advocate.** Lipscomb, accordingly, announced in the' middle of March, 1912, that he and E. G. Sewell had sold their interest in the **Gospel Advocate** to E. A. Elam, M. C. Kurfees, and A. B. Lipscomb. J. C. McQuiddy was still to retain his interest in the business end of the printing company. The property rights, Lipscomb explained, were to pass into these hands as of April 1, 1912. In making the change, Lipscomb explained,

> This fidelity to God and his truth has been our chief concern during our editorial lives, and was the chief concern in the sale of the paper. We were more anxious to put the paper into the hands of men who would remain true themselves and hold it firmly and kindly to the teachings of the Bible than we were to get a large sum for the paper. We did not run it for the money we got out of it, nor did we sell it for the money we get for it. We ran it for the opportunity it afforded of doing good through it. The brethren who have bought it did not buy it for the money they hope to make out of it. We are satisfied each one of them bought with this end in view.

It was agreed that Lipscomb and Sewell should continue to write, and have their names remain on the list of editors. The new managers felt it necessary to make some explanation of their policies, so Kurfees wrote the following:

> At this particular time in the history of the Gospel Advocate it is deemed proper to present to its constituency and to the public in general a restatement of the principles and policy which have hitherto marked its career,

[8]David Lipscomb, "Another Year," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. LII - No. 1 (Jan. 6, 1910) p. 13.

> and which, it is hoped, shall continue to characterize its utterances. To the full extent that the public is concerned at all in the matter, it will appreciate such an outline in connection with the recent statement of our beloved seniors on the editorial staff regarding their transfer of the paper on April 1, 1912, to other hands. Whatever field of usefulness may yet be open to its pages and whatever destiny may await it, we here cheerfully record the fact that it has thus far stood like a stone wall for a plain 'Thus saith the Lord' in matters of religious work and worship, insisting at all times upon a practical exhibition of that sensible and revolutionary oracle first proclaimed by Thomas Campbell: 'Where the Scriptures speak we speak, and where the Scriptures are silent we are silent.' Possibly no journal in existence today has maintained a more firm and uncompromising stand for that distinguishing slogan of the Reformation of the nineteenth century than the Gospel Advocate throughout its whole history. It was born and nurtured in its infancy in the very atmosphere of a determined and persistent contention for this principle. In the long ago its present senior editors were associated with Tolbert Fanning on its editorial staff, and since his death, about thirty-eight years ago, they have 'borne the burdens of the day' in its editorial management, and well have they done their work. With courage for the defense of the truth equal to that of Spartan heroes, and like David and Jonathan in the tender tie of mutual affection, they have worked together as true yokefellows through all the years; and, with the trophies of a well-fought battle to crown them in old age, they are as firm and resolute in their defense of the truth today as they were in the prime of young manhood. Their assistants on the editorial staff feel blessed of God in being associated on the paper with such men, and it shall be their fixed and constant aim to keep it to the high mark of devotion to the word of God long ago set for it by these faithful men. If we should find it possible for us to improve the paper in any way, whether from the literary, mechanical, or any other point of view, we stand ready to do so.[9]

By 1913 Lipscomb to all practical intents and purposes, closed up the book of his life, and spent the next four years waiting for the inexorable call of the grave. His old friends were continuing to yield to its melancholy invitation almost every day. His half-brother, Granville, made almost helpless by a stroke of paralysis in 1904, quietly passed away in February, 1910. On Friday, October 6, 1911, Lipscomb received the news with sadness that J. W. McGarvey had died. "Brother McGarvey has gone to try the realities of the judgment," he later wrote. "I cannot be many

[9]M. C. Kurfees**, Gospel Advocate,** 1912, p. 428.

days behind him. We are all weak and frail and fall short. With the best we can do, we must look to God to save the erring souls, while 'the work is burned up.' I have tried to live true to the word of God. I do not doubt McGarvey attempted to do what he thought was best for God and His cause."[10] Two years later came word that "Uncle Mac" Barnes had died at His home in Alabama. Barnes had accidentally run his car off a ten foot embankment near his home and broken his leg and left collar bone, and died, three days later. Barnes had visited often in the Lipscomb home, and though a little on the eccentric side, was one of the great preachers of the age.

Up to the time Lipscomb retired from active labors, he continued with a lively interest his writing, preaching, and teaching at the Nashville Bible School. His sermons were now mostly delivered at the Bible School, although he visited frequently with other congregations in the city. On his eighty-first birthday, January 21, 1912, which fell on a Sunday, he preached at Belmont Ave., the **Advocate** commenting, "While he is feeble, his mind is clear and active." Entering the Bible School in the fall of 1912, L. J. Goodson came with awesome reverence, for the names of David Lipscomb, **Gospel Advocate,** and religion had been synonyms in his home for years. On his first Sunday at school, he went to the auditorium and took his seat. Looking up, he caught his first glimpse of Lipscomb, sitting in the center of the platform with his left arm resting easily on the arm of his highbacked chair, and the elbow of his right arm, lightly flexed, resting on the right arm of his chair; the forearm extending upward while his right hand held tightly to a familiar hickory walking stick. Lipscomb, without any preliminaries, started his sermon. Soon his mannerisms, and style were all forgotten as the word of God was the only thing that became real.

Lipscomb's interest in the Nashville Bible School never wavered. By the spring of 1912 the Bible School owned 65 acres of land within two miles of the city. The boys' dormitory was able

[10]David Lipscomb, "President McGarvey," **Gospel Advocate,** Vol. LIII - No. 44, (Nov. 2, 1911) p. 1260.

to accommodate 120, and the girls', 40. The property was estimated to be worth $60,000. The school still owned seven lots on the' former site of the Bible School, four of which had houses on them. The school also owned three lots in North Nashville with houses on them worth $3,600. The houses rented for $117.00 per month. The school owned a note for $2,000, on which it paid interest until the death of the donor. There was $500.00 cash on hand. These were its financial assets at the time. There was, on the other side of the ledger, an indebtedness on the property of $3,000. There was $5,000 indebtedness on its property, and $2,500 on notes for borrowed money. A charitable woman had made a bequest sufficiently large enough to pay these bills, but at this time, the money was not obtainable. So, the future financially, was not so dark.

In the fall of 1913 H. Leo Boles succeeded E. A. Elam as president of the Bible School. The **Advocate** explained that Elam wanted *to* resign to give his entire time to preaching and to editorial work on the paper. Elam read the comment with some dissatisfaction and wrote the **Advocate** that this was not the truth and that he hoped nothing else would be said about it. Nothing was. Boles himself had been on the faculty of the Nashville Bible School for seven years. He studied under W. N. Billingsley at Burritt College, graduating in the class of 1900. He taught eight years in the public schools of Texas and Tennessee, then came to the Nashville Bible School as a teacher of mathematics and later, mental philosophy. Boles, as president of the Bible School, was often in and out of the Lipscomb home which was on the campus. Affectionately did Boles refer to Lipscomb as "Uncle Dave," a term of endearment that was used by all who knew Lipscomb in his declining years.

For the next two or three years Lipscomb attended every function of the Bible School that he was able. May 22, 1913, the day set for the closing exercises, was a rainy day, but Lipscomb attended anyway. Four days earlier Lipscomb heard J. D. Floyd deliver a commencement sermon. His hearing was failing, so he was unable to catch everything that was said. He attended

the opening of the Bible School on Tuesday, September 7, 1915, and heard E. G. Sewell, L. S. White and Price Billingsley give "stirring addresses." Lipscomb himself was too feeble to speak.

Lipscomb, unable to be active, his hearing and eyesight failing, still managed to squeeze the last full measure of enjoyment out of his declining years. At the request of a large number of his friends, he allowed a picture to be made of himself and E. G. Sewell, together with the **Gospel Advocate** as a background. The picture, made in September, 1912, was 9½ by 12¼ inches. On Christmas day, 1912, he received a copy of **Eunice Loyd** from the author, R. N. Moody. Since his sight was bad, the next day he asked a thirteen year old girl to read the book to him. The girl became so interested that she completed it in two days, and Lipscomb amused himself with the annoyance of the little girl when anything interfered to stop her reading.

Visitors often dropped by to idle away the hours with him. Frequently, J. C. McQuiddy stopped to talk over the work around the **Advocate** office and seek advice. H. Leo Boles came by often to offer his assistance and seek counsel. When Lipscomb celebrated his eighty-third birthday on January 21, 1914, E. G. Sewell came across town and spent the day with him. Questions on the Bible would come through the mail, and some he would try to answer. He recognized that he could not think as logically as before, but his old Bible was as precious to him as ever. Aunt Mag would put him in a chair beside a good light, and place the Bible close by, so he could always reach it. On warm days Lipscomb would sit in his rocking chair on the front porch. Students passing to and from their classes, would see the old man sitting on the porch with his Bible fondly grasped in his hands. Maybe the Bible was upside down, but the "feel" of the "precious book divine" never lost its thrill.

Once, on the last day of the year, 1915, Lipscomb struggled down to the **Advocate** office for one of his last visits. A. B. Lipscomb, in the office at the time, commented: "It certainly recalled some stirring scenes to see him sitting in the office as of yore."

Lipscomb had fought many a battle in his life. But on the eve of his death there loomed another dark and portentous, in which he was never *to engage.* In 1911 R. H. Boll became front page editor of the Advocate. Boll, an excellent Bible student and deeply devoted man, added considerable weight to the' **Advocate** for three years or more. But in December, 1914, he started setting forth some ideas of premillennialism in a study he was following on the book of Revelation. The articles carried on over to 1915. Lipscomb was too old to give much attention to it, but the belief that the kingdom was not yet set up, and that Christ was not yet on David's throne stirred F. B. Srygley. He answered an article by H. L. Olmstead, printed in **Word and Work** early in 1915. This started the ball rolling. Neither Olmstead nor Boll would be stopped. F. W. Smith threw his weight into the threatening danger and wrote:

> It is no pleasure to me to differ from, and to offer public criticism on positions held by my brethren, but I sometimes feel that silence on my part would be criminal before God. There are two brethren for whom I have always had the highest regard who are pursuing a course which I shall take the privilege to criticize in a friendly and brotherly way. I refer to Robert H. Boll and H. L. Olmstead, who are using their precious time and splendid intellects in speculative theories concerning unfulfilled prophecies. If these brethren would use their voices and pens in doing what Paul *solemnly* charged Timothy to do—viz., 'Preach the word'—eternity alone could reveal the good they might do. But at present they are both engaged in trying *to* tell the readers of religious papers things about which they **know** nothing. They are both trying to wade through the book of Revelation, and, like all others who have attempted to enlighten the world on the contents of that book, are doing some tall guessing.[11]

There followed a lengthy discussion between F. W. Smith and R. H. Boll with Smith continually asking Boll *to* keep his opinions to himself. Sensing a possible danger of division coming, the editors of the **Advocate** asked Boll: "Will Brother Boll declare a belief of these things essential to salvation? If not, then why continue to agitate them?" Boll apparently would have pre-

[11] **Gospel Advocate,** 1915, p. 857.

ferred to ignore this question, but being pressed, finally answered:

> None of the things God has revealed are 'unrevealed' things; no questions on which he has taught are 'untaught questions.' None of the word he has left us is superfluous. And it is essential that a preacher be faithful to present the whole counsel of God. And this is my answer.[12]

The statement was remarkable for its ambiguity. Boll did not specifically say that the theory was essential to salvation, but that the theory was taught in the Bible and it was essential for him as a preacher to preach it.

A private correspondence between the editors of the **Advocate** and R. H. Boll followed through the spring of 1915 in which they admonished him to remain silent on his "futuristic theories." When no satisfactory assurance from Boll could be given, the editors announced in the June 10 issue that they were refusing to publish Boll's articles. The front page of the **Advocate** was taken over first by J. C. McQuiddy, then by A. B. Lipscomb. David Lipscomb, meanwhile, watched the controversy with interest, and announced publicly his approval of what the editors of the **Gospel Advocate** had said.[13]

Through the summer and early fall attempts were continued to reconcile Boll to the point of getting him to hold his opinions to himself. Finally, in the November 4 issue, A. B. Lipscomb announced that an understanding had been reached and Boll was to continue as front page editor. The attitude of the **Advocate's** editors was that they did not want to hamper Boll from holding any private opinion he wanted, but felt compelled to insist that these opinions must not be preached. A conference was held with Boll by J. C. McQuiddy, A. B. Lipscomb, F. W. Smith, M. C. Kurfees, and G. Dallas Smith. These brethren reached a rather indefinite agreement with Boll. Nevertheless, each man understood that Boll was agreeing to "cease teaching the specu-

[12]**Gospel Advocate,** 1915, pp. 561, 562.
[13]**Gospel Advocate,** 1915, p. 564.

lative things that were' disturbing the churches." Boll, continuing his speculations, denied that he had made any such agreement. So the situation was back where it was.

In the years ahead this circumstance was to create many an embarrassing and heart-breaking situation in the church. David Lipscomb watched the beginning of it with interest, but his faltering pen was slowed to a halt. This struggle must be left for others to bear.

CHAPTER XX

THE LAST DAYS

Early in April, 1915, David Lipscomb wrote to his friend, J. G. Barlow. "We have passed quite a bit beyond the three-score-and ten limit, and I am sure you are feeling, as I do, the dropping off of many interests in life and the getting out of touch with friends and acquaintances, and, like travelers nearing the end of a long journey, our thoughts and desires turn more and more toward home and rest."[1]

He was a tired old man when he celebrated his eighty-fifth birthday in January, 1916. The last five years had been ususually hard. His hands and feet were so swollen that he could hardly hold a pen. For eight years he had not walked over one hundred yards at once, and were it not for his old hickory walking stick, he could not do this. "I was born a bad penman," he once wrote, "inherited it from my father." In later years his handwriting was so poor that the printers were scarcely able to make it out. Occasionally his articles in the **Advocate** were nonsense, but usually the printer sent him a proof before printing his material. He wanted his friends to understand this. "I take this occasion to say that I am mentally and physically in a bad fix to write. Very frequently my ideas get tangled and I say the opposite of what I intended to say." By the summer of 1916 he was down with the grippe and unable to write at all.

Through the long winter and spring that followed "Uncle Dave" sank lower and lower. McQuiddy continued his frequent visits at the home, and with sincere concern would ask Lipscomb if he had any pain. Lipscomb invariably answered in the negative. Friends and neighbors dropped by the home to offer their assistance. Aunt Mag continued her ceaseless vigil. Coming to the Lipscomb home in 1904 was a colored servant, called affectionately only "Brown," Brown adored Uncle Dave and Aunt Mag. When something was done that he thought would displease Lipscomb, he would shake his head and say, "I just know Mr.

[1]**Gospel Advocate,** 1916, p. 339.

Lipscomb wouldn't like that." He cared deeply for Aunt Mag. On that fateful day, March 23, 1926, when Mag, too, crossed over, someone observed Brown walking down the road and crying audibly. When he was told, "Brown, you've lost a mighty good friend," the old Negro replied, "Yes, she was everybody's friend." And so, what Aunt Mag could do for her weary husband, Brown, or a host of friends, would gladly do.

The sickness of 1909 had left Lipscomb in a condition from which he could never recover. Early in 1917 he sank steadily lower, and all thought his life was gone. He rallied, like an old warrior refusing to meet defeat, and in the weeks that followed spent two to five hours a day in his rocking chair with his Bible in his hand. The summer passed, and the fall came. The war drums were beating in Europe; American boys were trying to push the Germans back. Here at home giant rallies begged the citizens to get behind the boys, to buy Liberty Bonds, and to support the war. As the days passed, David Lipscomb was scarcely conscious of this. In May, the Alumni Association of the Bible School decided to have the portraits of James A. Harding and David Lipscomb done in oil, and hung in a suitable place in the college buildings.

Monday, November 5 came, and Lipscomb suffered another paralytic stroke. He had to say goodbye to his old rocking chair and go to bed. Tuesday passed and then Wednesday came. Lipscomb closed his eyes in deep sleep. Aunt Mag planted her chair by his bedside and refused to leave. The hours dragged by. Uncle Dave's breathing was easy, but he slept on. As though an invisible finger was holding them back, the hands on the clock slowly ticked off the minutes. Thursday, Friday, and Saturday passed, and the Lord's Day dawned. Uncle Dave still breathed easily, but slept on. Would he rally again as he so often had in the past? The morning eased by. Soon the hands on the clock said it was ten minutes until eleven. Suddenly, Uncle Dave's breathing stopped.

Aunt Mag bowed her head and said, "Lord Jesus, receive his spirit."

The weary traveler had come to the end of his long journey, and was going home to rest.

The funeral services were conducted at the South College Street Church building the following afternoon at 3:30. Visiting brethren came from far and wide. Lipscomb, always opposed to show, a lover of simplicity, had wanted a plain funeral. A double quartet from the Nashville Bible School sang. At Uncle Dave's special request Dr. C. A. Moore, long a fellow-elder at the South College congregation, and E. G. Sewell preached the funeral. They were assisted by E. A. Elam and J. C. McQuiddy. Sewell, reflecting over their long association together, stated that Lipscomb was one of the most unselfish and unassuming of men. McQuiddy stated the most prominent characteristic of Lipscomb to him was that of his whole purpose being to bring men into obedience to God and complete accord with the teachings of the Bible. Elam, with deep emotion, compared Lipscomb to Elijah in courage, to David in loyalty, and to Enoch in walking with God. Moore paid tribute to Lipscomb's ceaseless activity in missionary work, and the great encouragement to inspire the Nashville churches to do more of it. Pallbearers at the funeral were David U. Lipscomb, Horace S. Lipscomb, H. Leo Boles, John E. Dunn, Sam H. Hall, and John T. Lewis.

The funeral over, the procession moved out to Mt. Olivet cemetery. His body was carefully laid to rest beside that of his elder brother, William. He and Billy had romped the hills of Franklin County together back in the halcyon days of their childhood; now they could in silent grandeur wait together for the coming of the Lord. If a mystic had been present on that day, he might have listened and caught the sound of a chorus of angels welcoming the old soldier home.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boles, H. Leo, **Biographical Sketches of Gospel Preachers** (Nashville: Gospel Advocate Co., 1932)

Davenport, F. G., **Cultural Life in Nashville,** (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1941)

Heitman, **Historical Register of Officers of The Continental Army.** 1775-83

Lipscomb, David, **Life and Sermons of Jesse L. Sewell,** (Nashville: Gospel Advocate Co., 1891)

McAllister, J. T., **Virginia Militia In The Revolutionary War,** (Hot Springs, Va., McAllister Publishing Co., 1913)

Scobey, Jas. E., **Franklin College And Its Influences,** (Nashville: McQuiddy Printing Co., 1908

Srygley, F. D., **Biographies and Sermons** (Nashville: McQuiddy Printing Co., 1899)

Periodicals

Campbell, Alexander, **Millennial Harbinger,** (1830-70)

Fanning, Tolbert, **Christian Review,** (1844-1847)

Fanning, Tolbert and David Lipscomb, Gospel Advocate, (1855-61; 1866ff)

Ferguson, Jesse **B., Christian Magazine,** (1848-1853)

Franklin, Benjamin, **American Christian Review,** (1855ff)