

CHAPTER I

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

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

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

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

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

Again, Brother Allen says: "No man who respects the word of God can remain with the transgressives ... The fact is, no man can respect the word of God who refuses to abide in it, but insists on 'going beyond the things that are written' by introducing things that the word of God does not require or command." In this statement he condemns himself as completely as he does me.

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

Again, he says: “It is a fact that they [us] fraternize with the sinful denominations and go into union meetings with them.” I can hardly see how any man who really wants unity among all the followers of Christ could give expression to such a statement as that. “Sinful denominations,” Brother Allen says. Now, I do not believe in denominationalism any more than he does, for denominationalism is the wall which holds Christians apart and keeps alive the spirit of division, and thus prevents the unity for which our Savior prayed in the very shadow of his cross. But, if we admit, and I gladly do, that our religious neighbors are Christians, despite the fact that we do not see everything alike, why should we not practice all the fellowship we can with them, looking forward to the day when all our petty differences and bicker-

ings shall fade away in the beauty and glory of complete unity? My orthodoxy can take care of itself while I am busy working hand in hand with my brother of another religious body trying to bring lost souls to Christ. I know, and he knows, that neither one of us is compromising a single honest conviction we cherish in thus working together.

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

The American Christian Missionary Society was organized by the pioneers in 1849, at a general convention of churches in Cincinnati, Ohio. This convention was the first ever held in our brotherhood. This convention was suggested by Alexander Campbell himself. He said: "I am of opinion that a convention, or general meeting of the churches of the Reformation, is a very great desideratum. Nay, I will say further that it is all important to the cause of reformation. I am also of opinion that Cincinnati is the proper place for holding such a convention." He said further: "The purposes of such a convention are already indicated by a general demand for a more efficient and Scriptural organization, for a more general and efficient cooperation in the Bible cause, in the missionary cause, in the education cause." (See *Millennial Harbinger*, Volume 1849, pages 475, 476.) The convention was held, and W. K. Pendleton, one of the pioneers associated with Mr. Campbell, reported its proceedings in the December issue of the *Millennial Harbinger* of 1849. The following resolution was adopted: "Resolved, That the Missionary Society, as a means to

concentrate and dispense the wealth and benevolence of the brethren of the Reformation in an effort to convert the world, is both Scriptural and expedient.”

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

Following the report of Mr. Pendleton, Alexander Campbell writes an editorial (Volume 1849 of the *Harbinger*) in which he says: “Our expectations from the convention have been more than realized. We are much pleased with the result, and regard it as a very happy pledge of good things to come.” He commends the American Bible Society, the Foreign Bible Society, and the Christian Missionary Society. Of the latter he says: “The Christian Missionary Society, too, on its own independent footing, will be a grand auxiliary to the churches in destitute regions at home as well as abroad. These societies we cannot but hail as greatly contributing to the advancement of the cause we have been so long pleading before God and the people ... We commend these instrumentalities to the prayers of all the holy brethren and to the blessing of the Lord.” “We are therefore peculiarly gratified to see with what unanimity, liberality, and zeal the whole brotherhood assembled at the late Cincinnati convention have entered into this great work of evangelizing—at least of contributing their aid to the conversion of the world. It is the glory of the first convention ever assembled of our brethren, that then and there they unanimously resolved, in the name of the Lord, to institute, to organize, and put into operation a society for spreading salvation and civilization ... We have an organized missionary 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.” (*Millennial Harbinger*, 1850, pages 75, 76.)

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

I am quoting only a tithe of what Mr. Campbell said in support of organized work. He met with very little opposition from any source, so far as we can discover. Our brethren have always been committed to organized mission agencies. It is worse than folly to dispute this. The pioneers were almost unanimous in favor of organization. They may have been wrong in their position,

but one thing is certain: *Brother Allen and his people are not standing with them.* I am, and about one million five hundred thousand others of my brethren are, today. I challenge any man to prove that this is not true. The pioneers stood for organized missionary work. Brother Allen does not. That is the whole truth about it.

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

EXCHANGE OF VIEWS WITH BROTHER CLUBB

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

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

J. A. A.

CHAPTER II

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

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

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

If Brother Clubb had said, “The pioneers were almost unanimous in favor of *co-operation*,” he would have stated the facts; but he said, “The pioneers were almost unanimous in favor of organization.” The difference between cooperation and organization is the difference between God’s wisdom and man’s wisdom. “And ye yourselves also know, ye Philippians, that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no church had fellowship with me in the matter of giving and receiving but ye only; for even in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto my need.” (Phil. 4:15, 16.) This was *co-operation*, but not *organization*. When Paul traveled among the churches of Galatia, Achaia, and Macedonia taking a collection for the saints in Jerusalem, he was *co-operating*, but not *organizing*.

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

Brother Clubb says: “This convention was suggested by Alexander Campbell himself.” We will now let Mr. Campbell speak for himself. In the *Millennial Harbinger*, 1849, page 90, under “Church Organization—No. 1,” Mr. Campbell says: “There is now heard from the East and from the West, from the North and from the South, one general, if not universal, call for a more efficient organization of our churches.” This article closes on page

93 as follows: “Have we, then, no Scriptural model, no divine precedent or authority, for any form of church organization and cooperation? And if so, what is it? We must appoint a committee to examine the subject, and to report in our next number.” Mr. Campbell says the call came “from the East and from the West, from the North and from the South,” and he suggested “appointing a committee to examine the subject.”

In the *Millennial Harbinger*, 1849, page 221, under “Church Organization No. 2,” Mr. Campbell says: “We must, then, abstain from a dogmatical spirit, while there remains a reasonable doubt on the premises before us. To assist myself and others in coming to Scriptural conclusions on the topic, we will classify the Scriptures, and deduce from them a few inferences bearing on a proper decision of the question concerning cooperation.” This shows that Mr. Campbell felt that “there remains a reasonable doubt on the premises before us,” and he was advising caution. In the same article, page 223, he says: “There may, indeed, be ‘churches of God,’ ‘churches of Christ,’ ‘churches of the saints,’ in a city, as well as in a province or an empire. And there may also be but one church of Christ in a city or in a province. In both cases, however, a church of Christ is a single society of believing men and women, stately meeting in one place to worship God through the one Mediator. But a church of churches, or a church collective of all the churches in a State or nation, is an institution of man, and not an ordinance of God. Nothing in the constitution of a church of Christ is more evident than its individual responsibility to the Lord Jesus Christ for all its acts and deeds. No one can read, with proper discrimination, any one of the apostolic epistles, without recognizing this great and important fact.” Mr. Campbell’s mind was as clear as a bell on the New Testament church when he penned those lines.

In the *Millennial Harbinger*, 1849, page 269, under “Church Organization—No. 3,” Mr. Campbell says:

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

In the *Millennial Harbinger*, 1849, page 272, under “Church Organization No. 4,” Mr. Campbell says:

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

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

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

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

In the August issue of the *Millennial Harbinger*, 1849, pages 475, 476, Mr. Campbell had an article, titled “Convention.” He says:

I am of opinion that a convention, or general meeting, of the churches of the Reformation is a very great desideratum. Nay, I will say further, that it is all important to the cause of reformation. I am also of opinion that Cincinnati is the proper place for holding such convention. But the questions are: *How shall such convention be obtained, when shall it be held, and for what purpose?* These I cannot more than

moot, or propound. I must, however, to suggest considerations to our brethren, say that it should not be a convention of book makers or of editors to concoct a great book concern, but a convention of messengers of churches, selected and constituted such by the churches—one from every church, if possible, or, if impossible, one from a district, or some definite number of churches. It is not to be composed of a few self-appointed messengers, or of messengers from one two, or three districts, or States, but a *general* convention. I know that neither wisdom nor piety is rated by numbers; still, in the multitude of counselors there is more general safety and more confidence than in a few.

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

Mr. Campbell closes this article as follows:

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

Surely Mr. Campbell would not have made all these suggestions about something that he considered was taught or sanc-

tioned in the New Testament. However, he was willing to “submit with much deference to the judgment and decision” of the brethren in the matter, and it seems that Mr. Campbell was controlled more by the “judgment and decision” of the brethren than he was either by his own judgment or the teaching of the New Testament.

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

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

Mr. Campbell left home on December 6, 1849, and was away on a tour “in the Southwest” for fourteen weeks. (See *Millennial Harbinger*, 1850, page 164 and page 224.) On January 5, 1850, Mr. Campbell wrote from Frankfort, Ky., as follows: “We have said

that the ‘Christian Missionary Society,’ as now propounded and organized, is the first fruit of a general convention of the churches. At least, in the absence of the minutes of that convention, so we regard it.” (*Millennial Harbinger*, 1850, page 88.) This shows that what Mr. Campbell had thus far said about the convention was based absolutely on hearsay. He had not even seen “the minutes of that convention.” Brother Clubb should have told us that all he quoted from Mr. Campbell was written by Mr. Campbell before he had seen the minutes of the convention. That would have been perfectly fair.

Brother Clubb says: “The literature of that period shows very little opposition to organized missionary work.” We will now look into “the literature of that period” and see what it shows, I mean no reflection on Brother Clubb’s “learning and study.”

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

The difference between this mode of operation and that of early times may strike some minds more strongly, if we should ask the question, amidst all the light we have for answering it: What would Paul or Barnabas have thought, if, while far away among Greeks and Barbarians, they had received a letter signed by Simeon or Lucas, as secretary of the missionary society of the church at Antioch? We can easily imagine what astonishment—yea, what alarm—would have been depicted in the countenances of them both. What! they might have said, did we not leave the church at Antioch a missionary society of Christ’s own forming? Have a part of them apostatized from the work! Have any risen up to oppose it, that a society should need be organized within

the church, to do that which was committed to the church as her specific business? Were we not by her commended to the grace of God and “sent away?” They did run well who hath hindered them! (*Millennial Harbinger*, 1850, pages 131, 132.)

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER I

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

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

I shall not make a lot of bold, unsupported statements, and then, with the audacity of a Spanish matador, say: "It is worse than folly to dispute this." I have too much respect for my own intelligence to thus deal with an intelligent people, and too much

honor to thus trifle with the credulity of the credulous. Therefore, I shall ask you to accept *no statement* from me, on this subject, not supported with *undeniable* facts. I “challenge” the editor of the *Tennessee Christian* to show, “from the literature of that period,” where a *single* voice was heard, *among the Reformers*, “in favor of instrumental music in churches,” prior to 1851. I also challenge him to show where one was used prior to 1859. If this cannot be done, and it can’t, it is strange that a man at the head of as many *Christian* institutions as Brother Clubb seems to be would make such audacious statements. He is evidently a good psychologist and knows that a lot of bold statements will satisfy the masses in religion today. It is possible, however, that the secretary has made the above statements so many times before conventions that he believes them himself, and is, therefore, laboring under mental delusions in the matter. If so, I hope to help him and all who have believed his vagaries. One departure from God’s truth always calls for another, and the floodgate once opened, there is no checking the innovations. In less than two years after the American Christian Missionary Society was organized John Rogers wrote to Alexander Campbell as follows:

Carlisle Ky., June 9, 1851.—Brother Campbell: It is now seven years since I felt myself called upon (in view of the increasing disposition to frivolity in our churches) to prepare and publish a discourse against dancing, as an amusement. But however that and kindred efforts from the pulpit and press may have checked the evil, most certainly it is still on the increase in this section of Kentucky. For years past, many persons of wealth and influence have been advocating dancing as a social amusement—as innocent, elegant, healthful, and every way improving. But they have been much hindered, hitherto, by the old-fashioned sort of Christians, who have not so learned Christ; and the preachers, too, have all been against them.

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

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

Brother Campbell, more than a year ago I wrote to you in reference to some of these matters and urged you strongly to present your views concerning them. You promised me you would; but a press of business, I suppose, has prevented. I do think the whole weight of your influence is called for upon

this question. Are we to have instrumental music in our churches? Are Christian parents to be allowed to send their children to dancing school, and have social dancing in their houses? Is the church to tolerate and encourage all this? Circus going, card playing as an amusement, theatergoing, and all kindred practices? Give us, my dear brother, your best thoughts on this subject.

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

JOHN ROGERS.

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

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

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

After referring to dancing mentioned in “the book of Job,” which he says was the oldest on record, and Miriam dancing, and

the daughter of Herodias dancing before Herod, and “Washington balls on Washington’s birth nights,” Mr. Campbell says:

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

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

Mr. Campbell closes his reply as follows:

As idle they who dream of pleasure in what is called the fashionable amusements of the day. Why look to Paris, the metropolis of atheism, sensuality, and crime, for any other fashion or custom than those which drown men in destruction and perdition? I would say, if need there be, to every brother in the land: “Lift up your voice like a trumpet cry aloud and spare not. Show Israel their transgressions and Jacob their sins;” for because of these things “iniquity abounds—the love of many waxes cold.” The gospel is spoken and heard in vain and “because of these things, the wrath of God comes upon the children of disobedience.” “What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? what communion hath

light with darkness? what concord hath Christ with Belial? what part hath he that believeth with an unbeliever? and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?" (Page 507.)

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

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

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

The argument drawn from the Psalms in favor of instrumental music is exceedingly apposite to the Roman Catholic, English Protestant, and Scotch Presbyterian churches, and even to the Methodist communities. Their churches having all the world in them—that is, all the fleshly progeny of all the communicants, and being founded on the Jewish pattern of things—baptism being given to all born into the world of these politico-ecclesiastic communities—I wonder not, then that an organ, a

fiddle, or a jew's-harp, should be requisite to stir up their carnal hearts, and work into ecstasy their animal souls, else "hosannas languish on their tongues, and their devotions die." And that all persons who have no spiritual discernment, taste, or relish for their spiritual meditations consolations, and sympathies of renewed hearts, should call for such aid, is but natural. Pure water from the flinty rock has no attractions for the mere toper or winebibber. A little alcohol, or genuine Cognac brandy, or good old Madeira, is essential to the beverage to make it truly refreshing: So to those who have no real devotion or spirituality in them, and whose animal nature flags under the oppression of church service, I think with Mr. G., that instrumental music would be not only a desideratum, but an essential prerequisite to fire up their souls to even animal devotion. But I presume, to all spiritual-minded Christians, such aids would be as a cowbell in a concert.

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

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

I stated that Mr. Campbell was so opposed to organs in worship that he would not preach where one was used. I saw a statement made by his son-in-law, I reckon about the time of his death, or soon afterwards, when the organ question was up, he wrote an article that was published in the *American Christian Review*, that on one occasion, in New Orleans, a Presbyterian house was offered to Mr.

Campbell to preach in, which had an organ in it, and an organist that usually operated it during the services, taking for granted that they wanted the usual services, began the overture or whatever part it was, and Mr. Campbell arose and requested it to be stopped, that he could not preach where the organ was used. He preached in McKendree Church when he was here, which was offered to him, and no organ was used. I suppose there was an organ in the house, but there was none used. I do not know how that happened, but I know it was not used. I was there.

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

Of course, to the digressives, the “popular preacher” who came out in 1851 “in favor of instrumental music in churches, and social dancing in our families,” which called forth the withering protests from Rogers and Campbell, was a Christian gentleman who believed in Christian liberty and Christian union. *Christian liberty, to Brother Clubb and his people, is to have what you want in the worship, whether required in the New Testament or not, without protest from others.* To “our conservative brethren,” *Christian liberty is to have, and use, only what is ordered or required in the New Testa-*

ment. Unquestionably the position of “our conservative brethren” is the original, and invulnerable, position of the pioneers.

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

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

So far as known to me, or, I presume, to you, I am the only “preacher” in Kentucky of our brotherhood who has publicly advocated the propriety of employing instrumental music in *some* churches, and that the church of God in Midway is the only church that has yet made a decided effort to introduce it. The calls for your opinion, it is probable, came from these regions. The paper containing your strictures has been much circulated among our congregation, and even sent to some of its members from distant places. Under these circumstances you will, I trust, see the propriety of this communica-

tion. I shall endeavor, in the few lines I propose to write, to give your example as wide a berth as possible, by observing some rules of courtesy, and a few of the more common rules of English syntax ...

Now, touching this I have only this to say and I say it for the consideration of all whom it may concern that if your article on church music reflects the notions of the *Reformation* as to what constitutes Christian courtesy, manly literature, logic, rhetoric, religion; nay, if any considerable portion of the *Reformation* can even tolerate such coarse fulminations, then the sooner it is extinct, the better; and I, for one being assured of this would feel myself impelled by everything I owe my family, my country, myself, and my Savior, to aid in ridding the world of it, as of an immeasurable abomination. By what law of man or of God, written or unwritten, what law of gentlemanly civility, is one man authorized to denounce another as without the spirit of Christ, an ape, carnal without devotion, etc., on account of a difference of opinion as to what is expedient in a community of which the denounced is a part—of which the denouncer knows nothing? But I forbear. Finally, I am ready and willing to discuss the subject of instrumental music in churches with any man who can discriminate between railing in bad grammar and Christian argumentation; but I am as fully resolved as any man can be to have nothing to do with “silly claptrap.”

Yours truly,

L. L. PINKERTON.

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

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

As to any extra copies sent him, or any in his community, we know nothing. We ordered no copies sent to anybody in his vicinity, and did not write the article for any particular community, nor to fit any particular person. One thing is certain, and that is, if the instrumental music had as happy an influence upon his "poor heart" as he appears to think, our article or something else has had a very different influence upon it since, judging from what he has written above. We wish the Doctor well, and think he will feel better after meditation, reading the Scriptures, and prayer. He does not do himself jus-

tice in this article. He is a much better man than any one would suppose from this piece. By the way, we would rather let him have his plaything in the church than to have him so much out of sorts again. Will some one who understands “English syntax,” “logic,” “courtesy,” etc., discuss the merits of instrumental music in churches with the Doctor? (“The Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin,” by Joseph Franklin and J. A. Headington, pages 409-412.)

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

In the *Gospel Advocate*, 1856, page 199, Mr. Fanning said:

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

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

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

We do not intend here to enter into this rising controversy. We prefer to forestall the discussion by a full statement of facts bearing on the question and a calm and unprejudiced utterance of the conclusions which we think legitimately flow from the premises submitted. We think the following are lessons clearly taught in the facts which we have presented:

1. That music is a powerful auxiliary in the work of human redemption; and that it is a sacred religious duty, and ought to be a high religious pleasure, to employ it in public and social worship, as a means of spiritual edification.
2. That melody in the *heart* is the great end to be sought; and that artistic excellence is only valuable as it may conduce to that end.

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

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

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

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

voices in the churches in the knowledge of musical science and the practice of suitable tunes, so that the present partial, discordant, and unedifying music of our churches may be abandoned and forgotten.

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

Can Brother Clubb tell us how Isaac Errert, in 1861, could have written of “this rising controversy,” “the innovation of choirs and instruments,” and “that the genius of this reformation movement, like that of previous reformations, is not favorable to choir singing and instrumental music,” *if the pioneers had always stood for those things, as he claims?*

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

CHAPTER II

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

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

I wish some one would pinch me and see if I am awake or dreaming. "We are a Bible people" with a vengeance. Well, what next? [God only knows.—John T. Lewis.] Who will deliver us from the body of this death? ["Body of death" is a very appropriate name for the legitimate offspring of all departures from the New Testament order of things. Evangelist R. E. McCorkle can deliver himself from "the body of this death" by cutting loose from all the inventions and devices of men—such as missionary societies, instrumental music, etc.—in the work and worship of the church and coming back to the teaching of the New Testament.—John T. Lewis.] Methinks if the dead take an interest in the

affairs of men on earth, that Campbell, McGarvey, Errett, Stone and a great company of the departed spirits are weeping over the antics some of our modern churches and preachers are cutting.

Is it a delusion that an apostolic example is equal to a divine command? My understanding is that the communion is a fixed and immovable monument and inseparably united to another fixed monument, the Lord's day, the communion showing Christ's death and the Lord's day his resurrection. I can see no significance in either separated from the other.

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

This wall from Evangelist R. E. McCorkle is pathetic. The idea of the dust, in which the bodies of the fathers are molding, being moistened with their tears “over the antics some of our modern churches and preachers are cutting” is pitiable indeed. Brother M. D. Clubb says: “*Brother Allen and his people are not standing with them* [the fathers]. I am, and about one million five hundred thousand others of my brethren are, today.” We want Brother Clubb to feel free and uncramped in plainly giving us the benefit of his “learning and study,” and tell us which side is “cutting the antics” that are causing the fathers to weep. Is it “*Brother Allen and his people,*” or is it Brother Clubb and his “million five hundred thousand other brethren?” Did Brethren Clubb and McCorkle ever hear of any of “our conservative brethren” wanting to “federate with a Congregational church?” Did they ever hear of them taking communion at “8:45 P.M., Thursday?” These “an-

tics” are natural performances for all who have departed from *the faith of “the fathers.”*

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

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

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

In the *Millennial Harbinger*, 1864, pages 510-514, J. W. McGarvey had an article headed, “Instrumental Music in Churches.” I will quote some extracts from it:

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

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

We read again:

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

and improper that harps or any other musical instruments should be used in Christian congregations.

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

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

There is nothing said in the New Testament about burning incense in connection with Christian worship; it was authorized in Jewish worship, and it is represented in John's vision as accompanying the worship of the angels. Shall we thence argue that, in the silence of the New Testament, these facts should be taken as an indication of the divine will, and, like the Catholics, shall we burn incense in our public worship? Shall we, for the same reason, keep lamps or candles burning in our churches, and array our preachers in gorgeous robes? For all these

the argument is valid, if it is valid for instrumental music. If, therefore, we adopt the latter, we dare not pronounce any man or any church unscriptural in practice that adopts the other three. In whatever light this conclusion might appear to a Catholic or an Episcopalian, it must certainly convince every disciple that the argument from which it springs is unsound. (Pages 511, 512.)

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

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

If, now, any man can mention an act or an element of worship known to be acceptable to God, but not authorized by the New Testament, he will prove this argument against instrumental music in the

church to be invalid. I know not how it can be done in any other way. (Page 513.)

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

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

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

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

With this statement premised, not by way of flattery or apology, but as the naked truth which I think ought to be stated, I must proceed to say that I find a most painful antagonism between my soul and the purpose for which the article named was

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

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

Your first specification has reference to instrumental music in the church. You adduce the ease of certain people in Canada who denied that it was Scriptural to build meetinghouses; then that of the brother who objected to your "singing the harmony of a fine melody which others were vocalizing"; and finally you add: "Once more, more recent and more marvelous: A brother of reputation, educated, and bearing titles, has recently issued a pamphlet of many pages to prove the use of instrumental music in churches to be a violation of the gospel." And why is this *marvelous*? Why so much more marvelous than to oppose the use of meet-

inghouses? Can it be possible that our good brother here means what he says? More marvelous to oppose instrumental music in the church than to oppose the use of houses of worship! When did this become so marvelous? Has this practice been so long established among us as to make it marvelous that an educated man should oppose it? Has this innovation of the Mother of Harlots been so long a welcome guest even among Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists as to make it a marvelous thing to write against it? Certainly it puts on very lofty airs for a thing of its origin and its history.

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

Let our digressive brethren tell us which side did the drifting.

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

light of apostolic teaching, press the innovation in the manner you do? Do you say the opposition is unreasonable, and that you have a right to do as you please, and they have no right to dictate? You cannot say this, for you know that neither you nor I have any right to do as we please touching matters which affect the peace and fellowship of the churches. Do you say that you are under no more obligation to yield than they? You cannot, because you are urging an *innovation*, one which you confess the Scriptures do not authorize, and which, therefore, you cannot feel bound in conscience to maintain. Your only ground of defense is the expediency of it, and the assumption that our religion is flexible enough to receive it. If your religion is thus flexible, why must it all the time bend toward those corrupt parties who invented and have hitherto exclusively used the organ, yet remain as stiff as a crowbar against your own brethren who oppose it? Why is it so expedient to conciliate a sectarianized and vitiated public taste, but so inexpedient to conciliate your own conscientious brethren, whose heart's desire and prayer to God is for the restoration of the simple worship instituted by the apostles? (Page 217.)

I heartily commend this paragraph from the pungent pen of the scholarly McGarvey to our digressive brethren, who *think* they are standing with the pioneers on the music question. I hope they may *read, study, mark, and inwardly digest it*. In the light of what Brother J. W. McGarvey says about “conciliating a sectarianized and vitiated public taste,” I will quote again from Brother Clubb’s article. Don’t forget that I am answering Brother Clubb’s challenge in the *Gospel Advocate*, February 6, 1930, pages 132, 133.

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

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

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

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

In conclusion, let me add, that if any brother who reads this sees fit to style me intolerant dictator or self-consequent, I say to him that I claim to be nothing more than one plain disciple of Christ, and to exercise a prerogative which belongs to us all. It is my duty to find fault with everybody and everything that is wrong, and it is equally the duty of every other brother. In the full and free performance

of this task lies the only safety for the truth. Error alone can suffer in such warfare, and she alone is afraid of it. If I have struck one blow amiss, let it be returned on me double, and it will be well.” (Page 219.)

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

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

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

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

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

“The congregation had voted to install a pipe organ, and to this, Dr. McGarvey objected. He was

the first pastor of the Church after its organization in 1870.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

This is a sample of the material contained in
*The Voice of the Pioneers on
Instrumental Music and Societies*
by John T. Lewis

To order single copies, visit:
store.gospelarmory.com/product/voice-of-the-pioneers/

To place a bulk order (10 or more copies)
at a discounted price, visit:
www.gospelarmory.com/bulk/

Thank you!

