

A PLAIN DIALOGUE

BY J. H. T. KILPATRICK
(1793-1869)

*A plain dialogue between two brethren, A. & B. of the Baptist
denomination. By a friend to Zion in Georgia.*

Brother A. Good morning, brother B. I am truly glad to see you at my house so early this morning. I hope you have something pleasing and profitable to relate to me and my family concerning religion?

Brother B. Nothing very particular; but my mind has been running a great deal, of late, upon this Missionary and Anti-missionary business; and, as you know, I am what people call an Anti-missionary man—and, as I know, you are what people call a Missionary man, I thought I would just walk over, and have a serious, Christian, and brotherly chat with you on the subject.

A. With all my heart, my dear brother. But, I hope our conversation on this interesting and important subject, is to be not only serious, Christian, and brotherly; but, also, cool and dispassionate—

candid and plain, as between brethren. And, indeed, I hope we shall enter upon this subject with hearts lifted up to Almighty God in prayer; that our conversation may be to the edification of ourselves, the benefit of others, and the honor and glory of God.

B. I agree to all this; and hope, and trust, it may be as you say—for my own part, I wish to know what is right.

A. My brother, if we must enter on this subject, the first, thing, (if we would go correctly to work,) is to settle the meaning of the word Missionary; about which there is so much ado. I would, therefore, ask you, my brother,—what is the meaning of this word?

B. Why, I have always understood the word Missionary to mean a money-hunter, or a person going about the country preaching, or rather pretending to preach the Gospel, when, in reality, he is only hunting money; and begging people out of their hard earnings, as he says, for religious purposes, when, indeed, it is only to be put into his own pocket; thus cheating the people, and carrying on a great imposition and speculation.

A. If this be the idea you have attached to that word, it is no wonder you have been so opposed to Missionaries. If I understood the word as you do, I should be as strenuous in my opinion as you are, or perhaps more so. But I would further ask,—How do you define the word Apostle.

B. Why, Apostle, I always thought, meant one of the preachers in the days of Jesus, while he was here on earth, such as Peter and Paul, and others.

A PLAIN DIALOGUE

A. Peter and Paul were certainly Apostles, though Paul was not called to preach the Gospel, till some time after our Saviour had, in person, left this world. But permit me to observe, my brother, you have given no definition of the word Apostle, as to its literal or proper signification.

B. Will you be so kind as to let me hear your definition of Apostle and Missionary too? for I should be glad to know the proper meaning of them both.

A. I will with pleasure. And here, before I proceed, suffer me to say, I am truly sorry that you do not know the origin of these words; that is, you do not know the languages from which they are derived; for if you did, we should have no difficulty on the subject. And further, if you were acquainted with the proper meaning of these words, and knew from whence they are derived, &c. &c., I am persuaded that all those prejudices which now possess your bosom, would be done away.

The fact is, both these words signify the very same thing. They both come from words, or verbs, which signify to send, or to send forth; and when used as names, they signify persons sent, or sent forth. The only difference between the words is that of sound; one following the sound of the Greek—the other the Latin. The word Apostle comes from the Greek verb *Apostello*. The word Missionary, from the Latin verb *Mitto*; but these both signify, in English, to send, or to send forth. Therefore, the word Missionary, in its literal sense, signifies any one sent, or sent forth, on any business or matter whatever; but when the word Missionary is used in a religious sense, it signifies a, minister of

the Gospel, or one sent of God, to preach the Gospel:—consequently, every minister of the Gospel, who is indeed sent of God, is a Missionary, whether he knows it or not, or whether he believes it or not; of course, every word which our opposing brethren say against Missionaries, is just so much said against themselves, if indeed they are sent of God to preach the Gospel! Now, my brother, is it not a pity that people, yea, ministers of the Gospel too, should calumniate, vilify and abuse themselves, and yet not know it!! Oh! my dear brother, well might we adopt the language of the prayer of the dying Jesus in this case, and say,—“Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.”

B. Well! but brother A. you cannot show me the word Missionary in the New Testament, nor in the word of God?

A. I knew that as well as you. But, my brother, reflect for one moment, and you will certainly find that this mode of argument is too frivolous for any man of sense. And, more especially, I wish you to remember, that if it proves anything it proves too much. But as I am aware that this is considered a strong argument by you and your party, I shall therefore take some pains in showing you, that it is no argument at all, or, as already said, if it will prove anything, it will prove too much. I ask you, my brother,—Do you find the word “immersion” in the New Testament? Or do you find the expression, “imputed righteousness of Christ” in the word of God? You certainly do not. Now remember that this is the very same argument of which those make use who practise sprinkling; and also of those who deny the doctrine of the imputed righteousness of Christ. They cry out, “You can’t show

us immersion in the New Testament,” nor “the expression imputed righteousness of Christ, in the word of God.” And they think, or seem to think, they have completely stopped the mouths of those who hold to both. Now what are you to do? You must see that according to your own arguments, and in order to be consistent with yourself, you must drop the practice of immersion, and give up the doctrine of imputed righteousness. You must further see, that inasmuch as you bring forward the same argument against the Missionaries, which those other persons bring against the Baptists; therefore, I say, you must see that if your argument is good, so is theirs; and if theirs is not good, neither is yours. There is no way of getting round or over this.

B. But then, we have men enough among the Baptists who know the Greek language, in which, as I have been told, the New Testament was originally written and they all say, the word baptize signifies to immerse; and I believe them. Indeed, I have heard you explain the thing to my entire satisfaction.

A. True, my brother, the Greek word, rendered baptize in our present version, signifies to immerse, dip, plunge, &c.; and so the Greek word, rendered Apostle in our version, signifies Missionary, or one sent. The truth is, neither of the words was ever translated into English, properly speaking, but only altered a little in their termination, while the original Greek words were retained. If you do not feel free to believe me, go and ask others who know the original, and are not warped by sectarian prejudice, —go and consult the translation of Doddridge, Macknight,

and G. Campbell, and you will find what I say to be correct.¹ And now, my brother, I hope you will learn, and remember for the future, that to speak lightly of the word Missionary is the same as to speak lightly of the word Apostle. I do humbly trust that you will never deride, nor yet be frightened at this word any more, or speak hard things of those who bear the name. You said you believed those who were acquainted with the Greek, &c., when they told you thus and so concerning the word baptize—why then will you not believe them, when they tell you the proper meaning of the words Missionary and Apostle?

B. But do you not believe there is a speculation going on in this Missionary business?

A. I candidly do not. Nor do I believe it is in the power of you, or any one of our Anti-Missionary brethren, to prove one solitary charge, of the many which are brought forward of this nature. I know there is a mighty outcry about speculation; but is it not strange, passing strange, that those who never gave one cent, nor ever intend to give towards the spread of the Gospel, or the glorious Missionary effort that is now making, as the means in the hands of God to evangelize the world, should be the very persons to find fault about the money expended in this business! And is it not equally strange, that those who know nothing at all of what is doing, should be able to discover fraud, speculation, &c., while those who know the whole movement, and where every cent of the money goes, how expended, &c., should know

¹ Editor's Note: We agree in principle as to question the rationale of the argument. While not necessary to consult any so-called "original" or other "translations," the double-standard in B's justification is obvious.

nothing of this! And, surely, if any persons ought to complain about the improper expenditure of money, it should be those who give their money, and not those who do not give, or ever intend to give! But, my brother, what is still more strange than all the rest, if possible, is, that all those Christians, and especially ministers of the Gospel, not only among Baptists, but also, of other Christian denominations, who have always been the most signalized for disinterested Christian benevolence, honesty, zeal, and unwearied exertion and perseverance in the cause of humanity, of religion, of Christ, and of God—and whose moral and religious characters stand fair and unimpeachable—strange! that all the while, these men are nothing but a band of swindlers, pick pockets, and cheats!!! Be assured, my brother, there is a particular account taken of the time when, the place where, and the manner how this money is expended; and this you would know, if you knew anything at all about it. Indeed, what surprises me, is, that so much should be done at so small an expense. You can now obtain the blessed word of God for a mere trifle, compared with the usual price of paper, printing, binding, &c. before Bible and other benevolent societies sprang into being. The fact is, the day is coming, when it will be known who loved and hugged up their money, and who did not—when it will be known, who loved their money better than precious immortal souls, and who did not!

B. I have been looking over the word of God again and again, and I can find no—“Thus saith the Lord,” —no authority, either in precept or example, for all this Missionary business.

A. This appears very strange, indeed. If I mistake not, the

Missionary business, as you call it, is to do all the good we can, as instruments in the hands of God, in administering to the spiritual wants of our fellow-creatures—in preaching a crucified Saviour to a dying world. The Gospel is glad tidings of great joy, peace on earth, and good will towards all men—The Missionary spirit is to declare these glad tidings to all men.— The Missionary business is to visit every city, hamlet, and cottage—yea, every part of the whole world, and every spot where human beings live, and tell them of a Saviour—tell them Jesus died to save lost sinners. The ascending Jesus says, “Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature!” Surely this is precept—is it not? Well, the Missionary spirit is to carry this command—this positive, great, and heart-cheering command into effect. The Saviour says, “Ye are the salt of the earth.” Now, my brother, I pray you to reflect upon the import of this solemn passage of Scripture. What is salt? and what its use? Is it not to save from putrefaction and loss, those bodies and substances which are predisposed to putrefaction, and which would putrefy and rot, and consequently be lost, were it not for the application, yea, the speedy application of this salt? Again, salt is not only to save from putridity, but to render sweet and palatable to the taste, and proper for the master’s use. Now, if Christians are to the world, not a part of the world, but the whole of it, what salt is to a piece of flesh and other substances subject to putrefy, O! then, what a loud and irresistible call for speedy, powerful, and unwearied exertion! Here is a great body, a mighty mass, even eight hundred millions of human beings, carrying within them by nature the properties of putridity and the seeds of

death! Six hundred millions of these precious immortal souls are not even nominally Christians, and have not so much as heard of Jesus! Now, my brother, the missionary spirit is to apply this little remaining salt, as far as possible, to the whole of this vast body of putridity, and death. It is to go and tell those perishing millions that there is a Saviour. Thirty years is the length of time allowed for a generation to pass away. Then, my brother, I ask—Where, O! where is the Christian heart that can reflect unmoved, that in thirty years, six hundred millions of human beings must die, without having heard of Jesus—must stumble over the high mountains of darkness, and be lost for ever! Surely no Christian can know this, without feeling a strong desire to extend the helping hand, and exert himself, as God’s instrument, in sending the Gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation to all that believe, to these perishing sons and daughters of Adam. Again, our Saviour says, “Ye are the light of the world”—not a part of the world. The missionary spirit is to let this light shine into every part of the whole world, driving away moral darkness, and imparting moral light. “Go,” says our blessed master, “and teach all nations,” &c. The missionary spirit is to obey. God, by the mouth of Paul, says, “How shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard,” &c. “Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God;” therefore, the missionary spirit says, they shall hear—they shall have the word of God. —Hence it is that you see Bible Societies established, and Missionaries going forth. It would be in vain, my dear brother, to attempt to point out the many positive Gospel precepts which call upon every Christian for the most unwearied

exertions of a missionary nature; we shall, therefore, take a glance at the examples. We find after our Saviour had commanded his Apostles to go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature, it is said, in the 20th verse, “And they went forth and preached every where,” &c. This is precisely what the missionary spirit aims at, in this day and time. It is said, in the same verse, that the Lord worked with them. So he does at present; he works with his missionary servants, as the instruments in his hands. If this is not example, then, my brother, I am at an utter loss to know what you mean by example. If you wish any further example, take the whole Apostolic dispensation; see how laborious, persevering, and indefatigable were all the Apostles, in visiting every nation, and kindred, and tribe of people; but especially Paul, the great Apostle or Missionary to the Gentile or Heathen world. And if you will turn your attention to the 4th chapter of Phil. 15 and 16 verses, you will find proof that the brethren supported Paul while thus engaged in preaching to the heathen, just as the missionary brethren do in this day and time. See also 2 Cor. xi. 7, 8, 9, and xii. 13, &c. &c.

I would therefore say, that the Gospel breathes the very spirit of benevolence and religious missionary effort, and that the missionary spirit is the very spirit of the Gospel. Yea, I would say, the missionary effort now making, is the very hand of the Gospel, (so to speak) which the Lord of hosts is putting forward, by which to evangelize the world, and gather in the fields, which are already white to the harvest. —And that nearly the whole of the New Testament, both in precept and example, is a “Thus saith the Lord,” for the missionary exertions that we are now making.

B. But if God wishes the heathen to be converted, can he not convert them without your help, and all this ado?

A. True, God is able to carry his purposes into effect, without the agency of man at all, if he sees proper. But, you must remember, this observation is just as true about all things else, whether at home or abroad, whether temporal or

True, God is able to carry his purposes into effect, without the agency of man at all, if he sees proper. But, you must remember, this observation is just as true about all things else, whether at home or abroad, whether temporal or spiritual, as it is about the conversion of the heathen. If God wishes it done he can do it. Why then, my brother, do you give yourself all this trouble about your crop, when the truth is, if God will you to have a plentiful crop, he can give it to you without your labor and all this ado?

spiritual, as it is about the conversion of the heathen. If God wishes it done he can do it. Why then, my brother, do you give yourself all this trouble about your crop, when the truth is, if God will you to have a plentiful crop, he can give it to you without your labor and all this ado? Or why trouble yourself about any blessing whatever, for if God wills you to have it, he can give it to you without your agency? God is able to fill your barns with grain and your coffers with gold, without your labor; so give yourself no trouble; throw by all your implements of husbandry, and lie down and fold your hands, and say, "A little more sleep," &c. Again —If God wills the people to be converted in our own county, he can convert them, or in our own state, or country, or family—our wives, or sons, or daughters, or servants. If God wills any, or all these to be converted, he can do it without our work; so, then, away with all

Ah! my brother, you must see that your principle is rotten, and when reduced to practice, it will not do.

preaching, and praying, and exhorting, and reading—send home your ministers and burn your meeting-houses, for the

truth is, God can convert the people, and save their souls without all these. Ah! my brother, you must see that your principle is rotten, and when reduced to practice, it will not do.

The truth is, this principle goes not only to paralyze, but completely to destroy all human agency whatever, relative to all things, both in the physical and moral world. Again, what God can do, is no part of our business; our duty and business is to obey. Suppose there is a kind master with a great many servants; and he tells one of them to go to a distant part of his plantation, and give food to some persons there, who are likely to perish; but this servant, instead of obeying, says to his master, “Sir, if you wish those persons to be fed, you are able to feed them without my help; I shall not go one step.” What would you think of such a servant? Would you not say he was an insolent and disobedient servant? But what is still worse, suppose that this disobedient servant not only refuses to obey his master’s orders himself, but does all in his power to hinder others from obeying, and continually whispers in their ears, your master is able to feed those people, if he wishes to have them fed, without your help; and when he finds they are determined to obey their master, and do their duty, he actually insults and abuses them for this act of obedience, and declares he will no longer keep company with them, or any one else that will obey their master, in

affording relief to those persons who are starving for bread. What do you say of this servant now? O! you will say, his conduct is exceedingly improper. Very well, I leave you to make the application. There is one idea more embraced in this principle of yours, which I desire you to notice; and that is, it goes to impeach God with folly, for having called into requisition, or pressed into his service the weak agency of man, (which he has done from his first formation to the present time,) when, according to this principle of yours, there was no necessity for it, or propriety in so doing! Brother B., reflect and tremble.

B. What! Do you say God has called into requisition the agency of man from his first existence?

A. Certainly. When God created man, he put him into the garden to dress it. And surely if God willed the garden to be dressed, he was able to dress it, without the help of Adam. And I have sometimes thought this was to show that man was to be the dresser of God's spiritual garden, so long as he had a church upon earth. But let us return to the subject.

B. Yes, I wish to return; for you really have made my argument about God's ability look bad enough. But I still feel that the conversion of the soul is God's work; and we ought to be careful, lest we be found taking his works into our hands. —Remember Uzzah.

A. True, my brother, the conversion of the soul is God's work, and his only; and a man can no more convert his own soul, or that of another, independent of God, than he can create a world. But it is equally true, that he can no more make one grain of corn, or seed of

cotton, independent of God, than he can convert a soul, or create a world.—Nay, my brother, all the men in the universe combined, can no more make one blade of corn grow, independent of God and his blessing, than they can pull down the strong pillars of heaven. Is it not in God that we live, move, and have our being? But, because it is God's work, and by his blessing that our corn grows, and of his unmerited goodness that we have bread to eat, shall we cease to use our agency; or cease to make use of the means which God has put into our power? And so in a spiritual sense, because God giveth the increase, shall Paul cease to plant, or Apollos to water? Surely not. Again— You appear to be so fearful of doing God's work— I would ask you, whose work do you wish to do? Is it your own? If so, it will be the work of the flesh and sin. Or is it the devil's work you wish to do? If so, it will be the work of darkness and mischief. And is it not as much the work of God to convert souls in your neighborhood as in India? Then to be consistent, you ought to cease to preach, or exhort, or pray, or weep over, or plead with poor sinners; lest you might be the instrument of their conversion, and thus become guilty of doing God's work. We are commanded in the word of God, in almost innumerable instances, to this effect—To WORK while it is day, &c. To LABOR for the meat that perisheth not, &c. And in one place we are expressly called, Laborers together with God (1 Cor. iii. 9.) And again, it is said, we are workers together with him, &c. (See 2 Cor. vi. 1.)

You wish me to remember Uzzah; and so I would say to you—remember Meroz, with all the inhabitants thereof, who were to be

cursed bitterly, for not doing the very thing you are so fearful of doing, viz. helping the Lord.—(See Judges v. 23.) And as to Uzzah, whose case frightens you so very much, I do not think it a parallel case, or case in point; for he had no command to touch the ark of the Lord, but the Missionary has a positive command, to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature.

B. Well, but did not Uzzah think he was right?

A. It is very possible he did; and what then? I hope you do not think that I, or any other person, who is favorable to missionary efforts, will say that Christians ought to be governed in their conduct, merely by their own ideas of right and wrong, independent of the word of God? On the contrary, we contend, that we must be governed by the word of God; and that we do stand, yea, firmly stand on Scripture ground in all our missionary exertions. And, moreover, that we fall very far short, after our most vigorous efforts, of doing anything like as much as the Scriptures require us to do, as God's instruments, towards the salvation of the world. Christ himself plainly teaches us, (see Luke xvii. 10) that we are bound to do all things that are commanded us, and then say, we are unprofitable servants. And who, I would ask, can say he has done all that was commanded him, or all that God has put it in his power to do? Not one.

B. You said just now, that the Missionary had a command to go into the world and preach the Gospel to every creature; to this I have no particular objection. But what are all those about, who are not preachers? that say they also are engaged in the missionary cause?

A. Most certainly. There are two ways in which things may be done, viz.—actually and virtually. For instance, there is a house to be built; I am no mechanic, nor do I strike a stroke on the house; yet, by the blessing of God, I am enabled to find all the materials, bear all the expenses, and support all the mechanics while at work; hence it will be said of me, and justly too, that I built the house—not actually, but virtually. And so it is, my dear brother, by preaching the Gospel. Though I may be no preacher, actually; yea, I might be a delicate female, and even confined to a sick bed, yet by affording, by the blessing of God, a part of all those different secondary means which are necessary in carrying the Gospel to different and distant parts of the world, I thus become the weak, though much honored and happy instrument, in the hands of Almighty God, of preaching (that is, virtually) the glorious Gospel to perishing thousands in those destitute parts of the world, thousands of miles from me, where I never have been, nor expect ever to be. O, my brother, what Christian should not exult in, and praise the Lord for such a privilege?

B. But have we not enough unconverted people at home, to whom we may preach? Why then go so far abroad?

A. True, there are unconverted sinners at home; but do we not also preach to them? And as I know this is a very popular argument with you anti-missionary brethren, do suffer me to ask—Who are making the most vigorous exertions for those at home? Who ride and preach the most? Who distribute the most Bibles, Testaments, Tracts, and other good books amongst those at home? And I might add, whose

labors appear to be the more abundantly blessed of God? Who, by the help of God, are the foremost in all those things at home? If you will let experience, observation, and matters of fact answer, you must, you will say, they are those who are also engaged in supporting the gospel abroad. But again, according to your principles, how can you expect any minister to go and preach to other churches and congregations, while there are unconverted persons in his own neighborhood or congregation? Or how can you wish or expect him to go and preach to others, while there is an unconverted person in his own family? You must see this argument will not do.

B. Does not charity begin at home? Why then do you take the money—the hard earnings of the poor negro, to expend in sending the gospel abroad, while these unfortunate people are measurably neglected here amongst us?

A. The missionary brethren certainly pity this unfortunate class of people as much, and do as much to benefit them as the anti-missionary brethren do, if not more. But the truth is, hundreds and thousands of these people do receive and enjoy all the benefits of a preached gospel—thousands of them are rejoicing in an humble assurance of the pardon of their sins, for Christ's sake. But, my brother, to convince you that the missionary man pities these people as much as the anti-missionary man, and that this argument of yours is a mere make-shift, a mere “get off,” suffer me to ask you, Do not the anti-missionary brethren have negro slaves? What are they doing, with all the money and hard earnings of their poor negroes? Are they giving it

all back to them? Do they educate them any better? Do they preach to them any more? Do they give them better opportunities in any way? Again, my brother, What is the reason you never say one word about poor negroes' hard earnings, when you see hundreds of persons laying out large sums of money, in purchasing a thousand superfluities, and even sinful amusements and gratifications of life? Yea, a man may lay out just what he pleases—he may spend his hundreds and thousands a year, in sinful and wicked amusements—he may buy barrels of whiskey and hogsheads of rum, to his own hurt and the great annoyance and injury of both civil and religious society; yet you are perfectly silent! But, let a missionary brother spend anything with a view to the furtherance of the gospel, or of religious knowledge in any way, and that moment the hue and cry is raised about charity at home, poor negroes' hard earnings, &c. &c. Oh! my brother, how is this? Does it not look like a settled opposition to the spread of the gospel, and the diffusion of religious knowledge? Is not the poor negro as much benefited by his hard earnings, yea more, when it is used in the advancement of religious knowledge, than when laid out in whiskey, to be gulped down his master's throat, or other unnecessary articles, of which the poor negro is allowed no part.

B. But is not this missionary business attended with a great deal of expense, in proportion to the profit?

A. And has it come to this? What! a Christian talk of expense, when the precious, immortal souls of men and women are at stake! Now, my brother, if it had not been that I heard a brother, at an

Association once, make this same objection, I could not have believed that any Christian on earth, would ever complain of expense in such a case as this!

The brother to whom I allude, observed, "It is very possible that those missionary exertions may have been and may yet

Another brother, who advocated the missionary cause, replied, "Well, brother, I suppose you understand something of figures; will you be so kind as to take your pen, and calculate the value of one soul, and let us see what it is, and whether it is not as much as all that has yet been expended?" This reply appeared to strike the other brother dumb.

be instrumental in the conversion of some few souls; but then," added he, "what is that compared with so much expense?" (or words to that effect.) Another brother, who advocated the missionary cause, replied, "Well, brother, I suppose you understand something of figures; will you be so kind as to take your pen, and calculate the value of one soul, and let us see what it is, and whether it is not as much as all that has yet been expended?" This reply appeared to strike the other brother dumb. So my brother, I would say to you. But you certainly do know, (our Saviour being judge) that one soul is worth more than the whole world; for "What is a man's profit, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" Consequently, you must see from this, that if the whole world should be expended in missionary labors, and be instrumental in the salvation of but one soul, still it would be a world profitably and well spent.

Brother! brother! Read the 12th chap. of John, 3, 4, 5, and 6 verses, and tremble, when you so much as think of expense in such

a case as this! Judas cried out much as you anti-missionary brethren are now doing about expense, money, &c. when the anointing of the blessed Redeemer's feet cost something. And remember, Judas' excuse was the great regard he pretended to have for the poor: but, O! mark well, this was not the fact; but a covetous disposition was at the bottom of his out-cry about expense! I wish you also to remember, that this expense of which you anti-missionary brethren complain, is on account of Christ's mystical² body; for his church, wherever gathered from, is his body, mystically. And I have thought before now, that Jesus Christ suffered this circumstance to take place, on purpose to teach us a great lesson, viz: That if he approved of the expense bestowed, even on his own feet, how much more would he approve of that expense bestowed on his body, in the person of his saints. Moreover, I do not believe any man will ever impoverish himself by giving to the Lord, for the Lord loveth a cheerful giver; and he certainly will bless those whom he loveth, as far as shall be for their good and his glory. Again, I believe many people think whatever they withhold from the Lord, or from religious purposes, is just so much clear gain, as to their worldly possessions; and, also, that whatever they may give, is just so much clear loss; but surely such persons have forgotten that "The Lord giveth, and the Lord taketh away." And, also, as the Lord hath said by the mouth of Solomon, "There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth, and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty. The liberal soul shall be made fat, and he that watereth, shall be watered also

² Editor's Note: i.e. "spiritual"

himself.” (Prov. xi. 24, 25:) and “That it is more blessed to give than to receive.” — (Acts xx. 35.) Hence, you need not be surprised, my brother, as some appear to be, that the missionary brethren prosper, even in their worldly concerns. Not that I would wish any one to give from a hope of gain—God forbid; but to show that we need not be afraid of reducing ourselves to beggary, as appears to be the case with many.

B. Well, you do appear to tear up my objections on every side; but there is one thing I think you cannot deny, and that is, this missionary business has created a world of trouble and disturbance among brethren.

A. Indeed, brother B., I think this among the greatest mistakes you have made yet.

B. What! Do you deny this? And what, pray, has made all the disturbance, if it has not been this missionary business?

A. The opposition, my brother, is and has been the cause of all the disturbance! But as this is by far your most popular objection, and the hobby on which you all ride, I wish to take a little pains in removing it.—The spirit of freedom and independence, which seized upon the minds of the American people in ‘76, might just as well have been blamed as the cause of all the fighting and bloodshed which took place during the revolutionary war; and no doubt, all who were opposed to the cause of freedom, did blame it as the cause of all the troubles that took place. And, in a certain sense, it might be so said; but surely the guilty cause was the opposition, or the spirit of tyranny exercised towards us. Again, it might have been said by the Jews, that the coming

of our blessed Redeemer into this world, was the cause of all the innocent children, of two years old and under, being put to death; and, in a certain sense, this appears to be a fact; but surely the guilty cause was the jealous, wicked-hearted Herod.— And so with the Christian religion; it has been blamed by its opposers, at different times, as the cause of bloodshed, cruelty, and persecution. And, in the first Christian era, the religion of Jesus was blamed as the cause of disturbance. Hence we hear some crying out, “These men that turn the world upside down, have come hither also.” But surely the real guilty cause was the opposition to, and the want of, more of this blessed religion. And so with a thousand other instances which might be brought forward; but let this suffice. Therefore, I say, it is not the missionary spirit and exertions which have, properly speaking, given rise to these disturbances, but the opposition has been, and now is, the real cause.

B. But we are fearful you missionary brethren will lay a tax on us after a while, and make us pay into your funds, whether we will or not.

A. Indeed! And this betrays your ignorance, my brother, to the most fearful extent. Suppose we wished to do so, how could we do it? Is not the civil authority the supreme authority of the land? According to the Constitution of the United States, as well as of each state in the Union, there is no power or authority but what is subordinate to the civil; and this civil authority expressly secures liberty of conscience in matters of religion to every individual citizen. How then could any ecclesiastical court or religious body levy and collect a tax, contrary to the constitutional authority of the Federal Government? But the fact

is, we are so far from wishing to do any such thing, that if we knew any person to give grudgingly, if it were but one cent, we would not receive it; for we still maintain, “That God loveth a cheerful giver.” And the counterpart of this must be that he frowneth upon the penurious churl that will not give at all, or giveth grudgingly.

B. But again—I have always been told that you missionary brethren wish to make ministers, whether God has called them or not.

A. This is just like a great many other things you have been told; it is without foundation. To convince you of this, I refer you to the Minutes of Baptist Conventions and other bodies friendly to the education of ministers. In them you will find Resolutions on this subject which, I hope, will satisfy you, and for ever silence this false report which has been propagated against us. One of those Resolutions, adopted by a body in our own state, reads thus, “Every person proposed to participate in this benefit, (meaning the education fund) shall produce a regular license from the church of which he is a member, to preach the gospel in her bounds, accompanied by a certificate of his good acceptance among his brethren, and of his good report in the community at large.” Second, “He shall undergo an examination by, and receive the approbation of, the executive committee of this body, as to his call of God to the gospel ministry,” &c.

Hence, you see, it is not designed to make ministers, as has been falsely reported, but merely to afford the means of further improvement to those whom God has called, and whom their own churches have licensed to preach. And so far from opening a door for a carnal ministry,

as some have said, they place a double guard against it.

B. Can you show any Scripture authority for a man's studying after he is called of God to preach?

A. Yes—and I should think this is the very reason why he should study. Paul exhorts Timothy and Titus, again and again, to attend to this business. He exhorts Timothy thus, “Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.” The fact is, my brother, these two Epistles, being written to young ministers, are mostly taken up in exhortations to them, to attend to their theological studies. But our great authority in this matter, is the example given us by Jesus Christ himself. After he had chosen and ordained his twelve apostles, and set them apart to the gospel ministry, he still kept them with him about three years, except when they were out on short preaching tours, during the whole of which time, he continually taught and instructed them in the best theological school that ever was on earth. (See Mark iii. 13, 14,15.) “And he goeth up into a mountain, and calleth unto him whom he would: and they came unto him. And he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have power to heal sickness and to cast out devils.” Here, my brother, you see there was a calling, and an ordaining to the work of the ministry, but yet they did not go fully into the work, but remained with their teacher; and why? Because, though they were ordained ministers, yet they were very ignorant of a great many things they ought to have known, and afterwards did know. Now, my brother, I think this ought

to satisfy you, or any one else, on this subject. And this is precisely the manner of procedure in our theological institutions, against which so much is said. None are taken into them but those whom we believe to be called of God, and who are actually licensed to preach the gospel, by the churches of which they are members. And it is a rule, that those theological students shall preach as much and as often as possible during their studies. It is a most strange and erroneous idea, that because a man is called to preach the gospel, he then needs no further instruction or information. Now, my brother, you know better than this; but to convince you still further, if possible, let me turn your attention to one more striking instance of the necessity of further information, after being called to, and engaged in, the work of the gospel ministry. Apollos “was an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures;” yet when Aquila and Priscilla had heard him preach, “They took him unto them, and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly.” (See Acts xviii. 24, 26.) Let this suffice, though I could multiply Scripture authority in proof of the point.

B. But will not this learning and theological studying, bring upon us a carnal and ungodly ministry?

A. O, my brother, why will you talk in this strange manner, or entertain these groundless fears. Paul did not think with you; but, on the contrary, he tells us, that a minister must not be “a novice, lest being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil.” Hence, you see, that Paul greatly feared the dreadful effects of an ignorant and uninformed ministry. And justly, too, for pride and ignorance go hand

in hand, and are as inseparable as cause and effect; indeed, one is the effect, and the other the cause. Ignorance always begets pride, and this brings on a dreadful train of evil consequences. Remember this, my brother, if you please.—There is one thing in which learning and religion agree, and that is, the more a man has, the more he wants; and again, the less he has, the less he wants. Go to the man who makes no pretensions to religion at all, and who is just as wicked as he can be—talk to him about religion. O, he is just as good as you, or any body else; and has just as much religion as he wants. And just so it is with the illiterate man; he has just as much learning as he wants, and is as wise as any body. Now, in both these cases, those unfortunate and self-conceited men have not enough knowledge to see their deficiency. They both cry out—what good does it do? But go to men of learning or of piety,— talk to them about literature or religion, and they are both ready to acknowledge their deficiency, and tell you they want more. Why and how is this? Because they have enough to know something of their utility, and also to see how much they lack. I know, and so do you, of some brethren who do not know how to read the blessed word of God, and yet they will get up in the church and rail out against learning in the most bitter terms! Oh! brother, let us pray for such— “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.” They know not that they are aiming a death blow, so far as their influence goes, at the very root and foundation of all our liberties, both civil and religious? Only do away all learning and learned men, and what should we be, more than an untutored tribe of Indians? What would become of the word of God, or of what use would

it be? What would become of our civil government and liberties? Where would be our legislators?—Our statesmen?—Our congressmen?—Our ministers to foreign courts, &c. &c.? Gone, all gone! And then farewell, a long and an eternal fare well, to our present liberties and glorious form of government? But worst of all—Farewell, farewell—a long and last farewell to the word of God, the blessed book of eternal life! Do away learning and learned men, and you introduce ignorance, and ignorance would introduce its train of evils, which would overturn all civil and religious society. If it had not been for learned men, who could have gathered the word of God from the different languages in which it was written, and put it into our language? And if it were not for learned men now, how could we tell whether these scriptures are correctly translated from the Hebrew and Greek, into English, or not? Or how could we tell how many and how great errors may have already crept into our translation, if we could not run back to the original, and there examine for ourselves?³ And who would there be to translate the word of life into the various languages of the different tribes and nations on earth, who, as yet, have not this book in their own languages? This must be done. And glory to God, it is rapidly doing. God is now, by and through the instrumentality of learned men, giving his blessed word to various tribes and nations, who, a little while back, did not so much as know there was such a book! But now, they can read it in their own language—they do read it, and praise God for the gift.

³ Editor's Note: Since there is no "original" to examine, we will trust the power of God to perfectly and eternally preserve the Scriptures for us: "*Thy word is true from the beginning: and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth for ever*" (Psalms 119:160).

The owl grumbled at the rising sun, because the weaker powers of his eyes were thereby eclipsed; and is it possible that men, who know but little more about learning and its benefits, than the owl did about the benefits of the sun, will complain of those bright rays of the Sun of Righteousness, which God is causing to shine forth, through the instrumentality of learning and learned men, merely because their humbler attainments are thereby eclipsed? I would fain hope better things. Once more: Did you ever know a religious man rail out against, and vilify religion and religious men? O, no. Why? Because he knew the value and utility of both, too well. And just so it is with learning and learned men. Those only who know nothing about the value of either, rail out against both. What right has a blind man, to set himself up as a judge of colors? None. And what right has a man, who has never had the advantage of an education, to set himself up as a judge of the utility of learning or learned men? Again—Suppose there is a man who cannot walk—he either has no feet, or is deprived of the use of them. What would be your surprise, to hear this man, instead of using those means whereby he might be brought to walk, or praising God that there were others who could walk, and thereby help him,—I say, what would be your surprise, if, instead of this, you should hear him continually crying out against walking, and finding fault with those who can walk? and that too, when this man must know, that those persons who can walk, are the instruments, in the hands of God, of communicating to his necessities, and that whenever he wants anything done, he is obliged to call upon those who can walk. You are ready to say, this would be the

strangest man, and the strangest conduct you ever knew. Very well, I leave you to make the application.

Observe! Those who are opposed to learning, information, and mental improvement, though I do not suppose they know it, are in fact opposed to, and fighting against the best interests of their country, and striking, as before said, at the root of all our liberties, both civil and religious. Because, you will take notice, our form of government is republican, or democratical, and surely you know that in all republics, or democracies, the strength is in the people; hence you must see, that the strength of the government must be in precise proportion to the strength of the people, and this strength will be in precise proportion to the degree of information or mental endowment possessed by every individual citizen in the government.—In a word, in our form of government, the people govern. How necessary then, that each man who has a right to a vote, be possessed of that information and mental acquirement which would be necessary in a state legislator, a congressman, a governor, a president; for in reality, the people are the legislators, the congressmen, and the president; only it is in the person of those whom they have chosen. For all civil officers, from the constable to the president, are only the creatures of the people. I hope, my brother, you will take this subject into serious consideration. I feel much concerned in this business. The Baptists have always been considered the greatest friends to their country, and to republicanism. This is the spirit of their form of church government, and this they adopted because they conceived it to be the spirit breathed forth by the word of God. Oh! let

it not be said, that Baptists have become the enemies of their country, by trying to stifle learning and mental improvement, which are two of the strong pillars on which republicanism stands.

B. But if God wants a learned man, can he not call him?

A. True, my brother, and if God chooses, he can make one acre of your land, (and that without your clearing it, planting or ploughing it,) yield one or ten thousand bushels of corn. What is the reason, my brother, that you are always advocating those measures which require nothing on your part but laziness?

B. Have not some unlearned ministers been greatly blessed in their ministerial labors, and very useful men?

A. Yes, and we thank God for it. But these men were possessed of clear heads, strong minds, and sound hearts. They were not opposed to education, but encouraged it in others, and lamented the want of it in themselves. But, I ask, does the fact of those men being useful, prove anything against the utility of education? Surely not. It only proves they would have been more useful with the advantage of an education!

B. Well, but are not some ministers who have not had the advantage of an education, as great preachers and useful men, and even more so, than some who have had this advantage.

A. I am perfectly free to acknowledge all this. But I still maintain my position, and contend that this, all this, does not go to prove anything against the utility of education in others, nor does it prove that those very men would not have been greater preachers and more useful men with the advantage of an education. Suppose you have

one of your hands tied behind your back, and I have the free use of both of mine, but still, notwithstanding this great disadvantage on your part, you are able to lift a greater weight and do more work with your one hand, than I can with both of mine—I ask, does this prove that two hands are not better than one? Or does it prove that you could not do still better, if you had the use of the other hand? Or does it prove that I could do just as well with one hand as both? Surely it proves nothing of all this. I leave you to make the application.

B. Well, my brother, you cut me off at such a rate in all my arguments, that I would give up and call for quarters, if it was not for one thing, and that is, as you must surely agree, that the disciples of our Saviour were ignorant and unlearned men?

A. I know this is a generally received opinion, even by many who are in favor of a well informed ministry; but I can by no means subscribe to the idea. And I think a few minutes' reflection will convince you, and them too, that you are all under a very great mistake. We have ample proof at hand that those men were neither ignorant nor unlearned, according to the ideas associated with these words; or according to their modern signification. Remember, it was Peter and John who were called ignorant and unlearned; (see Acts iv. 13;) now we have the writings of both those men in Greek. Compare their writings with those of the best Greek scholars and classic authors, such as Xenophon, Homer, and others, and you will find their style, language, &c. are pure and correct. This, then, ought to settle the point. Because, if you can write as correctly, in all respects, as an acknowledgedly good scholar, this surely

ought to prove, to the satisfaction of all, your good scholarship. But do observe, my brother, Peter and John labored under a vast disadvantage, viz: They were not Grecians, nor was the Greek their mother language; hence, we see, they were capable of writing, and that correctly too, in a language that was not their own. Surely this is more than sufficient to prove my point. Your mother language is English, but suppose you can take your pen and throw together the most excellent ideas in the Greek language, in a style as pure, as chaste, and as grammatical as the very best Greek scholar, do you think you ought to be called ignorant and unlearned? Surely not. Well, such was the case with Peter and John, and all the others so far as is known to us. Matthew was called from the receipt of custom; this office he was unfit for, unless he was a good scholar, and capable of writing and transacting business in various languages, as must be evident to you and any one else. But again—The disciples were three years in the best theological school and under the best teacher that ever was on earth, previous to their going fully into the work of the ministry. And, in addition to all this, God, by a miracle, enabled them, on the day of Pentecost, to preach the gospel in thirteen different languages. (See Acts ii. 7—13.) Now I wish to be clearly understood; I do not deny but that these men might have been styled ignorant and unlearned in a comparative sense, that is, when compared with Paul, Gamaliel, &c., but they were by no means ignorant and unlearned according to the ideas we attach to, or associate with those terms.

B. But is it not said, God hath chosen the weak things of this

world to confound the things which are mighty?

A. Yes; but if you will examine this chapter, you will find that Paul includes himself throughout, as a part of those weak things; and, therefore, it cannot answer your purpose, as to an uninformed ministry; for Paul was learned in all the languages, science, and wisdom of his day and time. The fact is, Paul is here speaking in a kind of satirical manner, in accordance with the prejudiced ideas of the Jews and Greeks.—Hence you find in this same chapter, Paul, in this kind of satirical sense, calls the preaching of the gospel, and a crucified Saviour, foolishness and a stumbling block. “For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom; but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness.” (See 1 Cor. i. 22, 23.) The fact is, the whole plan of salvation by a crucified Jesus, was considered nothing but a parcel of nonsense, foolishness, and weakness by the unbelieving Jews and Greeks: though it was, indeed, the wisdom and power of God unto salvation, to all that believed, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.

B. Well, brother A, I acknowledge I have different views of this part of the subject, from what I ever had before, and am heartily willing to give it up. You have brought some, yea many things to my mind, which I hope I shall never forget. I will take the whole of what you have said into deep consideration, and look to God for the aid and direction of his holy Spirit.

A. May the Lord grant you the aid necessary to the forming of just ideas, is my most sincere prayer.

B. But there is one thing that appears to be wrong on the part of you missionary brethren concerning us, and that is, you appear to have taken up the idea that we are opposed to the spread of the gospel. God forbid that this should be the case.

A. I too, my brother, can heartily say, God forbid! But suffer me to ask—suppose you were opposed to it in every shape and sense, and did not pretend to deny it, how else could you act, than as you do? What else could you do than speak against it publicly and privately, and preach against it from the pulpit, and do all you could to enlist the prejudices of the religious public against it! What else, I ask, could you do?

B. O, but we do not pray against it.

A. True. And is not this full proof that you are conscious you are wrong? For if your cause is good, why not go to God with it? If you are right in opposing those means, which are, in their nature, calculated to spread the gospel and a knowledge of religious truth, it certainly

The very first step towards consistency on the part of those ministers who are opposed to the missionary cause, is to quit preaching themselves, because every gospel sermon is a missionary effort. The next step towards consistency, would be to quit praying for the spread of the gospel, for every sincere prayer is an effort in the missionary cause. And the third and last step to be completely consistent, would be to pray against it.

would be right to pray to God to stop it, and to bless the feeble exertions which you are making against its spread. Yea, I do insist, my brother, the very first step towards consistency on the part of those ministers who are opposed to the missionary cause, is to quit preaching themselves, because every gospel

sermon is a missionary effort. The next step towards consistency, would be to quit praying for the spread of the gospel, for every sincere prayer is an effort in the missionary cause. And the third and last step to be completely consistent, would be to pray against it; for our preaching and praying surely ought always to correspond.

B. This, my brother, would be dreadful!—awful!!

A. It would, indeed: nor would I by any means advise you to do so. But still I say, to be consistent with yourselves, you ought to do it. But, my brother, I do not think this would be any worse than being opposed to Bible Societies: for I think this is, in effect, rising up in open and positive opposition to the word of God! and I think if you were to reflect seriously upon it, you would see with me. Because, when you protest against any society, it is not the mere circumstance of their meeting together which you oppose; no, but it is the business in which this society is engaged. Well, in what are Bible Societies engaged? Why, in sending the Bible into different, distant, and destitute parts of the world—they are engaged in putting the word of eternal life into the houses and hands of poor dying sinners. But you protest against this. Now the question is—How can you oppose this, unless you are opposed to the Bible, and think it an improper book to send abroad?—an improper book for sinners to read! Alas! my brother, for the Lord's sake—for your own soul's sake—for the soul's sake of lost and perishing sinners, reflect, O! reflect what you are about!

B. Truly this looks bad enough!

A. It surely does, but it looks no worse than it really is. It is not a

whit worse than denying to people the liberty of conscience!

B. O, brother, I hope you do not accuse us of that too?

A. I do not know how you can get over it! For instance, I feel for my fellow dying man, and desire to be instrumental in doing something for his spiritual good. I therefore think it my duty to give a part of what the Lord has given me, towards sending the gospel where the people are dying for lack of knowledge; and this I do positively believe, before God and my own conscience, to be my bounden duty. But you say I shall not—if I do you will turn me out of the church. Thus you go as far as your power extends in depriving me of the liberty of conscience. And what is this mighty crime for which I must be banished from the church and the house of God? The great crime—Oh! can my tongue utter it?—the great crime is, that I desire to see sinners saved from eternal death! My crime, my deep, and black, and dismal crime is, that I gave something towards the spread of the gospel! My only and unpardonable crime is, that I threw one mite into the treasury of the Lord! For this I must be expelled from church privileges, though my conscience, and the word of God, and the spirit of the gospel, all told me, and yet tell me, it was right—it was my duty: while others can spend their scores of dollars for rum and whiskey to the injury of their own health, the detriment of their family, and the great annoyance of both civil and religious society, and yet maintain their place and standing in the church! Now, my brother, wherein does all this differ from the most settled spirit of persecution and Popery?

B. I hope and trust you are not going to palm persecution and

Popery upon us!

A. No. I am not going to do it; and would pray God that you might be kept from both. But for the life of me, I cannot tell what else to make of your conduct. You know as well as I do, that it is the spirit of Popery to keep the people in a state of as great ignorance as possible—to keep the Bible out of the hands of the people—to deprive the people of the liberty of conscience in matters of religion—to keep all the means of religious knowledge from the people. The Pope is issuing his prohibitory edicts against missionary enterprise—against Missionary, Bible, and Religious Tract Societies, &c. And why all this? Because the Pope, and all the papal authorities, see and know, that if these things become common, the reign of Popish darkness will come to an end. And now, my brother, reflect, when I ask you, what are our anti-missionary brethren doing, different from the Pope and Popish authorities? Are they not issuing their decrees and edicts against all Missionary, Bible, and Tract Societies? Are they not, in effect, (as we have already shown) denying the liberty of conscience, so far as their power extends? Are they not doing all in their power to stop the progress of religious knowledge? Does not all this breathe the very life and spirit of Popery? If there is any difference, my brother, I acknowledge I am so stupid I cannot see it. And if you, or any one else, will point out to me the difference, I will thank you for the information. The fact is, if you will compare the different publications, put forth by the Pope himself and the different papal authorities, against Missionary, Bible, and Tract Societies, with those put forth by the anti-missionary brethren against the same

societies, you will find they are so exactly alike, in all respects, as to induce the belief that one must have been borrowed, or copied from the other!! This circumstance ought, surely, to be enough to open the eyes of our opposing brethren.

B. I do acknowledge, that there is something very much alike in their conduct and ours; but then we have not got to burning the Bible yet; and you know the Popish authorities have done this in many instances.

A. True, my brother, you have not got to this extent yet. But do you not bid fair for it! And, further, would it not be perfectly consistent with the rest of your conduct to do so. For it really appears to me if it is wrong for Bible Societies to send the Bible abroad into the world, it would be right for you to burn it! Understand me, my brother. I say, it appears to me, that if it be wrong for us to publish the Bible, it is, of course, right for you to burn it!!

B. Ah! my brother, this alarms me!!

A. Well it may,—it ought.

B. There is one thing, however, that comforts me a little, and that is—If this missionary business is of the Lord, he will bless it, and carry it on. And, further, if it is not, it will come to nothing.

A. This is true. And if you are willing to let this be the criterion whereby to determine whether it is of the Lord or not, then you must give up the point. For, thanks be to Almighty God, he has already blessed it; and is now blessing and carrying it on in the most wonderful manner. This, I know, you may be disposed to question. But surely,

my brother, we cannot deny the combined testimony of hundreds of the most pious and eminent ministers of the gospel, belonging to the Methodist, Episcopalian, Congregational, Presbyterian, and Baptist denominations. All these, with thousands of private characters, declare to us, the glorious effects produced, by and through the agency of missionary exertions, at home and abroad, of which they have been eye and ear witnesses. Enlightened travelers and officers of government, who have visited many of our missionary stations, declare the same things. We see letters from all parts, written by men of piety and integrity, giving circumstantial accounts of these important facts. And there are not a few in our own churches in this state, whose names we could mention, who own these missionary labors as the means, in the hand of God, of their conversion. I know of several myself, who acknowledge religious tracts as the means of bringing them to a knowledge of the truth. And shall we—can we say, all these have become common liars? Surely not.

B. But will not God's purposes stand. And after all your missionary labors, will there be one soul saved, more than what God saw from all eternity would be saved?

A. To be sure God's purposes will stand, and I am rejoiced in the fact. But then, what of all this? Now, I would not think this old, worn out, Antinomian, and infidel excuse for laziness and wickedness, worthy of any notice, were it not that I know it is destroying the usefulness of many, and encouraging thousands to go on in a course of sin. I mean that the false conclusions, drawn from these premises,

are doing this injury. I would, therefore, say, (as I have said before) that whatever may be said on this subject, will hold just as true when applied to our preaching and praying, at home, in our own congregations and families, as when applied to our missionary labors abroad; and, also, when applied to things of a temporal nature, just as much as when applied to things of a spiritual nature. It is just as true, that God's purposes will stand with regard to our crops, and after all our toiling and sweating there will not be one grain of corn more made than what God already knew would be made. What then? Are we on this account to lie down and sleep? Are God's purposes and foreknowledge against, or opposed to man's agency? If you will read Acts xviii. 9, 10, you will find that God himself teaches a very different doctrine, and assigns as a reason why Paul must speak and not hold his peace while at Corinth, that he had much people in that city. Now if Paul had been an Antinomian, might he not have said, "Well, Lord, if thou hast these people, why then need I preach to turn them unto thee?" Also, see Paul's account of the shipwreck. Though he had been assured by a messenger from heaven that they should all get safe to land, yet when he saw the shipmen, or sailors, about to escape, he tells the centurion—"Except these abide in the ship ye cannot be saved." My dear brother, I do verily believe that this old Antinomian sentiment causes thousands of Baptists to live in the neglect of duty; and no doubt keeps vast numbers of them from engaging in the missionary cause.

B. But are we not saved by grace?

A. O, yes. And I am so willing to subscribe to this doctrine, that

I say it is by grace, (that is, unmerited favor) that I have a morsel of bread to eat. And now, brother B, as it is growing late, and is time for us to draw to a close, let me ask you a question or two before we part.

1. Would it not be well for you to stop your opposition, lest you be found fighting against God?

2. Will it not be a poor death-bed consolation to think you never gave one cent to the spread of the gospel; but, on the contrary, always opposed those who did?

3. Why do you not throw away all the hymn books now in use, for they were all put out by missionary men, and abound with missionary hymns, such as this, viz:

“Go, Missionary and proclaim
The kind Redeemer you have found;
Publish his ever-precious name,
To all the wond’ring nations round.” &c.

4. Now how would you anti-missionary brethren have this hymn? Would you have it to read thus? viz:

“Stop, Missionary, don’t proclaim
The kind Redeemer you have found
Publish not his glorious name,
To all the wond’ring nations round.” &c.

5. How do you think this would sound, bursting forth from the hearts and mouths of a congregation of Christians? It would certainly sound oddly enough; but to be consistent with yourselves you ought to have your anti-missionary hymns and prayers, as well as your anti-

missionary sermons.

6. Do you think that those brethren can be actuated by a good spirit, who are always urging a separation among the Baptists—always urging a non-fellowship?

7. For the Lord's sake, and for the peace of the churches, ought we not all to be willing to live and let live?

B. Yes, we ought, my dear brother; here we agree exactly.

A. And I hope we shall always agree in this particular; for it has always been a great grief to me to hear any one urging a non-fellowship, and a separation on account of things which ought not to disturb our fellowship. If I think it is my duty to give, let me enjoy the liberty of my conscience; and if you do not think it your duty to give, I am willing to let you enjoy the liberty of your conscience.

B. I hope so too. Farewell—may the Lord bless you.

A. Farewell, my brother—the Lord bless you too, and teach us all our duty, is my prayer.

B. Amen.

A. Amen.