

will tell us, that he is in favor of *doing the work* in some other way, and that he would not lessen the real amount done. But we claim that what we are doing, or may do, through our Missionary arrangement, or General Missionary Society, which is the same, will not lessen one whit all that is being done every other way in which we are accomplishing anything. Indeed, we claim more than that. We claim that it will infuse the missionary spirit among us, lead us to speak of it, read the Scriptures to learn how the first Christians spread the name and authority of the Lord so wonderfully over the earth, pray more, go to meeting more, exhort, preach, sing and worship more. In one word, in this way, we shall keep alive, save the brethren from coldness, carelessness, backsliding and make us better in every sense. Keep all hands busy in the work of the Lord, and it will inspire more piety, devotion, zeal, love, earnestness, spirit, life and animation, than all the fine theories that our pious and profound philosophers have afforded us. Our churches must not be mere formal, nominal and respectable arrangements, but powerful, effective and operative bodies, so that each member of the body shall be doing enough to make him feel sensible that he is a part of the body. Have work going on that will require the strength of the whole body to move it, and every member realizes that he is of some importance or use in the body.

Our brother continues the sound in our ears, that *it is an unscriptural society*. Before we become alarmed at anything, however, it is proper to know precisely what it is. Before our brother makes his attack, he should know precisely what he is making his attack upon. It is not the missionary work he attacks. He is in favor of that. He makes no attack upon missionaries. It is, therefore, neither our missionaries nor missions that he opposes. Indeed, we cannot gather from anything he has said above, that he really attacks anything that we are doing. He believes in missions, both home and foreign. He believes in missionaries. He believes that they should be sustained by the churches. About all this we have no controversy. What, then, is the trouble about? We may have names for some things not as consistent as others he might suggest, or find in the New Testament. Evangelists, or missionaries, were, in some instances, sent out by the churches anciently. They had in the ancient churches "messengers of the churches." The business of these extended beyond the limits of an individual congregation. They were men who transacted business for the churches abroad. These men met, consulted, deliberated and transacted business as the churches had authorized them. We call such men *presidents, secretaries and agents*, and the body of them, or the company of them, when met to do the business of the churches, or to act as messengers for them, the "General Missionary Society," for the sake of the advantages of a charter and corporate body, though, in reality, there is no body of an ecclesiastical character at all, but simply an arrangement of brethren, by means of their messengers, for the consummation of their will and work. It is right for two churches to co-operate in missionary work, and appoint a suitable number of their